Document 9.2
PINS Ref: EN010088

West Burton C (Gas Fired Generating Station)

The West Burton C (Generating Station) Order

Land to the north of the West Burton B Power Station, Nottinghamshire

Applicant's Responses to ExQ1

Examination Deadline 2

Applicant: EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Limited
Date: 6 December 2019

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

ABBREVIATION	DESCRIPTION
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load - a load that cannot, without undue expense or risk of damage, be divided into two or more loads for the purpose of being carried on a road.
Applicant	EDF Energy (Thermal Energy) Limited (the Applicant).
BAT	Best Available Techniques – available techniques which are the best for preventing or minimising emissions and impacts on the environment. BAT is required for operations involving the installation of a facility that carries out industrial processes.
BDC	Bassetlaw District Council – the local planning authority with jurisdiction over the area within which the West Burton Power Station site and Proposed Development Site (the Site) are situated.
BPEO	Best Practicable Environmental Option
BPM	Best Practicable Means – actions undertaken and mitigation measures implemented to ensure that noise levels are minimised to be as low as practicable.
BS	British Standard – business standards based upon the principles of standardisation recognised inter alia in European Policy.
CCGT	Combined Cycle Gas Turbine – a CCGT is a combustion plant where a gas turbine is used to generate electricity and the waste heat from the flue-gas of the gas turbine is converted to useful energy in a heat recovery steam generator (HRSG), where it is used to generate steam. The steam then expands in a steam turbine to produce additional electricity.
CCR	Carbon Capture Ready – a power station is Carbon Capture Ready where it has been demonstrated that: sufficient space is available on or near the site to accommodate carbon capture equipment in the future; retrofitting carbon capture technology is technically feasible; that a suitable area of deep geological storage exists for the storage of captured CO2; transporting CO2 to the storage location is technically feasible and carbon capture and storage is likely to be economically feasible.
CCS	Carbon Capture and Storage - a technology that enables carbon dioxide, that would otherwise be released to the atmosphere, to be captured and permanently stored. Once carbon dioxide has been captured, it is then compressed and transported, before being permanently stored in deep geological formations, such as depleted oil and gas fields and saline aquifers.
CCS	The Considerate Constructors Scheme – a non-profit making, independent organisation founded in 1997 by the construction industry to improve its image.

CD&E	Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan – a plan to outline how a construction project will avoid, minimise or mitigate effects on the environment and surrounding area.
COSHH	Control of Substances Hazardous to Health – a United Kingdom Statutory Instrument stating general requirements on employers to protect employees and other persons from the hazards of substances used at work by risk assessment.
CIRIA	Construction Industry Research and Information Association – a member-based research and information organisation dedicated to improvement in all aspects of the construction industry.
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan - a plan outlining measures to organise and control vehicular movement on a construction site so that vehicles and pedestrians using site routes can move around safely.
CWTP	Construction Workers Travel Plan – a plan managing and promoting how construction workers travel to a particular area or organisation. It aims at promoting greener, cleaner travel choices and reducing reliance on the private car.
DCO	A Development Consent Order made by the relevant Secretary of State pursuant to The Planning Act 2008 to authorise a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. A DCO can incorporate or remove the need for a range of consents which would otherwise be required for a development.
DCLG	Department of Communities and Local Government – the UK department for communities and local government in England (now the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government).
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.
EA	Environment Agency – a non-departmental public body sponsored by the United Kingdom government's Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), with responsibilities relating to the protection and enhancement of the environment in England.
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment – a term used for the assessment of environmental consequences (positive or negative) of a plan, policy, program or project prior to the decision to move forward with the proposed action.
ELV	Emission Limit Values – emission limit values based on the Best Available Techniques.
ES	Environmental Statement – a report in which the process and results of an Environment Impact Assessment are documented.

FBA	Furnace Bottom Ash – the "coarse" ash fraction produced by coal-fired power stations when pulverised fuel is burned at high temperatures and pressures.
FGD	Flue Gas Desulphurisation – a set of technologies used to remove sulphur dioxide from exhaust flue gases of fossil-fuel power plants.
HEMP	Handover Environmental Management Plan
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle – vehicles with a gross weight in excess of 3.5 tonnes.
HRSG	Heat Recovery Steam Generator – an energy recovery heat exchanger that recovers heat from a hot gas stream. It produces steam that can be used in a process (cogeneration) or used to drive a steam turbine (combined cycle).
IDB	Internal Drainage Boards – a type of operating authority with permissive powers to undertake work to secure clean water drainage and water level management within drainage districts.
ISMP	Invasive Species Management Plan
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council – the county council that has jurisdiction over land to the west of the River Trent.
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
MMP	Materials Management Plan
NCC	Nottinghamshire County Council – the county council with jurisdiction over the area within which the West Burton Power Station site and Proposed Development Site (the Site) are situated.
NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework was published on 24 July 2018 and replaced the previous NPPF published on 27 March 2012. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied in both plan-making and decision-taking. It does not contain any specific policies on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects but its policies may be taken into account in decisions on DCOs if the Secretary of State considers them to be relevant.
NPPW	National Planning Policy For Waste
OCGT	Open Cycle Gas Turbine – a combustion turbine plant fired by gas or liquid fuel to turn a generator rotor that produces electricity.
PFA	Pulverised Fuel Ash – a by-product of pulverised fuel fired power stations.
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
PWMS	Precautionary Working Method Statement
PPG	Pollution Prevention Guidelines – a series of documents developed by the Environment Agency for England and Wales, the Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA) for Northern Ireland,

	and the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) for Scotland. Each PPG is targeted at a particular type of business or activity and covers environmental good practice to minimise pollution.
SEA/SA	Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal - SA is designed to ensure compliance with SEA and as such includes for requirements on environmental decision making such as an opportunity for the public to express their opinion on draft plans (community involvement), take into account significant environmental effects including those on human health, material assets and climatic factors and a full assessment of alternative options and reasons why alternatives have been assessed and why others have not.
SWMP	Site Waste Management Plan - a SWMP sets out how resources will be managed and waste controlled at all stages during a construction project.
WBA	West Burton A - the existing coal fired power station within the West Burton Power Station Site, owned and operated by EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Limited.
WBB	West Burton B - the existing gas-fired power station, using Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) technology, owned and operated by EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Limited.
WLDC	West Lindsey District Council – The adjoining local planning authority to where the West Burton Power Station site and Proposed Development site (the Site) are situated.

The Examination Library

PINS' Examination Library references are included in these questions (e.g. APP-010) in addition to the Applicant's Application Document Numbers. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/north-east/west-burton-c-power-station/?ipcsection=docs

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

ExQ1	Questions to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
1.	**General and Cross-topic Questions**		
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?	The dimensions for some of the smaller proposed structures are not defined in the parameter tables in the draft DCO (**APP-004** – **Document 2.1**), because they are not considered to have any effect on the assessment of environmental effects associated with the Proposed Development due to their small size. Only those structures with the potential to have landscape or visual effects have been specified in the draft DCO. Nevertheless, the maximum parameters for each of these structures has been included in **APP-033** (**Chapter 4:** The Proposed Development). **Table 4-1** and **Table 4-2** set out the parameters that have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES) applying the Rochdale Envelope approach. Each topic specific chapter (Chapters 6-16) of the Environmental Statement (**Document 5.2**) has considered these maximum (and, where applicable, minimum) parameters to undertake a worst-case assessment.
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?	WBA will not need to cease operation during construction of WBC. WBB may need to cease operation of one or more units for a period of time during construction, but the duration of any such periods would be minimised.
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?	As described in paragraph 4.8.10 of **APP-033** (**Chapter 4:** The Proposed Development) the design of the Proposed Development has evolved and been refined through a continuous process of environmental assessment, consultation and design development to the point of submission of the Application. Examples of design decisions which considered early environmental appraisal work, including that presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) report published for statutory consultation, are described in paragraph 4.8.11. For example, detailed air quality modelling presented in **APP-051** (**Appendix 6A:** Air Quality Technical Appendix) informed the design decision that if up to five smaller OCGT units are installed, they would be orientated in a nominal north-south direction, unless it can be demonstrated that environmental effects for any parameter would be no worse than those assessed and presented in the ES. Matters relating to operational efficiency are cited in paragraph 4.8.5 of **APP-033** (**Chapter 4:** The Proposed Development) i.e. the Proposed Power Plant Site is located in close proximity to the National Grid electricity transmission network and to available electrical, gas and utility connections associated with the existing WBA and WBB Power Stations, providing opportunities for synergies, efficiencies and thus economic and environmental benefits for the Proposed Development.

			Each chapter of the ES (Chapter 6 – 16) sets out a range of design and impact avoidance measures that are embedded in the design of the Proposed Development. As described in paragraph 2.6.1 of **APP-031** (**Chapter 2:** Assessment Methodology) these typically include measures required 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 of impacts and effects in each chapter has been undertaken on the basis of these measures being implemented (i.e. they are considered 'embedded mitigation'). In the 'design and impact avoidance' sections of Chapters 6 - 16, details on associated Application documents which provide further detail on design and impact avoidance measures is provided. As an example, to illustrate this response, those measures in **APP-039** (**Chapter 10**: Landscape and Visual Amenity) include the following: • lighting required during the operation stage of the Proposed Development would be designed to reduce unnecessary light spill outside of the Site boundary, in accordance with the Lighting Strategy (**APP-138** - **Document 7.4**) - (secured through the discharge of Requirement 7 (1-4) of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**); and • the existing vegetation along the Site boundary would be retained and managed to ensure its continued presence to aid the screening of low level views into the Site. This has been incorporated into the Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan (**APP-139** - **Document 7.5**) and is secured through Requirement 6 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**). While these are mentioned in the context of Landscape and Visual Amenity, they are implicitly followed for other topics.
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.	No comment

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?	The actual quantity of gas that would be used by the plant will depend upon electricity and gas market conditions during the operational life of the plant. These will vary from year to year and cannot be anticipated in advance. **Table 1** of **APP-069** (**Appendix 15A**: Greenhouse Gas Assessment) explains that the annual quantity of natural gas used would be up to 1,242GWh. The findings in relation to climate change are based on this assumption. This represents a worst case scenario where the plant runs for 1,500 hours per year, the maximum anticipated to be allowed under its Environmental Permit.
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?	The abstraction licence for WBA and WBB allows for the abstraction of 21,820 cubic metres of water per day. These volumes are primarily to allow for the abstracted water to be used to indirectly cool process steam in the steam cycles of both stations. WBC as an Open Cycle Gas Turbine (OCGT) plant will not have a steam cycle and therefore only low volumes of abstracted water will be required for such purposes as filling closed cooling water circuit(s), for maintenance and cleaning, for firefighting and possibly for gas preheating. It is not possible to be specific about the volumes involved at this stage of design and because of the nature of usage the volumes will vary depending on the plant operation and maintenance activities being undertaken in any period however an application to vary the abstraction licence to enable water use by WBC will be made at a later date without an increase in overall abstraction allowance.
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 conclusions in the ES?	**APP-137** (**Document 7.3**) - the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced in conjunction with the ES (**Document 5.2**) with the aim of ensuring that design and impact avoidance measures which the ES has assumed will be implemented, are implemented effectively during the construction phase, together with any additional mitigation measures proposed to reduce significant adverse environmental effects. Section 3 of the Framework CEMP sets out the embedded impact avoidance and additional mitigation, enhancement and management measures to be included as a minimum in the final CEMP, proposed to be secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**). For each discipline, the Framework CEMP also illustrates where additional surveys will be required, either pre-construction or during construction. It describes how the monitoring strategy would be implemented in order to assess the effectiveness of mitigation measures, monitor the impact of construction works and take other actions necessary to enable compliance.

			National policy includes and acknowledges the need for measures to be 'reasonably practicable' given that in certain circumstances, there may be justifiable constraints to implementation of a design or impact avoidance measure (e.g. due to local conditions on Site). It has been agreed with West Lindsey District Council in the signed Statement of Common Ground (**REP1-012**) and through the Statement of Common Ground with Bassetlaw District, which will be completed and submitted at the subsequent Examination Deadline, that the impact avoidance and control measures outlined in the Framework CEMP are appropriate. In the vast majority of cases, these are standard practice mitigation measures, widely used in the industry when undertaking construction projects, so it is envisaged that they would be applied. If greater assurance is required to demonstrate that the proposed measures are being committed to by the Applicant, the use of the phrase "*where reasonably practicable*" can be reviewed and amended or further clarified as appropriate.
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?	**Table 16-3** of **APP-045** (**Chapter 16**: Cumulative and Combined Effects) sets out the consultation process undertaken for this ES Chapter and the comments received from relevant stakeholders and addressed by the Applicant. The relevant local authorities were invited to comment on the list of schemes considered in the cumulative impact assessment from an initial list provided in **APP-046** (**Appendix 1A**: the EIA Scoping Report) and then the short-list considered in Chapter 16: Cumulative and Combined Effects, of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. Each local authority was also provided with a final draft copy of Chapter 16: Cumulative and Combined Effects, prior to submission of the Application. This included the short-list of major projects, with the offer of a pre-application meeting to discuss the proposals and feedback on the Application documents. Meetings held with and feedback received from West Lindsey District Council are described in the Statement of Common Ground agreed with the authority and submitted at Deadline 1 (**REP1-012**). The same approach is taken in the Statement of Common Ground in discussion with Bassetlaw District Council, which will be completed and submitted at the subsequent Examination Deadline. Through the finalisation of these SoCGs, '*It is further agreed that the short list of committed developments for cumulative effects assessment was appropriate at the time of the Application.'*
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?	No decision on the closure date for WBA has been taken at this time. This will be influenced by factors including future market conditions, which are outside of the control of the Applicant. Similarly, there are no timings at this stage for the demolition of any structures associated with WBA Power Station.

			As discussed within paragraph 10.4.38 of **APP-039** (**Chapter 10**: Landscape and Visual Amenity), while it is anticipated that WBA Power Station would close by 2025 under current legislation, the uncertainty regarding the future closure plans has precluded this scenario from consideration in the assessment in both the landscape and cultural heritage chapters (**APP-043**).
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?	The likely closure of Cottam Power Station has been acknowledged in **APP-042** (**Chapter 13**: Socio-economics) of the ES. **Chapter 13**: Socio-economics explains that some of the up to 15 operational roles for the Proposed Development are likely to be met by current workers at Cottam/West Burton Power Stations and notes that the Proposed Development would generate employment during the construction phase, contributing to sustainability of employment of current workers at the West Burton and/or Cottam Power Station sites. None of the conclusions of any assessment presented in the ES are affected by the closure of Cottam Power Station. Its cessation of operation is likely to result in a slight improvement in local air quality but conservatively this has not been taken into account in the assessment of impact from 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?	The indicative elevational drawings (**APP-023** and **APP-024)** show the proposed development at an arbitrary 'ground level' and do not consider the minimum or maximum final ground heights described in the draft DCO. The Applicant does not believe that the elevational drawings should be based on an Ordnance Datum (OD) or reflect either minimum or maximum ground levels as this does not materially affect the appearance of the Proposed Development or the details provided in the elevational drawings. Indicative visual representations of the Proposed Development are provided in the relevant photomontages and wireframes (**APP107 – APP-126**) which show the Proposed Development at an indicative final ground height of +13m above AD (AOD). As outlined in Q7.4, the photomontages and wireframes largely represent the worst-case maximum final ground height scenario, as the 1m difference is not material at the distances in the wireframes and photomontages from Viewpoint 4 and Viewpoint 12 (**APP-107 to APP-126**) looking towards the Site. Visual impacts and effects of the Proposed Development have been considered in **APP-039** (**Chapter 10**: Landscape and Visual Amenity), the conclusions of which are

			based upon a computer generated ZTV that incorporates the worst-case maximum ground level height of +14m AOD as described in the draft DCO (**APP-004** – **Document 2.1**).
Q1.12	The Applicant	Does the Applicant intend to submit a s106 agreement in relation to any part of the Proposed Development?	No matters have been identified by the Applicant or any stakeholders to necessitate mitigation to be secured via a Section 106 agreement. It is intended that the Community Fund referred to in the Applicant's submission to Deadline 1 (**REP1-005**, response to RR-017) would not be recognised as a material planning consideration, but instead recognised as an act of being a good neighbour. It would be an extension to the Community Fund already administered by EDF Energy in connection with its WBA and WBB stations, but uplifted by £5,000 per year for each year of construction of WBC. This could be directed towards some of the initiatives identified by Bole residents and Historic England in their relevant representations.
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.	**APP-031 (Chapter 2**: Assessment Methodology) outlines the mitigation hierarchy which is considered in the technical chapters (Chapters 6 – 16) of the ES, including the design and impact avoidance measures that are considered 'embedded mitigation'. **Appendix 1**: Commitments Register of the Planning Statement **APP-136** (**Document 7.1**) provides a detailed inventory of all commitments to mitigation measures contained in the ES and the wider suite of Application Documents and signposts to where they are located (column 2), what the measure comprises (column 3), the reason for the measure (column 4) and how they will be secured (column 5). Where Requirements of the draft DCO (**APP-004**, **Document 2.1**, which should be read alongside **Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) are proposed to secure the design/impact avoidance or mitigation measures, the Requirement is cited. **Appendix 1**: Commitments Register of **APP-136** (**Document 7.1**) is a working document and will be updated throughout the Examination, with any additional mitigation agreed added to this.
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?	Generation would be controlled by installing plant with an output (if necessary limited by control systems) of up to 299MW at ISO conditions. Output would be measured at the generator terminals or the sum of the outputs at generator terminals if there is more than one OCGT.
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	It is not possible to commit to the use of rail or other forms of transport (for example water borne) at this time, because it is not certain where materials required for the construction of the Proposed Development would be sourced from. It is likely that this would not be known with certainty until after the DCO is granted and a contractor is

		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?	appointed. However, the Applicant is committed to reviewing the viability of transporting materials by sustainable modes of transport during the construction of the Proposed Development. This is secured through Requirement 18: Construction Traffic Management Plan of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**). As noted in Q4.5(h) the draft DCO has been amended so that Requirement 18 refers to 'framework construction traffic management plan' instead of 'construction traffic and routing management plan' or 'framework construction transport management plan'. The Site is rail connected with the Lincoln to Sheffield Railway Line running north-east/south-west along the western boundary of the West Burton Power Station site. This existing rail line has been used for delivery of coal, limestone and gypsum to the West Burton Power Station site on a regular basis, with up to 20 trains per day when WBA Power Station was base loading, reducing to approximately 10 trains per day from 2010, and to approximately 2-3 trains per day in 2019. As such, if the origin of construction materials is rail connected, delivery by rail may be possible. Rail deliveries would require the necessary infrastructure on-Site for the unloading of materials from rail wagons. The rail-offloading area has therefore been included in the draft DCO Order Limits for the Proposed Development (refer to **APP-017**, **Document 3.2**: Works Plan Sheet 9 of 10). Should the delivery of construction materials by rail be preferred by the appointed contractor, it is not anticipated that environmental effects such as noise would go beyond the worst-case scenarios assessed in the ES. Rail deliveries to the wider West Burton Power Station site are a long standing and accepted part of operations, with no complaints received in relation to aspects such as noise. Indeed, use of rail would likely result in benefits, particularly in relation to traffic and transport. Such benefits, however, are not likely to materially affect the overall conclusions of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport).
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 number of studies have been undertaken in the ongoing design development prior to submission of the Application to determine the most appropriate finished site level, using topographical data on existing site levels. These studies have informed the maximum and minimum parameters for the finished floor levels specified in **Table 4-1** and **Table 4-2** of **APP-033** (**Chapter 4**: The Proposed Development) that have then been considered in chapters 6-16 of the ES.

		a) Confirm that the up to 14mAOD build up would provide a consistent level across the Proposed Development site; 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; c) That the Applicant does not require spoil to be brought into the site to make up levels; and d) Whether the Applicant has considered the use of a soil management plan to ensure best practice soil management.	The intention is to work towards an almost neutral cut and fill balance to minimise site preparation works. Existing levels across the Proposed Power Plant Site typically vary between approximately 12.7m - 13.3m (average of 12.9m AOD). The intention is to remove the existing approximate 200mm of topsoil and then level the working area to a consistent working level which may be between +12.0m and +13.0m (although levels up to +14.0m have been assessed in the ES for the purposes of determining worst-case impacts and the final level will be subject to detailed design depending upon the appointed contractor). The proposed maximum ground level of the Proposed Power Plant Site is +14mAOD. Actual site levels may be less than this and would be determined in the detailed design phase and controlled by Requirement 5(b) of the draft DCO (**APP-004**, **Document 2.1**). A final maximum ground level of +14m AOD is similar to the adjacent WBB Power Station which has working levels of approximately +8.6 - +12.3m AOD; and WBA Power Station which has approximate working levels of between 8.6m AOD - 11m AOD. As such, the level difference between the adjacent WBB and WBA Power Stations and the maximum final ground height of the Proposed Power Plant Site would be approximately 1.7m - 5.4m. If a consistent working level between +12.0m and +13.0m is assumed, maximum level differences are considerably less. It is not expected that there would be any significant volumes of PFA or waste spoil which are required to be imported or removed from the Site to facilitate the Proposed Development. Much of the on-site spoil would be re-used and the aim would be to achieve a material cut and fill balance. This is explained in paragraph 4.5.4 of **APP-033** (**Chapter 4**: The Proposed Development) and 15.4.8 of **APP-044** (**Chapter 15**: Sustainability, Waste and Climate Change). Paragraph 4.5.5 of **APP-033** (**Chapter 4**: The Proposed Development) explains that soils would be managed in accordance with the Defra (2011) *Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Development Sites* to minimise impacts on soil structure and quality. If necessary, suitable measures would be put in place to prevent sediment being washed off-site, and the stockpiles would be monitored/measured for wash away. Such measures are outlined in **APP-137** (**Document 7.3**) the Framework CEMP; this includes the production of a Materials Management Plan developed as part of the application of the CI:AIRE *Definition of Waste Code of Practice* to allow beneficial re-use of materials and a Site Waste

			Management Plan to manage waste to be removed and disposed of. Please refer to **Appendix A** of **APP-137** (**Document 7.3**).
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]?	It is the intention of the Applicant to vary its existing water abstraction licence (reference number: 03/28/69/0070) to include the purpose of supplying WBC at an appropriate time, there will be no change to licenced abstraction location or licenced volumes.
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?	As the UK moves toward net zero carbon emissions by 2050, it will depend on a secure low carbon electricity system to support that transition. Electricity supply and demand must be continuously balanced by National Grid to ensure stable operation of the grid and security of supply to homes, transport and businesses. That means that we need sources of flexible and quickly dispatchable (capable of being scheduled in advance, sometimes at very short notice, to operate, independently of weather conditions) 'back up' capacity for those times when the wind does not blow or the sun does not shine sufficiently and to secure electricity supplies against insufficient availability or failure of other plant. As the proportion of renewable generation increases, due to its intermittency, there is a corresponding requirement for more back up capacity. An Open Cycle Gas Turbine (OCGT) is well-suited to provide this back up or peaking capacity. The selection of open cycle gas turbine(s) is consistent with and recognised to represent BAT for plant operating up to a maximum of 1,500 hours per year on a rolling five year average, as defined by the Environment Agency. The 'Net Zero Technical Report' by the Committee on Climate Change in May 2019 (in response to the Government's request for advice on setting a net zero target) (the Report) addresses the decarbonising of back-up power generation and the following extracts are considered particularly relevant by the Applicant: *"A key component of maintaining security of supply in the UK's electricity system entails ensuring that electricity supply can be provided when electricity demand is high, and renewable output is low. Backup gas-based power plants that are available at all times, but run at low levels over an average year can be used to provide electricity during these periods." (Box 2.3. of the report)*

			"Modelling by Imperial College suggests a need for around 40-120 GW of backup gas plant by 2050, operating in over 15% of hours but providing less than 1% of generation." (Box 2.3. of the report) *"Our power sector scenarios for 2030 include 75-85% of electricity generation being met through low-carbon sources. Continued deployment of low-carbon electricity generation will allow this share to be maintained between 2030 and 2050." (page 43 of the report)* *"Decarbonising backup power generation will require the production of low-carbon fuels and infrastructure to transport and store these fuels for use at times of peak demand. Successful development of this infrastructure could see the small level of emissions from peak power generation decarbonised by 2050." (page 44 of the report).* The Applicant, therefore, understands that the Report accepts the importance of backup gas-based power plants for security of supply. It further understands that the Report acknowledges that the emissions from gas fired backup generation are small and that the infrastructure to enable its decarbonisation remains to be developed in the future, before deployment at scale is possible. Plant such as the Proposed Development will, therefore, be needed for many years ahead. The Applicant considers that the need for such plant is urgent to support increased deployment of intermittent renewables and cannot be deferred until such infrastructure is in place, which may be many years away. The Applicant would operate the Proposed Development in accordance with all applicable regulations as they may evolve in the future, including those related to implementation of climate change policy. Development of such regulations would be taken into account in determining the operational life of the Proposed Development and/or assessing any potential for future conversion to decarbonised operation, should the necessary supporting infrastructure (notably including a suitable decarbonised fuel supply) become available.
2.	**Air Quality and Emissions**		
Q2.1	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.3.26 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] sets out that the assessment has been conducted conservatively, assuming	A conservative approach has been followed throughout the assessment to ensure that potential adverse effects were not under estimated.

		the 2019 baseline as the opening baseline, as air quality is expected to improve in the future. Can the Applicant qualify this expectation?	One such assumption was that there would be no improvement in background air quality between 2019 and the earliest date of operation (Quarter 3, 2023). In reality, background concentrations are predicted to improve over time due to a range of measures implemented at a local and national level and also based on the gradual trend across the UK of ambient air quality improvement over many years. This is partly due to improvements in regulation of industrial sources but primarily because emissions from transport sources are improving due to the older vehicle fleet being replaced with newer cleaner vehicles. In addition, the Government at a national and local level is implementing plans to incentivise and accelerate the uptake of cycling, walking and shifts to cleaner ways of travel, including uptake of ultra-low emissions technologies such as electrically powered vehicles. This anticipated decrease in background concentrations is consistent with general UK trends in background air quality (Defra 2019)[1], which have tended to show improvement in air quality year on year due to improvements in the UK vehicle fleet. Implementation of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) which covers many industrial sectors requires BAT to control emissions to air. These BAT controls are reviewed regularly, which ensures that there is continued improvement in the environmental performance of UK industries. The implementation of the IED will ensure that emissions from industrial sources continue to decrease over time. Locally, host authorities including West Lindsey District Council and Bassetlaw District Council are responsible for implementing geographically targeted measures through their Air Quality Management responsibilities, where necessary, which will also target improvements in air quality, where required. Consequently, the concentration predictions for 2019 should not only be considered to be conservative, but the impact of the Proposed Development should be considered to be greatest in the opening year and will reduce in future years as background air quality improves.

[1] DEFRA (2019): Defra National Statistical Release 25 April 2019 - *Air Quality Statistics in the UK 1987 to 2018. Available online:* https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/796887/Air_Quality_Statistics_in_the_UK_1987_to_2018.pdf

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?	The Applicant's response to Q2.1 provides detail to qualify the use of 2019 as a conservative baseline. This is primarily due to the assumptions considered in the assessment, such as assuming there would be no improvement in background air quality between 2019 and the earliest date of operation (Quarter 3, 2023). In reality, background concentrations are predicted to improve over time due to a range of measures implemented at a local and national level and also based on the gradual trend across the UK of ambient air quality improvement over many years. The methodology has been accepted by West Lindsey District Council and Bassetlaw District Council through the formal consultation process. This is also reflected in signed Statement of Common Ground with West Lindsey District Council provided at Deadline 1 (**REP1-012**) and has been agreed through the Statement of Common Ground with Bassetlaw District Council, which will be completed and submitted at the subsequent Examination Deadline.
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?	Yes. The guidance provided by the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) (2017) *Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality* and the by the Environment Agency (2016) *Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit* (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/air-emissions-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit) has been considered in determining the study area for emissions during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. The study area for operational phase impacts extends up to 2km from the Proposed Power Plant Site in order to assess the potential maximum impacts on human health and ecological receptors, as in practice, and as shown by the isopleth figures of predicted concentrations from the Proposed Development in **APP-081** – **APP-084** (**Figure 6.2** – **Figure 6.5**), the predicted impacts become negligible beyond this distance. In order to ensure that all statutory and non-statutory ecological receptors were considered, the ecological study area was extended to up to 10km from the Proposed Power Plant Site, in line with the Environment Agency's risk assessment methodology. The study area for emissions during the construction phase has taken into account the likely affected road links using data from **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport). The study area has been determined by the screening of traffic data against criteria

			published by the IAQM (2016) '*Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction*'. In defining the study area, desk based assessment has also been undertaken in order to identify the sensitivity of receptors that could be affected. This is explained in paragraphs 6.4.1 – 6.4.4 in **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality). The study area has, therefore, been determined by the sensitivity of receptors and geographical extent over which impacts from the Proposed Development could occur.
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 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?	As explained in paragraph 6.4.5 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality), existing air quality conditions in the vicinity of the Site have been evaluated through a review of local authority air quality management reports, Defra published data and other sources. **Table 6-14** of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) provides data on the monitoring locations considered to represent the baseline air quality, including contributions from the WBA Power Station site and contributions from WBB Power Station site. The Defra background concentrations presented in **Table 6-15** of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) and used in the assessment will include the current contributions from the existing WBA Power Station and WBB Power Station current emissions. Assuming a three year construction programme, the Proposed Development is unlikely to commence commercial operation before 2023. As described in paragraph 6.4.15 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) it is expected that operation of the WBA Power Station will be reduced by 2025. In addition, the emissions from WBA Power Station are dispersed from stacks that are 198m high and, therefore, the peak impacts from WBA Power Station emissions occur several kilometres from the peak impacts predicted from the Proposed Development. The inclusion of WBA Power Station process contributions within existing background pollutant concentrations, therefore, represents the worst-case assessment of the future baseline at the Proposed Development opening year. WBB Power Station will continue to operate beyond 2025 and its future operation could be all year round. It is, therefore, likely to operate concurrently with the Proposed Development for a significant number of years. In addition, the Proposed Development is being included within the Environmental Permit for WBB Power Station and the two

			power plants would operate as a single permitted installation. Therefore, in order to ensure a conservative assessment was carried out, emissions from WBB Power Station and the Proposed Development were modelled together, as this represents the long-term operation of the whole installation, once the Proposed Development becomes operational. As a result, the WBA Power Station emissions are included in the baseline used in the assessment and there is an element of double counting of WBB Power Station emissions (due to these already being present in the background concentrations used), which again leads to a conservative 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?	Five years of meteorological data was used in the assessment (2011 - 2015), as recommended in the Environment Agency's (2019) guidance (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/environmental-permitting-air-dispersion-modelling-reports#explain-weather-data-and-surface-characteristics); which states that a minimum of three years data must be used, with a recommendation of using five. Of the five years of data used, 2011 returned the highest predicted model results, and therefore was used to represent a worst-case scenario. At the time the assessment was originally carried out meteorological data for 2016 and 2017 was not available, although it has now been published. However, it is considered that meteorological conditions during the period 2011 – 2017 have not changed materially so as to change the conclusions of the assessment, particularly as the predicted operational impacts of the Proposed Development give rise to emissions that are classified as not significant.
Q2.6	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.3.24 of ES Chapter 6 [APP-035] sets out that SO_2 and PM_{10} 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_2 and PM_{10} emissions the Proposed Development is anticipated to produce to warrant being scoped out?	Natural gas fuel would be combusted in the Proposed Development. It is recognised that combustion of natural gas can lead to nitrogen oxide (NO_2) and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions, and these have been considered in the assessment. Sulphur dioxide (SO_2) emissions only occur where the fuel being combusted has a sulphur content. Natural gas supplied through the National Transmission System contains negligible sulphur and, therefore, cannot generate SO_2 emissions. Likewise, particulate (PM_{10}) emissions from combustion arise from the combustion of solid or liquid fuels, leading to ash, soot or droplet formation. Again, the combustion of natural gas fuel does not give rise to such emissions and hence the particulate emissions from the Proposed Development stacks are likely to be negligible and could therefore be safely scoped out of the ES assessment.

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?	Paragraph 6.3.33 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) specifically describes the assessment of depositional impacts, and the explains that these have not been assessed at non-statutory Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) as there are no published critical loads associated with such sites, as there are for statutory designated sites such as Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Critical loads are set for the protection of national or internationally designated sensitive habitats. The impact of atmospheric air quality, however, has been considered at these non-statutory LWS and has been compared against the relevant critical levels; the only relevant assessment criteria published for these sites. The results are provided in **APP-051** (**Appendix 6A**: Air Quality), **Table 20** and **Table 21** and demonstrate that predicted effects on critical levels are negligible and, therefore, not significant. Effects on non-statutory LWS are explained further in paragraphs 6.6.25 – 6.6.26 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality).
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.	Within the Application and draft DCO (**APP-004** – **Document 2.1**), the Applicant has assessed a range of different scenarios that reflect the extent of the Rochdale Envelope considered. This includes assessment of up to five OCGT units, emissions parameters from a number of potential OCGT vendors, a range of stack heights and the potential location of the stack(s) within the Proposed Power Plant Site. Specifically, the assessment conservatively considered the potential impacts from stack emissions with stacks located at the defined maximum extents of the Gas Fired Generating Station Work Area in each direction (as shown in Plate 2 of **APP-004** - **Appendix 6A**: Air Quality) and the maximum predicted impacts at receptors have been reported. The worst-case parameters used in the assessment included: • largest building massing and building heights from all OCGT manufacturers (thereby considering the worst-case potential downwash effects from those structures); • highest pollutant mass emission rates from all OCGT manufacturers; and • lowest release temperatures and efflux velocities from all OCGT manufacturers, thereby considering the worst-case emission momentum released from the stack(s).

			The predicted concentrations at sensitive receptors from the flexibility/potential variation in stack locations was shown to have limited influence on the maximum reported values. Therefore, the reported impacts are considered worst-case and any changes within the Rochdale Envelope would only reduce the level of predicted impact and would not affect the conclusions of the assessment.
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 Agency permit/s?	The Environment Permit application was received by the Environment Agency on 15 May 2019. Since that time, further discussions have been held with the Environment Agency on the permit application such that the permit application was confirmed to be Duly Made by the Environment Agency on 8 October 2019. The Applicant will update the ExA on the progress with the determination of the Environmental Permit at relevant points during the Examination.
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?	**APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) in paragraph 6.3.23 states that based on professional judgement *'emissions of CO (carbon monoxide) at the IED limit do not drive the need for additional mitigation, such as the determination of stack height, and therefore were not included in the PEI report'*. Impacts and effects relating to CO emissions from the operational phase of the Proposed Development were, however, assessed in the ES for completeness, with the results being negligible as presented in paragraph 6.6.21 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality). CO emissions from vehicles were screened out of the assessment, as detailed in paragraph 6.3.15 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: 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?	**Table 6-8** of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) details the IAQMs air quality descriptors for changes in ambient concentrations of NO_2 and PM_{10}, as provided in IAQM and EPUK (2017) *Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality*. The descriptors are applicable to any change in the ambient concentration, be it from road, construction or operational sources. In this case, the assessment of the point source releases resulted in all the impacts being assessed as negligible, and therefore reference to the descriptors in **Table 6-8** of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) was not required.
Q2.12	The Applicant	The Air Quality assessments appear to have used the same criteria for determining the magnitude of impact for all	The ExA is referred to the response to Question 2.11.

		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?	There are no residential human receptors within the screening distances provided in IAQM guidance for impacts from dust soiling, PM_{10} or Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) to arise. Therefore, they have been screened out as it is considered impacts would be negligible. The final mitigation measures to be adopted for such activities will be shaped by the specific construction activities and associated risks to be identified by the appointed construction contractor. Consideration of the inclusion of the measures included in the IAQM guidance will be undertaken during the drafting of the final CEMP includes a scheme for the control of emissions to air (requirement 16(2)(b)). Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) specifically requires that the CEMP be approved by the relevant local planning authority.
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?	Eutrophication impacts have been considered in the assessment of nutrient nitrogen deposition. The predicted impacts from nitrogen deposition have been assessed at all relevant habitat receptors screened into the assessment (**Table 9-8** of **APP-038** - **Chapter 9**: Ecology) and have been compared against the critical loads for each habitat present. Please refer to: • **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality, paragraphs 6.6.22 – 6.6.28); • **APP-051** (**Appendix 6A**: Air Quality - Tables 20 - 23); and • **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology paragraphs 9.6.47 – 9.6.55).
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?	Paragraph 6.3.36 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) states that '*The Framework CEMP (Application Document Ref. 7.3) is the primary mechanism for identifying necessary measures that the appointed contractor will need to take into account in preparing the CEMP for construction'*, with regards to construction dust and NRMM emissions. **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan) was produced in conjunction with the Environmental Statement (ES) (**APP-028** – **APP-131** - **Document 5.2**) with the aim of ensuring that design and impact avoidance measures which the ES has assumed will be implemented, are implemented effectively during the execution of the construction stage, together with any additional mitigation measures proposed to reduce significant adverse environmental effects.

			Therefore, with the application of appropriate design and impact avoidance measures for air quality, as detailed in **Table 2** of **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan) and secured by Requirement 15 of the draft DCO (**APP-004** - **Document 2.1**), the impacts on environmental receptors are considered to be not significant. **Table 2** of the Framework Environmental Management Plan specifically details the mitigation measures to be applied for NRMM and construction dust. The final measures to be adopted will be shaped by the specific construction activities and associated risks to be identified by the construction contractor. Consideration of the inclusion of the measures included in the IAQM guidance will be undertaken during the drafting of the final CEMP. Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) specifically requires that the final CEMP be approved by the relevant local planning authority.
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?	Paragraph 6.5.8 of **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) states that '*Appropriate best practice mitigation measures will be applied during any decommissioning works and documented in a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP), proposed to be secured by a Requirement in the draft DCO (Application Document Ref 2.1); no additional mitigation for decommissioning of the Proposed Development beyond such best practice is considered necessary at this stage. The predicted air quality effects of eventual decommissioning of the Proposed Development are considered to be comparable to, or less than, those assessed for construction activities*.' On the basis that such effects were screened out for construction, due to the distances to sensitive receptors and the scale of site operations, by extension the same approach has been taken to screen out such emissions from any future demolition activities.
3.	**Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA))**		
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 Applicant indicate what surveys will be carried out, why they	The guidance provided by CIEEM (2019) '*Advice note on the lifespan of ecological reports and surveys'* has been considered when determining the survey data that will be updated prior to construction, so as to demonstrate that the conditions assessed in the Environmental Statement (ES) remain valid at the time of construction. The updated ecology survey requirements are outlined in **Table 5** of the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (**APP-137** - **Document 7.3**) and paragraph 4.2.3 of the Landscape and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan (LBMEP) (**APP-139** - **Document 7.5**). Based on the age of the

		are necessary and how they will be secured?	survey data and consent requirements, the following surveys will be updated prior to the start of construction: • Bats – a pre-construction bat survey will be undertaken to re-confirm the status of roosting bats within trees identified adjacent to the Site. Activity surveys (transects and static detector surveys) will be updated to confirm the nature conservation value of the bat species assemblages associated with the Site. • Great crested newt – updated population estimate surveys will be required to inform the formal protected species licence application to Natural England that will be made prior to the start of construction works. Natural England provides guidance on the age of survey data and validity periods. Where no ponds are lost and development is within 50m of the nearest pond, the maximum age of survey data should be 2 breeding seasons. Therefore, 'top-up' surveys will be conducted in the newt survey season (March – June) in the year prior to commencement of construction, to inform the formal licence application. • Breeding birds – a pre-construction survey to check for active nests would be undertaken during the bird breeding season (March-August inclusive) with the aim of ensuring that no nests are damaged or destroyed during vegetation clearance. Bird species listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981, as amended) would be identified to inform mitigation requirements with the aim of ensuring no disturbance to these species during construction works. • Otter - otter were confirmed absent from waterbodies within and adjacent to the Site during the 2017 surveys and habitats were considered sub-optimal for breeding. However, habitat to support occasional and transitory refuge was available on Site. Therefore, updated surveys will be undertaken to re-confirm the status of otter, including any mitigation requirements. • Water vole – water vole was confirmed absent from waterbodies within the Site during 2017 surveys and habitats were considered sub-optimal. However, water vole populations are known to be present in the wider area and there is a low risk that they may colonise water features to be affected by the Proposed

			Development. Therefore, updated surveys will be undertaken to re-confirm the status of water vole and any mitigation requirements. • Badger – updated surveys will be undertaken to determine which setts will require temporary or permanent closure and the requirement for compensatory artificial setts (if required) to inform the licence application to Natural England. In addition to the above surveys, as outlined in paragraph 4.2.1 of the LBMEP (**APP-139** - **Document 7.5**), the Phase 1 Habitat survey would also be updated which would comprise a walkover survey to ground-truth the habitats recorded during the 2017 and 2019 surveys. The pre-construction surveys for species are secured by Requirement 15 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) and are required due the legislative protection afforded to these species' groups. As agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council, the LBMEP has also been updated (**Document 7.5A** and **Document 7.5B**, submitted at Deadline 1) to require a botanical survey to be undertaken prior to construction to inform the baseline condition assessment of Area 5 and the results provided in the LBMEP, secured by Requirement 6 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) prior to seeding. The pre-construction botanical survey will be secured by Requirement 6 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) in order to re-confirm the baseline condition of Area 5 for the purposes of creating areas of local biodiversity action plan (LBAP) quality lowland neutral grassland habitat.
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?	The total area for the Proposed Power Station Site is approximately 3.9ha; this comprises the following habitat types: broadleaved woodland – plantation (2.44ha); semi-improved neutral grassland (1.36ha); dense scrub (<0.01ha); bare ground (0.09ha) and hardstanding (<0.01ha). The assessment conservatively assumes that all of this area would be cleared prior to construction; in reality some of the area may be able to be retained, but assuming clearance of the whole means that a conservative assessment has been conducted.

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]?	No comment
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?	A proposed programme of management and maintenance for the ecological enhancement and restoration measures is provided in the LBMEP (**APP-139** – **Document 7.5**) and the enhancement measures timeframe is provided in paragraph 5.2.8 of the LBMEP. The implementation of the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures will be contingent on the timeframes of the Proposed Development and are, therefore, based on the number of years post commencement. As stated in **APP-139** – **Document 7.5**, management and maintenance of areas not impacted by the Proposed Development (Areas 1, 3, 4 and 5 shown on **Figure 2** of **Document 7.5**) will commence during the construction phase. Management and maintenance of areas impacted by the Proposed Development (Area 2 shown on **Figure 2** of **Document 7.5**) will commence as soon as reasonably practicable once construction works are completed in these areas. It is envisaged that the habitats will have matured within 5-10 years of establishment.
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?	The methodology used to determine whether an identified receptor is sensitive in relation to the air quality impacts resulting from traffic is presented in Section 6.4 Baseline Conditions of **APP-035** - **Chapter 6**: Air Quality. The study area used for ecological receptors is provided in paragraphs 6.3.34 (construction impacts) and 6.3.35 (operational impacts) in the chapter. Construction traffic, in particular HGVs, could give rise to nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions but the air quality impacts of traffic have been screened out within **APP-035** - **Chapter 6**: Air Quality as the number of vehicles will be below the IAQM (2016) guidance screening threshold recommending initiation of a detailed assessment of air quality impacts. The cumulative effects of construction traffic emissions (including NOx and $PM_{2.5}$) arising from committed developments including the adjacent Tarmac Quarry are also

			considered in **APP-045** (**Chapter 16**: Cumulative and Combined Effects) and the effects are considered to be not significant (**Table 16-6**). No additional site access roads will be constructed as part of the Proposed Development. The existing established access road through the West Burton Power Station site will be utilised for all HGVs accessing the construction site. This access road is subject to strict speed limit restrictions and ecological receptors will already be habituated to these roads. In addition, enforcement of speed limits on haul roads for safety reasons will help to reduce the risk of mortality of ecological receptors. The final CEMP, secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) will manage HGV movements on haul roads, including speed restrictions; a Framework CEMP (**APP-137 - Document 7.3**) is provided with the Application.
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?	The effects of noise and vibration on ecological features during construction are considered in **Table 9-7** of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology). The receptors scoped into the ecological impact assessment (EcIA) due to noise and vibration included West Burton Power Station local wildlife site (LWS), bats (paragraph 9.6.24 and 9.6.56 – 9.6.57), grass snake, red and amber list passerines associated with scrub and woodland habitat (paragraph 9.6.33), amber listed species associated with wetland habitats (paragraph 9.6.35), otter (paragraph 9.6.37 – 9.6.38) and brown hare (paragraph 9.6.40). In addition, badger have been highlighted as a receptor to construction noise and vibration (**Confidential Document 5.2, Appendix 9D,** paragraph 5.1.2 and 5.2.2). The impacts from noise and vibration on these receptors will be managed through the implementation of committed design and impact avoidance measures, including those set out within the Framework CEMP (**APP-137 - Document 7.3**). Impacts on badger will be addressed through the implementation of a Natural England badger licence. These measures are described in Section 9.5 (paragraph 9.5.11) and also in the LBMEP (**APP-139** - **Document 7.5**), in the Framework CEMP (**APP-137** – **Document 7.3**) and in the Commitments Register presented in Appendix 1 of **APP-135** (**Document 7.1**) and include: • a pre-construction survey to check for breeding birds including Cetti's warbler would be undertaken in advance of construction works; and • if the proposed southern drainage connection corridor is chosen, or should it be necessary to undertake works associated with the third drainage option adjacent to West Burton Reedbed LWS, construction works that would cause

			disturbance to Cetti's warbler or other protected birds within the nearby West Burton Reedbed LWS and other adjacent habitats would be timed to be outside the bird breeding season (March to August inclusive). This is proposed to be secured through Requirement 15 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**). During operation, Table 9-8 of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) explains that impacts due to noise disturbance during the operational phase of the Proposed Development are not anticipated. This is because this species was found within the West Burton Reedbed LWS, which is located approximately 200m to the south of the Proposed Power Plant Site and is already subject to operational disturbance associated with the closer WBB Power Station, located approximately 100m to the west.
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?	Notable habitats occurring outside the Site are summarised in paragraph 9.4.12 of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology). In particular, three LWS are present immediately adjacent to the Proposed Development to the north (Bole Ings LWS), east (West Burton Power Station LWS) and south (West Burton Reedbed LWS), shown on **Figure 9C.1** in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (**APP-055 – Appendix 9C**). The LWS provide a diverse range of habitat types including flooded gravel pits, ponds, ditches, drains, reedbed, woodland and scrub, which provide optimal habitat for the ecological receptors identified for breeding, shelter, foraging and commuting. In addition, the River Trent lies to the east of the Site with associated scattered scrub, tall ruderal and grassland.
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 Applicant clarify this point?	The Proposed Power Plant Site is to be located on the former construction laydown area for West Burton B (WBB) Power Station which now comprises a landscaped area of seeded semi-improved neutral grassland and young planted scrub and trees. These habitats were established in 2012 as part of the agreed compensation for the loss of sub-optimal terrestrial great crested newt habitat associated with the construction of the WBB Power Station, though they were not used as receptor sites for great crested newts recovered during licensable works. Works were completed in accordance with the approved Landscape and Creative Conservation Plan (LaCCP) to discharge Condition 35 of the WBB Section 36 Electricity Act consent (granted October 2007). Areas 1 and 2 of the 2007 LaCCP (EMEC Ecology, 2007) are coincident with the areas which now form part of the Proposed Development.

			A variation to Condition 35 of the Section 36 consent was granted by Bassetlaw District Council in 2009, and a further variation was subsequently granted in 2012. Both variations reflected the need to amend the approved 2007 LaCCP following commencement of construction of WBB Power Station, given the significant depths of pulverised fuel ash (PFA) encountered across the WBB Power Station construction site. The PFA was used to construct new landforms in the approved Areas 1 and 2 and constructing a new landform in a new area; Area 1b. An addendum to the LaCCP was submitted with each variation (2009; 2012) such that the 2012 addendum to the LaCCP became the approved scheme. Area 1 of the 2012 LaCCP comprises 2.15ha of habitat which broadly coincides with the western part of Area 5 of the Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Area for the Proposed Development (**APP-086** - **Figure 9.1**). The approved scheme under the 2012 LaCCP in Area 1 was the delivery of 1.78ha of species rich grassland; 0.23ha of woodland and 0.14ha of native shrub planting. Area 1b (4.83ha) wholly coincides with the eastern part of Area 5 of the Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Area for the Proposed Development (**APP-086** - **Figure 9.1**). The approved scheme was for the delivery of 4.49ha of species rich grassland and 0.34ha of native shrub planting. A total of 6.98ha of land within the Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Area for the Proposed Development (**APP-086** - **Figure 9.1**) has, therefore, been subject to a scheme of management and enhancement under the 2012 LaCCP addendum. The obligation to maintain the areas in the 2012 LaCCP lasted for a period of 5 years, ending in 2017 as described in paragraph 5.2.6 of **APP-139** (**Document 7.5**). Area 2 of the 2012 LaCCP broadly coincides with the Proposed Power Plant site (shown in **APP-073** – **Figure 3.3**) which will be permanently lost to the Proposed Development. The long-term objectives of the LaCCP for this area were that it should be enhanced and reseeded with a wildflower wetland grass mix with the aim being to increase the density of invertebrates in this area and thus increase the food supply available for great crested newt. The Planning Statement (**APP-135 - Document 7.1**) explains why it has been necessary to use this land for the Proposed Development, principally due to its proximity to the existing WBB Power Station for the required

			connections to utilities and services. In addition, the habitats present are of relatively low sensitivity and of the greatest potential for substitution, having been established relatively recently on land that was previously disturbed, and still in the early establishment phase and consequently are of relatively low botanical interest. The effect of the use of this land has been considered in **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) and mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in **APP-139** (**Document 7.5**), secured by Requirement 6 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**). Through the required landscaping and biodiversity management plan, a net biodiversity gain will be achieved.
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?	The obligation to maintain the areas on the 2012 Landscape and Creative Conservation Plan (LaCCP) required as part of the WBB consent lasted for a period of 5 years, ending in 2017. As described in paragraph 5.2.6 of the **APP-139** (**Document 7.5)**, the habitats are now managed as part of the wider West Burton Power Station landscape and management regime, which in summary involves: - cutting grassland in Areas 1a, 1b, 2, 3 and 4 at specific times of the year; - plot strimming in Areas 1a, 1b, 2, 3 and 4 at specific times of the year; - maintenance visits (plot tidy up); - removal of stakes/split or damaged tubes/ties on trees (as required); - management of hedges in Areas 3 and 4; and - herbicide treatment in Area 4 (as required). The proposed management and maintenance regime for the landscape and biodiversity management and enhancement areas is detailed in Section 5 and **Appendix C** of the LBMEP (**APP-139** -**Document Ref. 7.5**). The ecological assessment of the Site has considered the baseline habitats recorded during surveys undertaken in 2017 and ground-truthed in 2019. Therefore, the nature conservation value of the habitats recorded has taken account of the management previously undertaken and reflects the current (2019) baseline conditions at the Site at the time of submission of the Application.
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	Figure E11/E12 of the GCN licence application (EPSM2009-506) (provided for Deadline 2 at **Document 9.4**) should be referred to for the locations of the hibernacula created as part of the GCN licence mitigation. These are outside the Proposed Power Plant Site area.

		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.	It is recognised that the Proposed Power Plant Site occupies an area of land previously allocated as part of the 2012 West Burton B Landscape and Creative Conservation Plan (LaCCP). The Applicant has explained why it is necessary to use this land for the Proposed Development in the Planning Statement (**APP-135 - Document 7.1**), this is principally due to its proximity to the existing West Burton B Power Station for the required connections to utilities and services. In addition, the habitats present are of relatively low sensitivity and of the greatest potential for substitution, having been established relatively recently on land that was previously disturbed. As such, these habitats are still in the early establishment phase and consequently are of relatively low botanical interest. A draft European Protected Species Mitigation licence application was submitted to Natural England via the Pre-submission Screening Service on 9th September 2019. Natural England has confirmed that they are satisfied with the content of the draft application, and on 28 November 2019, issued a 'letter of no impediment' to the granting of a licence, a copy of which is provided at Deadline 2 (**Document 9.3**). This confirms that in principle, a formal licence could be issued once a DCO is in place, based on the information provided in the draft application. The method statement for the licence application includes information on permanent loss of habitat and hibernacula. As outlined in paragraph 9.7.2 of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology), in addition to the six hibernacula associated with the Proposed Power Plant Site, which will be dismantled and translocated to areas of retained habitat to the north of the Site (Areas 1 to 4 on **APP-086** - **Figure 9.1**), an additional 6 habitat piles and hibernacula would be constructed in these areas using arisings (logs, turf) generated during clearance of the Site to provide additional opportunities for refuge and hibernation for newts and other species. All hibernacula creation will follow the dimension criteria provided in the English Nature (2001) *Great crested newt mitigation guidelines*. An additional 4 smaller habitat piles (using logs/stones) will also be created in the mitigation areas.

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?	Requirement 6 (3) of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**) requires the Applicant to submit a landscaping and biodiversity management and enhancement plan prior to commencing each of Works No 1, No 2 and No 4, or parts of them, in accordance with the LBMEP submitted with the Application (**APP-139** (**Document 7.5**). The Plan to be submitted must be in accordance with the **APP-139** (**Document 7.5**) which includes monitoring measures for effectiveness on an annual basis for the first five years following commencement of operation of the Proposed Development, and a review after this initial five-year period to ensure measures continue to be suitable to deliver the objectives of the Plan. Monitoring for a period of up to 10 years is implicit in the LBMEP and it is considered that the wording of Requirement 6 (3) of the draft DCO is appropriate to secure the required monitoring as part of the required details relating to maintenance and management. The Applicant would, however, be happy to amend Requirement 6 (2) to explicitly refer to monitoring if the ExA considers it necessary.
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]?	No comment
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	The justification for scoping in/out ecological receptors is explained in **Table 9-7** (construction) and **Table 9-8** (operation) of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology). As the surface water outfall option to the River Trent has been removed from the proposals, no impacts on riverine receptors are predicted. The scope of surveys was designed using the preliminary ecological appraisal (**APP-055** - **Appendix 9C**). In the case of aquatic and riverine species this included surveys for water vole and otter within the River Trent and other suitable wetlands and wet ditches. The surveys undertaken (**APP-062** – **Appendix 9I**) were then used to screen features in or out of the ecological impact assessment, considering the habitats and features likely to be lost/disturbed by the Proposed Development. Guidance provided by CIEEM (2018) '*Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal'* states that it is not necessary in the assessment to address all habitats and species with potential to occur in the zone of influence of a proposed development. Instead, the focus should be on those that are *'relevant*'. The CIEEM guidance states that there is no need to '*carry out detailed assessment of*

		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?	*ecological features that are sufficiently widespread, unthreatened and resilient to project impacts and will remain viable and sustainable'*. **Table 9-7** and **Table 9-8** of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) provide justification for species and habitats scoped in and out on the basis of habitat loss, disturbance and air quality impacts. Further explanation of potential construction disturbance effects on any local otter population that may be using the River Trent is provided in paragraphs 9.6.36 – 9.6.38 of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology). Agreement that the scope of species surveyed is appropriate and that adequate details are presented to inform the assessment of impacts on protected and notable habitats and species has been achieved through the formal consultation process and evidenced in the signed Statements of Common Ground with Natural England and Nottinghamshire County Council, provided at Deadline 1 (**REP1-009 and REP1-013**).
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?	Paragraph 7.1.2 of **APP-142** (**Document 7.8**) explains that the design risk assessment in Appendix F is intended for use in developing detailed designs and informed risk assessments that will be necessary for future site investigations and subsequent drainage construction. The initial risk rating is determined by factoring potential hazards to aquatic organisms and habitats with the likelihood of the hazard occurring prior to implementing design control measures and the implementation of Operational and Maintenance controls. The risk rating was assessed as being moderate in this scenario. The hazard considered is the unintentional release of contaminated water through the WBC drainage system and subsequent release into the River Trent. The design of the WBC drainage system will include best practice design measures to mitigate this risk. These design and impact avoidance measures are explained in paragraph 12.5.37 of **APP-041** (**Chapter 12**: Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources) and have been considered as embedded mitigation. As identified in paragraph 12.5.37, with the appropriate Operational and Maintenance control measures in place and with good housekeeping and management practices adopted and adhered to through compliance with the Environmental Permit, significant impacts to surface water and groundwater as a consequence of site drainage are expected to be avoided.

			Based on the preventative measures to be applied and set out in section 12.5 of **APP-041** (**Chapter 12**: Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources), it is considered that the final risk of harm (magnitude of impact – refer to **Table 12-5**) to aquatic organisms and habitats in the River Trent would be very low, with resultant effects on biodiversity in the River Trent classified as negligible (not significant) (refer to paragraph 12.6.30 – impact on biodiversity).
Q3.15	Natural England	Is Natural England satisfied with the No Significant Effects report [APP-027] in relation to European protected sites?	No comment
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?	Yes. The draft European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence application was submitted to Natural England via the Pre-submission Screening Service on 9 September 2019 and a letter of no impediment to the granting of a licence was issued on 28 November 2019 (submitted at Deadline 2 at **Document 9.3**). This confirms that in principle, a formal licence could be issued based on the information provided, although cannot be applied for until a DCO has been secured.
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?	Apart from great crested newt, no other EPSM licences will be required. A Natural England licence to interfere with a badger sett for the purpose of development will be required to cover damage and disturbance to any badger setts. This will be applied for in advance of construction works commencing to allow sufficient time for sett exclusion works to be implemented, if required. A licence cannot be applied for until a DCO is secured. **APP-026,** the Schedule of Other Consents and Licences has been updated to reflect this consent and is included within the Deadline 2 submission (**Document 4.2A** and **Document 4.2B**).
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,	**APP-086** - **Figure 9.1** provides information specifically on the enhancement and management of habitats proposed. It was not considered necessary to include the northern and southern drainage corridors on this figure as the construction works in these areas will be temporary and habitats are to be reinstated on completion to an equal or higher ecological value and will continue to be managed as they are currently. As set out in Paragraph 4.5.5 of **APP-033** (**Chapter 4**: The Proposed Development), soils would be managed in accordance with the Defra (2011) *Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Development Sites* to minimise impacts on soil structure and quality. Such measures are outlined in **APP-137** (**Document 7.3**) the Framework CEMP; with the final CEMP to be secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**).

		can the Applicant provide a timeframe for when this will be submitted.	
4.	**Draft Development Consent Order**		
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?	The draft DCO has been amended as requested and is submitted to Deadline 2 (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
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?	The Applicant and the Canal & River Trust (the Trust) are engaging in ongoing discussions. The Applicant's position is that protective provisions for the benefit of the Trust are neither necessary nor appropriate because the relevant waterway falls outside of the Order limits and there are no new outfalls or abstraction/drainage systems proposed and therefore no potential for the River Trent, which the Trust has responsibility for, to be affected by the Proposed Development. Furthermore, as confirmed in **Chapter 12** (Flooding and Hydrology) of the Environmental Statement (**APP-041, Document 5.2**), any alteration to the current abstraction volume would be "minor" and carried out within the existing licence capacity, Therefore, there is no risk of adverse impacts on the navigation of the waterway or the Trust's undertaking.
Q4.3	The Applicant	**Questions/comments relating to Articles (Art):** 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) definitions mentioning certification?	a) Articles 2(1) and 17 of the draft DCO are based on the model provisions. The Applicant has already provided more information by which to identify these documents than is included in the model provisions (and other recently approved DCOs). The Applicant has included application document references and revision numbers. The PINS Examination Library references could be added, but it is not considered that this would provide further clarity as the revision numbers will be amended as required at the close of the Examination to refer to the final versions of any certified documents. Reference to Art 17 in the Art 2(1) definitions is not recognised DCO drafting, and Art 17 would need to be referred to in each one of the relevant Art 2(1) definitions. The Applicant can make this change if required, but it is not considered necessary.

		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?	b) The definition of 'Order limits plans' in Art 2(1) comes from the model provisions. The 'Order limits plan' is a separate plan to the 'works plans'. It shows the redline boundary of the DCO rather than the works areas. The Applicant considers that it is useful to have both plans and that this does not cause any confusion.
		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).	c) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). The definition in Art 2(1) has been deleted, reference to 'plan' in the final paragraph of schedule 1 has been replaced with 'land plans, Order limit plans and works plans'.
		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)?	d) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
		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?	e) The Applicant does not consider there to be a need for an additional plan. The definition is used for descriptive purposes only in the draft DCO. The description of the land set out in the definition is considered sufficiently clear for the context in which the definition is used.
		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	f) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).

		reflect the title of the documents submitted. 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? 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? i) Art 6 refers to 'relevant work areas'. What are these? Where are they defined in the dDCO? 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? k) Art 14: The words in brackets are not an accurate reproduction of the heading of s264 being referred to. This should be rectified.	g) The current wording is based on the model provisions, but the draft DCO has been amended to refer to 'scheduled works' for clarity (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). h) 'Use' has been included in the reciprocal Articles in the approved Drax Re-powering (Ref EN010091) and Eggborough CCGT (Ref EN010081) DCOs (which are the two most recently consented gas-fired power station DCOs). 'Use' is not considered to be inconsistent with 'operation'. The Applicant's position is that the same wording should be adopted in the draft DCO as for the other recently consented schemes for consistency. The Applicant agrees that the wording 'the generating station comprised in the authorised development' should be included and the draft DCO has been updated accordingly (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). i) The word 'work' has been deleted in the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). The words 'relevant areas' should be construed as having their natural meaning. j) There is no specific identified need to temporarily stop up, alter or divert any streets and public rights of way at this stage. However, the ability to stop up streets and public rights of way is a standard provision for nationally significant infrastructure projects to ensure that the projects can be delivered without the delay that would otherwise arise from the local authority agreeing to promote stopping up separately under its powers. The Applicant needs to retain the ability to temporarily stop up, alter or divert any streets and public rights of way during construction of the Proposed Development, and in particular to manage for the delivery of Abnormal Indivisible Loads during construction. The power is appropriately restricted by Art 9(3) where the consent of the street authority is required to any stopping up, diversion of works required under this article. Approval of the construction traffic management plan by the local planning authority will also ensure that the need for any stopping up or diversion is agreed with the relevant authority. Neither Bassetlaw District Council or Nottinghamshire County Council have raised any concerns with the operation of this article. k) Art 14 of the draft DCO has been amended to reflect the heading of section 264 (TCPA 1990): 'cases in which land is to be treated as not being operational land.'

		l) Art 15(1): Can the Applicant justify the power sought over 'publicly maintainable highway'? m) Art 15(3): The Applicant has not defined 'relevant tree preservation order' anywhere 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. n) Art 16: This appears to refer to an incorrect Schedule number.	l) The Applicant must retain the powers sought over the publicly maintainable highway in case of obstruction to ensure that there is no delay to the delivery of the nationally significant infrastructure project whilst the relevant consents are sought outside the DCO. The powers are restricted to felling or lopping within the Order limits or the publicly maintained highway only. The power is also considered to be appropriately constrained by Art 15(2). m) The wording 'relevant tree preservation order' should be construed as having its natural meaning. It is not possible to identify affected TPOs at this stage in the process. The Applicant requires this deemed consent to prevent a further consent needing to be obtained should an affected TPO be identified. The power is constrained by the limitations set out in Art 15(1), i.e. that the Applicant may only fell or lop trees etc. which are overhanging the Order limits or within the extent of the publicly maintained highway. n) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
Q4.4	The Applicant	**Questions/comments relating to Schedule 1:** a) Schedule 1 Work No.1(a): Might the definition of 'OCGT' be better placed in Art 2(1)? b) Schedule 1 Work No 10: This refers to 'the plans' - see previous comment above.	a) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). b) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
Q4.5	The Applicant and Natural England (in respect of Q4.5g only)	**Questions/comments relating to Requirements (R):** 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?	a) The Applicant does not agree that the relevant planning authority should be precluded from agreeing amendments to matters that have been approved by the Secretary of State. Given the nature of the Proposed Development, it may be necessary to agree minor changes to the approved details that do not affect the conclusions of the Environmental Statement, such as the approach to surface water storage on the Site and to prevent this could mean that reasonable and sensible minor amendments are not possible without the Applicant having to take them through the post-consent change process. The

			ability of the relevant planning authority to agree changes is limited by R1(3), which provides that such approval may only be given where it can be demonstrated that the subject matter will not give rise to any new or materially different environmental effects. The same approach has been approved by the Secretary of State on the Drax Re-powering (Ref EN010091) and Eggborough CCGT (Ref EN010081) DCOs and is now considered to be standard practice.
		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)?	b) The draft DCO has been amended so that R6(3) refers to the 'outline landscaping and biodiversity management and enhancement plan' (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
		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?	c) The draft DCO has been amended to include a programme for maintenance as well as implementation.
		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'?	d) The draft DCO has been amended to refer to 'significant effects' (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**).
		e) R13: 'Historic England' should be defined in Art 2(1) as 'The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England'.	e) The draft DCO has been amended as requested.
		f) R13(3): 'and/or' should not be used in legislation. This should be rectified.	f) The draft DCO has been amended to remove the requirement for design mitigation altogether, as this should be considered as part of the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development (**Documents 2.1A** and **2.1B**). This approach has been adopted in the approved Eggborough CCGT (Ref EN010081) DCO.
		g) R14: Does Natural England consider it reasonable to request pre-commencement surveys?	g) N/A – Natural England to respond.

		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'?	h) The draft DCO has been amended so that R17 refers to 'framework construction traffic management plan' instead of 'construction traffic and routing management plan' or 'framework construction transport management plan' (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
		i) R17: Highways England should be defined in Art 2(1) by its full company name and number.	i) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
		j) R18(1): Should this require a 'construction worker's travel plan' rather than a 'written travel plan for construction staff' for consistency?	j) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
		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?	k) The draft DCO has been amended as requested (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
		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).	l) The purpose of the Community Liaison Forum is to provide a regular meeting for community representatives to meet the Applicant site team and be briefed on upcoming activities across the Site and associated with the construction of the Project. It also allows the community representatives to raise any concerns or complaints they may have. As such, it is not an elected committee with a limited or set number of representatives; rather it is a communications forum for the community to be briefed and notified about Project developments. Consequently, it is not considered necessary to define the number of representatives that may attend from any one group or party. The Applicant does not consider that the draft DCO needs to be amended.

		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.	m) The draft DCO has been amended to re word the Requirement and remove the word 'decides' (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
Q4.6	The Applicant	**Questions/comments relating to Schedule 3:** 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? Schedule 3 Paragraph 4(10): 'Planning Practice Guidance' should be defined.	Para 4(2)(a): The current wording is based on the model provisions and is similar to the wording used in the approved Drax Re-powering (Ref EN010091) and Eggborough CCGT (Ref EN010081) DCOs. Sub-paragraph 4(2)(a) allows for the provision of supporting information which could include a further explanation if considered necessary. The Applicant does not consider that the draft DCO needs to be amended. Para 4(10) of the draft DCO has been amended to include the definition of planning practice guide within Schedule 3 as '"Planning Practice Guidance" means the planning practice guidance as published online by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government'.
Q4.7	The Applicant	In the Explanatory Note, no document inspection location has been included. Can this be included?	The Explanatory Note has been updated to include the site inspection address as 'Bassetlaw District Council, 17B The Square, Retford, Notts, DN22 6DB'. It is contained in Deadline 2 at **Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**.
Q4.8	The Applicant	**Questions/comments relating to the Explanatory Memorandum [APP-005]:** Paragraph 3.3(e): Should this refer to other persons who may obtain the benefit under Art 7? Paragraph 4.1: This mentions that there are 22 articles in the dDCO, but there are only 19. Paragraph 4.4: The article referred to is not fully in accordance with s140 of the Planning Act 2008, as highlighted above. 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? Paragraph 4.21 (w): R24 refers to needing agreement of a 'majority' of members for different meeting frequencies, but this	Paragraph 3.3(e): The Explanatory Memorandum (EM) has been amended as requested. An updated EM will be provided at the final Examination Deadline. Paragraph 4.1: The EM has been amended as requested. Paragraph 4.4: See the Applicant's response above. The Applicant does not consider that the EM needs to be amended. Paragraph 4.21(h): The EM has been amended so that it corresponds with the wording in R9. Paragraph 4.21 (w): The EM has been amended so that it corresponds with the wording in R24.

		paragraph makes no mention of only needing a 'majority'. Can the Applicant clarify this matter?	
5.	**Ground Conditions**		
Q5.1	The Applicant	Intrusive ground investigation surveys were undertaken in December 2017/January 2018. 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?	A Phase 1 Geo-environmental Site Assessment (presented as **APP-064** (**Appendix 11A:** Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Site Assessment) was carried out as part of the initial data search (as a desk study). It summarises the baseline conditions, following review of information obtained from commercially and publicly available databases. As discussed within paragraph 11.3.4 of **APP-040** (**Chapter 11:** Ground Conditions and Hydrogeology), this information, together with a site walkover has been used to formulate a conceptual site model (CSM) of the Site and identify environmental risks. In addition to the Phase 1, a Phase 2 intrusive ground investigation was undertaken during December 2017/January 2018. This provided further information to assist in defining baseline soil and groundwater conditions which could not be obtained from the desk study information reviewed as part of the Phase 1. This included items listed in the bullet points of paragraph 11.3.5 of **APP-040** (**Chapter 11:** Ground Conditions and Hydrogeology) such as collection of soil samples for chemical laboratory analysis. The results of this are included in **APP-065** (**Appendix 11B:** West Burton C - Ground Investigation Environmental Support and Sampling Report). Therefore, a Phase 1 and Phase 2 have been undertaken as part of the Application; with the Phase 2 providing supplementary information to the Phase 1.
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?	The draft report of the Factual Report on Ground Investigation (**APP-065 - Appendix 11B:** West Burton C - Ground Investigation Environmental Support and Sampling Report) was submitted with the Application. The final report has now been prepared which addressed the outstanding remarks column of the Exploratory Hole Summary and Installation Details tables and included a final version of Appendix D (Geotechnical Laboratory Test Results) and Appendix E (Photographs). The Applicant confirms that the conclusions provided in **APP-040** (**Chapter 11:** Ground Conditions and Hydrogeology), **APP-064** (**Appendix 11A:** Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Site Assessment) and **APP-065** (**Appendix 11B:** West Burton C - Ground Investigation Environmental Support and Sampling Report) are unchanged by the final report. A copy of the final report is submitted into the Examination at Deadline 2 (**Document 9.5**).

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?	The Applicant also wishes to point out that prevention of soil and groundwater contamination from the operation of the Proposed Development will be required by the Environmental Permit that is required for the operation of the Proposed Development from the Environment Agency.
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?	It is envisaged that the Proposed Development would have an operational life of up to circa 40 years. There are currently three options for discharge of drainage from WBC. Option A and B would not be impacted by any future decommissioning of WBB. Option C, which may be impacted by decommissioning of WBB, utilises existing drainage pipework which is expected to have a lifetime in excess of 50 years and to remain in service if utilised by WBC after decommissioning of WBB. Commercial operation of WBB commenced in 2013 and the intention is for the plant to remain operational for many years to come with a design life until circa 2043, the existing drainage pipework is expected to remain serviceable beyond that date and for the design life of WBC. Therefore the drainage infrastructure is anticipated to remain fit for purpose throughout the operational life of the Proposed Development.
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?	An assessment has been carried out on the WBB drainage system and it is confirmed that there is sufficient margin capacity within the system to allow drainage of both WBB and WBC for a worst-case scenario (1/100 year, 60-minute storm rainfall event). This takes into account attenuation of storm water at WBC. As assessment in the form of an integrity test using a remotely operated vehicle (ROV) has been carried out on the purge line and purge chambers. Conclusions from the assessment have indicated that the condition of the purge line and proposed connection point at the purge chamber are sufficient to accommodate the proposed WBC connection for 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.	Given the proximity of a major surface water feature (River Trent) and the underlying bedrock aquifer being a Secondary B Aquifer, i.e. less permeable and storing only limited amounts of abstractable groundwater, it is the opinion of the Applicant's geo-environmental advisors that it is unlikely that any contaminant source present at the Site would be a significant concern to receptors greater than 2km away. In addition, no significant effects were identified in the controlled waters immediately adjacent to the Site.
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?	The assessment considered the worst-case effects of developing up to 5 OCGT units, which it is recognised could involve a greater area of ground disturbance at the Site than a single (albeit larger) unit. However, as no point-source contamination has been identified and no specific risk to human health or controlled waters has been identified, it is considered that the risks associated with ground contamination are unchanged whether a single OCGT or up to 5 OCGT units are constructed and operated. In addition, the Environmental Permit will specify preventative maintenance and control measures that will be required to be installed so as to prevent ground contamination from the operation of the Proposed Development.
6.	**Historic Environment**		
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?	The Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1) (DECC, 2011) draws a distinction between the significance of designated and non-designated assets in paragraph 5.8.3 and 5.8.6. It further states in paragraph 5.8.8 that, as part of its assessment, the Applicant should provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected by the development and the contribution of their setting to that significance: *'The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage assets and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset.'* In recognition of this, separate study areas were employed for designated and non-designated assets, as explained in paragraph 14.3.5 of **APP-043** (**Chapter 14**: Cultural Heritage) taking into account the zone of theoretical visibility (**APP-090** – **Figure 10.4**) and distances at which potentially significant effects could occur. Comprehensive changes to the setting of locally listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets of low heritage value – (see **Table 14-4**) that could result in a high

			magnitude of impact (see **Table 14-5**) and, therefore, a moderate adverse (significant) effect (see **Table 14-6**) were assessed as being highly unlikely beyond a 1km radius of the Proposed Development. The study area was agreed with relevant authorities (Historic England, Via East Midlands on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council) including through the EIA scoping process and informal consultation.
Q6.2	The Applicant	The search area for non-designated heritage assets as shown on ES Figure 14.1 [APP-127] does not appears to be circular. What is the reason for this if, as indicated, it has a 1km radius from the centre of the site?	It is acknowledged that paragraph 14.3.5 of **APP-043** (**Chapter 14**: Cultural Heritage) states that the study area for the identification of non-designated assets is defined as a 1km radius from the centre point of the Site. This is incorrect. The study area is an area extending 1km from the Order Limits that were developed at the time of the assessment being prepared to inform the Preliminary Environmental Information report. This is clarified in the title of **APP-127** (**Figure 14.1**: Non-Designated Heritage Assets within 1km of the Order Limits). This resulted in a larger study area than a radius of 1km from the centre of the Site, and as such is not circular. Prior to finalisation of the Application, the proposed Order Limits were slightly modified and so there is a slight discrepancy between the original 1km study area and that of the Order Limits in the Application. This does not affect the conclusions of the assessment.
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]?	No comment
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	Paragraph 14.3.14 of **APP-043** (**Chapter 14**: Cultural Heritage) states that moderate effects are unlikely to meet the test for substantial harm and a major effect would more often than not be the basis by which to determine substantial harm. Paragraph 14.3.14 of **APP-043** (**Chapter 14**: Cultural Heritage) is not intended to provide a direct correlation between significance of effect and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (NPPF) assessment of harm, but rather provide the NPPF context to the assessment of significance of effect. The determination of harm has been made based on professional judgement.

		Applicant clarify this approach and is this an approach that Historic England considers appropriate?	There is no formal guidance on the approach to correlating significant effects in EIA with harm under the NPPF. The test for substantial harm is acknowledged to be very high (paragraph 019) within the Planning Practice Guidance (2019); therefore, it is considered appropriate to distinguish it from a significant effect, for which the test is lower. The methodology has been accepted by Historic England through the formal consultation process and signed Statement of Common Ground provided at Deadline 1.
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?	The locally listed buildings are considered in the desk-based assessment (paragraphs 4.2.59 - 4.2.61) of **APP-068** (**Appendix 14A**: Desk Based Assessment). Their location is referenced by the Bassetlaw District Heritage map (https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-services/conservation-and-heritage/bassetlaw-heritage-mapping/). The desk-based assessment found that they would not be affected due to the presence of the existing West Burton Power Station. Advice from Historic England indicated that the historic assets within Bole should be assessed more holistically within the wider context of the village, recognising their relationship with each other as well as their setting (**APP-043** - **Chapter 14**: Cultural Heritage, **Table 14-2**). As a result, the locally listed buildings were not plotted on **APP-127** (**Figure 14.1:** Non-Designated Heritage Assets within 1km of the Order Limits).
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?	No comment
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	No comment

		of St Martin in Bole and West Burton Power Station) identified in ES Chapter 14 [APP-043], and 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?	The listed bridge at Gainsborough was visited as part of the site visit on 11 July 2017. Consideration of listed buildings within Gainsborough, including the bridge and toll house, is presented in paragraph 4.2.29 of **APP-068** (**Appendix 14A**: Desk Based Assessment). It was found that given the distance to the West Burton Power Station site and screening provided by existing trees and vegetation, only the 112m high natural draught cooling towers of WBA Power Station were visible. WBB Power Station was not visible and as the Proposed Development would be smaller in scale than WBB Power Station, it was determined that the structures associated with the Proposed Development would also not be visible. As a result, it was concluded that listed buildings in Gainsborough would not be affected by the Proposed Development.
Q6.9	Historic England	Is Historic England satisfied with the approach of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-143] in respect of archaeology?	No comment
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?	Given that there are no significant impacts to mitigate it is not considered that any obligations would meet the necessary planning tests. Notwithstanding, it is intended that a Community Fund would be provided as an extension to the Community Fund already administered by EDF Energy in connection with its WBA and WBB stations, uplifted by £5,000 per year for each year of construction of WBC. This could be drawn down on to support the initiatives suggested by Historic England.
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?	All Grade I listed buildings within the 5km study area were identified. The Grade I listed Church of St Martin at Saundby was specifically considered in paragraphs 4.2.19 - 4.2.20 of **APP-068** (**Appendix 14A**: Desk Based Assessment). With regard to the remainder of the Grade I buildings, these were judged to be unaffected by the Proposed Development (as per response to Q6.1) and were therefore not considered further in the assessment.
7.	**Landscape and Visual**		

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?	Consultation took place in 2017 in order to agree the methodology to be used and the locations of viewpoints to be used for the assessment. Bassetlaw District Council, West Lindsey District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council (via their appointed consultant Via East Midlands Ltd) and Lincolnshire County Council were party to these discussions. The initial viewpoint list was amended to ensure that viewpoints representative of other visual receptors suggested by West Lindsey District Council and Via East Midlands Ltd, on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council were included. Photomontages were requested by consultees and prepared from two viewpoints to inform the Stage 1 consultation (including public exhibitions) and to accompany the Application. As the photomontages were illustrative of the indicative scenarios and not used for assessment purposes, they were not formally agreed with consultees, but rather were selected to illustrate the likely visibility of the Proposed Development at two of the assessed viewpoints, including the single viewpoint at which significant effects have been predicted (Viewpoint 4 (**APP-095** – Figure 10.19)).
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?	The potential viewpoints were identified using professional judgement during the EIA scoping process to represent an appropriate range of views and user groups which have the potential to experience significant visual effects. These viewpoints were then issued to the consultees described in Q7.1 above for feedback. West Lindsey District Council requested additional viewpoints from Gate Burton/Marton and Gainsborough, such as the Gainsborough Riverside Walk and uphill Gainsborough to be considered. In response, viewpoints from Lea (Viewpoint 6), Knaith (Viewpoint 11), Knaith Park (Viewpoint 8) and Gainsborough (Viewpoint 3) have been included in the assessment presented in **Section 10.6** of **APP-039** (**Chapter 10:** Landscape and Visual Amenity)**.** Viewpoints representative of other visual receptors at Gate Burton/Marton (Viewpoint 14) and uphill Gainsborough (Viewpoint 15) were also included. Via East Midlands Ltd (on behalf of NCC) confirmed that viewpoints proposed were acceptable but queried the need for a viewpoint from the eastern edge of North and South Wheatley and requested an additional representative viewpoint from the southern and western edges of Gainsborough, in the area of Whitton's Mill apartments on Bridge Street. In response, Viewpoint 7 was deemed representative of views from North/South Wheatley but an additional viewpoint from Whitton's Mill apartments was included in the assessment (Viewpoint 3). Viewpoint 5 is located on a public right of way along the River Trent to the north-east of the Site and was selected as representative of the junction of footpaths Lea 41/1, Lea 41/2, both on the eastern bank of the River Trent and Gain 33/1. A minor adverse effect during both construction and operational stages was predicted at Viewpoint 5. It is considered that a viewpoint located along Lea 41/1 closer

			to the Proposed Development than Viewpoint 5 would be dominated by existing West Burton Power Station infrastructure and would result in effects that are similar to those assessed for Viewpoint 10 (Junction of Bridleway Sturton Le Steeple BW13, Footpaths Sturton-le-Steeple FP39 and Sturton-le-Steeple FP40).
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 Habblesthorpe BOAT15 where it intersects with another footpath. Can the Applicant clarify why there is an inconsistency in this regard?	The initial identification of the proposed location of Viewpoint 13 was provided on a plan for consultation to the relevant local authorities. The proposed location of Viewpoint 13 was then visited during a site visit on 14 November 2017. Due to localised vegetation, no view was possible of the Site from that location. Therefore, the assessor, using professional judgement, took the viewpoint photography from a slightly different location further to the north and, therefore, closer to the Site. The revised location was not amended on **APP-091** (**Figure 10.5:** Viewpoint Locations). The view from the originally proposed viewpoint location is now illustrated on **APP-091** (**Figure 10.5:** Viewpoint Locations), Revision 1 (marked as 'Viewpoint 13A'), which was submitted into the examination at Deadline 1. This in no way affects the result of the visual assessment undertaken for Viewpoint 13.
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?	The model used to produce the photomontages and wireframes in respect of Viewpoints 4 and 12 (**APP-107** to **APP-126**) considered a finished floor level of +13mAOD. The maximum finished ground level as outlined in **Table 4-1** and **Table 4-2** of **APP-033** (**Chapter 4**: The Proposed Development) and secured by Requirement 5: Detailed design of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**) is +14mAOD. The photomontages and wireframes are, therefore, considered to largely represent the worst-case scenario, as the 1m difference is not material at the distances in the wireframes and photomontages from Viewpoint 4 and Viewpoint 12 (**APP-107 to APP-126**) looking towards the Site.
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?	The characteristic plumes that can arise from operation of traditional power stations, including WBA and WBB, under certain atmospheric conditions, arise from water vapour from the cooling towers associated with the steam cycle. For the Proposed Development, an open cycle gas turbine generating station with no steam cycle present and hence no cooling towers, there is no possibility of a visible water vapour plume of this nature occurring from the operational plant.
Q7.6	The Applicant	How might detailed design relating to form, siting, materials and use of colour minimise	Section 10.5 of **APP-039** (**Chapter 10**: Landscape and Visual Amenity) sets out the development design and impact avoidance measures considered in the landscape and visual amenity assessment. This section also details the associated Application

		adverse visual effects as suggested in Table 10-2 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-039]?	documents where further detail on each impact avoidance measure is provided, which includes the following: • suitable materials would be used where reasonably practicable, in the construction of structures to reduce reflection and glare and to assist with breaking up the massing of the buildings and structures (secured through the discharge of Requirement 5 (1)(a) of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**); • selection of finishes for the buildings and other infrastructure would be informed by the finishes of the adjacent developments and agreed with relevant consultees and approved by Bassetlaw District Council at the detailed design stage (secured through the discharge of Requirement 5 (1)(a) of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**); and • lighting required during the operation stage of the Proposed Development would be designed to reduce unnecessary light spill outside of the Site boundary, in accordance with the Lighting Strategy (**APP-138** – **Document 7.4**) - (secured through the discharge of Requirement 7 (1-4) of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). At the detailed design stage, if a single OCGT were to be selected as the preferred technology, this would reduce the overall massing of the Proposed Development and the number of stacks, which would slightly reduce the visual effect of the Proposed Development within the Rochdale Envelope assessed. However, it is considered that a single OCGT would not change the overall conclusions of the classification of significance of effects of the Proposed Development at each Viewpoint location.
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?	The opportunity for mitigation of the visual effects of the Proposed Development is limited due to the size and scale of the Proposed Development. As shown in the assessment presented in **APP-039** (**Chapter 10**: Landscape and Visual Amenity) a significant effect on visual amenity at Viewpoint 4 (Users of PRoW Bole FP3B/Bole FP4/residents at Bole) located north-west of the Proposed Development largely relates to the height of the tallest structures (stacks up to 45m above ground level). As such, it is considered that the addition of landscape features such as trees and woodland would not be effective in reducing the effects on visual amenity. An integrated design approach, which has been followed in the Proposed Development, considers massing and the disposition of taller structures within the Site to minimise potential wall effects (block massing that creates a constant mass of structures that are not broken up). In doing so, it is considered that this approach has assisted in reducing visual impacts of

			the Proposed Development, but nevertheless a significant effect from that Viewpoint remains. Section 2.6.5 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-2 (DECC, 2011) states: "*it is not possible to eliminate the visual impacts associated with a fossil fuel generating station. Mitigation is therefore to reduce the visual intrusion of the buildings in the landscape and minimise impact on visual amenity as far as reasonably practicable.*" This key policy, therefore, clearly identifies both that visual impacts cannot always be eliminated for a development of this type and that there are also practical limitations on how far such impacts can sometimes be reduced. Implementation of detailed design parameters is proposed to be secured by Requirement 5 (1)(a) of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
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?	The image shown in **APP-102** (**Figure 10.16:** Viewpoint 11) has been merged incorrectly. A revised **Figure 10.16** (Revision 1) has been produced and is included within the Deadline 2 submission (**Document 9.7**).
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?	The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) assumes a maximum final ground height of +14.0m above ordnance datum (AOD) which takes into account proposed earthworks to provide a platform for the Proposed Development, to establish the maximum (worst-case) stack height of +59m AOD (for stacks up to 45m above ground level (AGL)). Conservative assumptions were built into the ZTV in order to ensure a worst-case assessment. These are explained on the notes on the inset for **APP-090** (**Figure 10.4:** Zone of Theoretical Visibility) and include: • the whole of the Proposed Power Plant Site, (rather than simply the stacks), being modelled at a height of 45m AGL i.e. 59m AOD; • screening effects of existing and proposed vegetation, buildings, and other above-ground structures not being taken into account in the ZTV; and • all existing woodland being as given a height of 15m AGL. Such conservative assumptions assisted in providing a worst-case ZTV in order to identify all points within 5km of the Proposed Development which could have a view of any part of the modelled area. The list of potential viewpoints was derived on this basis. The ZTV has been agreed with relevant authorities and is therefore considered to be appropriate.

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?	The Site is on the boundary of the Trent Washlands Landscape Character Area (LCA) and the Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands LCA as defined by the Bassetlaw LCA. The species list for both Mid Nottinghamshire Farmlands and Trent Washlands LCA has been considered in developing the Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan (**APP-139** - **Document 7.5**) in order to ensure continuity with surrounding landscape character. This is further explained in paragraph 5.2.11 – 5.2.30 of **APP-139** (**Document 7.5:** Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan).
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'?	The value of view for Viewpoint 9 is classified as low taking into account **Table 12** of **APP-063** (**Appendix 10A:** Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology) which defines this as: *"An ordinary, but not necessarily unattractive view, with no recognised quality which is unlikely to be visited specifically to experience the views available. Although the view may be appreciated by receptors, it is typically incidental to the receptor's reason for being there."* The classification reflects the existing view dominated by the existing West Burton Power Station. The sensitivity has then been reduced to reflect the value of view in comparison to the other viewpoints.
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?	As stated in paragraph 3.6.1 of **APP-063** (**Appendix 10A:** Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology), '*The sensitivity of the landscape receptor is determined by the combination of its susceptibility to change due to the specific type of development being assessed and the value attached to the landscape receptor. Landscape sensitivity is not an absolute scale and requires professional judgement to determine the sensitivity for each receptor'.* Sensitivity is derived from susceptibility of the receptor and value of view. The views within the representative viewpoints are not assessed to be of high value, based on professional judgement that has been applied using the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) '*Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment'* (GLVIA3) within the ZTV. The sensitivity of receptors has been reduced as a result of views either not having strong cultural associations or as a result of being dominated by the existing West Burton Power Station.

Q7.13	The Applicant	Can the Applicant provide further explanation as to why it considers that the Proposed 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?	**Table 10-11** of **APP-039** (**Chapter 10**: Landscape and Visual Amenity) states that the removal of existing vegetation on-site would result in a low magnitude of impact on a low sensitivity receptor, resulting in a negligible adverse effect for the landscape features on Site. During the operational phase and set out in **Table 10-12** of **APP-039** (**Chapter 10**: Landscape and Visual Amenity) reinstatement of the grassland after use as a construction laydown area, and the mitigation of ecological impacts through a scheme of landscape and biodiversity management and enhancement, would provide a beneficial impact to the landscape features on Site which would be of low magnitude and result in a negligible beneficial effect.
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?	As outlined in **Table 6** of **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan) provides the requirement for an arboricultural survey (in accordance with BS5837:2012) to be carried out concurrently with detailed design and prior to site clearance works being undertaken. This survey will identify trees likely to be affected by detailed design. The results of the survey will be reported, and a method statement prepared that will outline recommended mitigation and/or other procedures for the protection of any specimens of value or importance. This survey will therefore be secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**), which secures the final CEMP.
8.	**Noise and Vibration**		
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?	The noise survey took place over a ten-day period during the summer of 2017. The results were then filtered to remove those levels measured during periods when the weather may have produced unrepresentatively high background and residual levels. Specifically, this means that periods of high wind and precipitation were discounted. The results for each location were then additionally filtered for downwind conditions only, as these are the conditions most favourable for propagation from the Proposed Development to each receptor. The results were then statistically analysed to derive a representative level. The analysis was based on examination of the modal and lowest tenth percentile level (i.e. the L_{90} of the L_{90}) of each data set. The representative value for each receptor was derived from measurements in either calm conditions or low speed downwind conditions. The potential effects of wind on local vegetation have been removed. There is not anticipated to be any difference between the sound propagation across the ground between the Proposed Development, the existing residual sources and the receptors in similar wind conditions at different times of year. In the winter months, there is a slightly greater possibility of temperature inversion

			under some atmospheric conditions. The propagation calculation methodology used for the assessment (International Standards Organisation (1996) *ISO 9613-2 – Attenuation of Sound during Propagation Outdoors, Part 2: General Method of Calculation*), which assumes gentle downwind propagation in all directions, is representative of temperature inversion conditions. The combined effect of this processing is to remove the influence of transient effects that might vary seasonally and produce a value independent of time of year.
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?	The measurement and receptor locations are as agreed with the host authority Bassetlaw District Council and adjacent authority West Lindsey District Council. Evidence of consultation to agree the measurement locations is demonstrated via the signed Statement of Common Ground with West Lindsey District Council submitted at Deadline 1 (**REP01-012**) and has been agreed through the Statement of Common Ground with Bassetlaw District Council, which will be completed and submitted at the subsequent Examination Deadline. The measurement and receptor locations are derived taking into account those locations that have been used for the existing West Burton Power Station annual noise monitoring programme that has been undertaken since 2009 at selected measurement positions. The purpose of the annual noise monitoring since 2009 has been to provide a comparison of current operating noise levels against those measured in previous years. The locations selected are designed to be representative of the groups of homes and receptors around each of them but avoiding local sources that only affect a small area, such as farm plant or domestic boilers. As such the measurement locations represent the following: ML1 Sturton-le-Steeple (other parts of the village will be noisier due to sources such as the local roads, homes and businesses, but the measured value is representative of those properties unaffected by these sources); ML2 Crossing Keeper's Cottage and St Ives; ML3 Mill House Farm (between them, ML2 and ML3 also represent the other receptors along Gainsborough Road, Grange Farm etc.); ML4 Bole (see notes for Sturton); ML5 Gainsborough (see notes for Sturton); ML6 Lea (see notes for Sturton); and ML7 Knaith (see notes for Sturton).

			It is considered that these receptors provide a robust set of locations for assessment of impact from the Proposed Development, while also allowing 10 years of relevant baseline noise data at those locations to be used to inform the assessment.
Q8.3	The Applicant, Bassetlaw District Council and West Lindsey District Council	Have noise monitoring locations been agreed with the relevant local authorities?	The locations of seven representative NSR were agreed with Bassetlaw District Council (the host local authority) and West Lindsey District Council (the adjacent authority) in May 2017. The consultation with West Lindsey District Council resulted in an additional receptor being added at the southern edge of Gainsborough (ML5). The agreement of these NSR is demonstrated through the signed Statement of Common Ground with West Lindsey District Council submitted at Deadline 1 (**REP01-012**) and has been agreed through the Statement of Common Ground with Bassetlaw District, which will be completed and submitted at the subsequent Examination Deadline.
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?	No comment
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 account in relevant assessments within the ES?	**Table 8-1** in **APP-037** (**Chapter 8:** Noise and Vibration) signposts to **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) which presents information on the habitats and species considered likely to be affected by construction and operation of the Proposed Development, including disturbance due to noise and vibration that could potentially result in adverse effects on protected and notable species (see paragraph 9.6.3). **Table 9-7** and **Table 9-8** of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) provide the rationale and justification for the species and habitats scoped into or out of the ecological impact assessment (EcIA) following the initial screening exercise on the basis of disturbance due to noise. Disturbance impacts due to noise during the construction and operational periods that have the potential to result in significant effects on relevant ecological features are considered further for: • bats in paragraph 9.6.24 and 9.6.56 – 9.6.57;

			• red and amber list passerine birds associated with scrub and woodland habitat in paragraph 9.6.33; • amber list bird species associated with wetland habitats in paragraph 9.6.35; • brown hare in paragraph 9.6.40; • badger in paragraph 5.1.2 and 5.2.2 (Confidential **Appendix 9D**); and • otter in paragraph 9.6.37 – 9.6.38. Cetti's warbler has been recorded in habitats adjacent to the Site (West Burton Reedbed local wildlife site (LWS)) although the LWS is not designated on this basis. Cetti's warbler was specifically included as a species in **Table 9-7** and **Table 9-8** of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) for consideration of noise disturbance impacts. Disturbance impacts on this species were further considered in paragraph 9.5.11 of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology). It was considered that during construction, potential disturbance impacts due to noise would be unlikely, taking into account the design and impact avoidance measures required for legal compliance and which are therefore proposed to avoid disturbance to this species. These measures are described in **Section 9.5** (paragraph 9.5.11) and also in the Landscape and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan (**APP-139** - **Document 7.5**), in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (**APP-137 – Document 7.3**) and in the Commitments Register presented in **APP-135** (**Document 7.1**) and include: • a pre-construction survey to check for breeding birds including Cetti's warbler would be undertaken in advance of construction works; and • if the proposed southern drainage connection corridor is chosen, or should it be necessary to undertake works associated with the third drainage option adjacent to West Burton Reedbed LWS, construction works that would cause disturbance to Cetti's warbler or other protected birds within the nearby West Burton Reedbed LWS and other adjacent habitats would be timed to be outside the bird breeding season (March to August inclusive). The final CEMP is secured through Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**) and must include this detail. **Table 9-8** of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) explains that impacts due to noise disturbance during the operational phase of the Proposed Development are not

			anticipated for Cetti's warbler. This is because this species was found within the West Burton Reedbed LWS, which is located approximately 200m to the south of the Proposed Power Plant Site and is already subject to operational disturbance associated with WBB Power Station, located approximately 100m to the west.
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?	The assessments are based on different criteria, with the construction noise predictions for each receptor being based on the levels expected when the busiest phase of construction is occurring at the closest part of the Site to each receptor. The traffic predictions are based on the highest anticipated flows during the construction phase. As such, each assessment uses worst-case assumptions in predicting impacts and assessing whether effects may be significant. By their nature, the sounds due to construction activities and traffic will be transient in nature and both have been predicted as illustrative worst-cases. The likelihood of simultaneous occurrence of predicted worst-case construction activity and construction traffic sound levels at a given location is low. As explained in paragraph 8.3.28 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) the assessment of construction road traffic effects uses 18-hour peak traffic flow data on all existing roads that are predicted to be subject to a potentially significant change. In doing so, noise predictions represent the periods for assessment of the worst-case impacts; outside of these periods, traffic flow and hence noise effects would be lower. **Table 8-29** shows that either no change or a very low magnitude of noise impact is predicted due to changes in traffic flows along all the assessed routes during construction of the Proposed Development. This would result in no change or negligible adverse effects (not significant) at local residential NSR. These effects would occur during the daytime period when workers and HGVs access the Site. As explained in paragraph 8.6.9 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration), construction noise effects at all NSR during construction of the Proposed Development are predicted to be negligible (not significant) during the daytime period, due largely to the distances between the construction works and NSR. Therefore, no significant residual combined effects of residual construction noise and road traffic noise on noise sensitive receptors are considered likely.
Q8.7	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain whether it anticipates piling to be required during construction and if so, can the Applicant	The potential need for piling has been acknowledged in **APP-033** (**Chapter 4**: The Proposed Development) and the consideration of the potential effects of piling have

		indicate where potential impacts associated with this activity have been assessed in ES Chapter 8 [APP-037] or else provide such an assessment?	been presented throughout the ES, including **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration). In **APP-037** (**Chapter 8:** Noise and Vibration), design and impact avoidance measures are committed to such that if piling is required, use of lower noise piling (such as rotary bored or hydraulic jacking) rather than driven piling techniques will be considered where reasonably practicable. In **Table 8-25**, the predicted free-field noise levels have been considered if piling was required, at each of the noise sensitive receptors identified in the assessment. With mitigation measures outlined in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan **(APP-137** - **Document 7.3**) significant adverse noise effects are not predicted due to piling, if required during construction of the Proposed Development.
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]?	The operation of WBA Power Station has been included within the existing baseline assessment for **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) and, therefore, represents the worst-case assessment of the future baseline at the earliest potential opening year of the Proposed Development, based upon what is currently known about the future of WBA Power Station. No decisions on the closure date for WBA or its subsequent decommissioning have been taken at this time. The decision will be influenced by a number of factors including legislative requirements and future market conditions, which are outside of the control of the Applicant. Any decommissioning approval that is sought for WBA Power Station, either planning permission or prior approval, would need to consider any potential cumulative overlap with construction or operational activities at the Proposed Development. It would be for any WBA consent to include any necessary mitigation measures, since the detail of these future works for WBA would be known and would be able to take into account the timings of construction or operation of the Proposed Development.
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	The agreed scheme of noise control during construction will be secured through Requirement 21 of draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). It will also form part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan, secured through Requirement 16 of **Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). **Table 4** of the Framework CEMP (**APP-137** - **Document 7.3**, sets out the embedded impact avoidance and additional mitigation, enhancement and management measures to be included as a minimum in the final CEMP secured by Requirement 15 of the draft DCO (**Document**

		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?	**2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). Specifically, this includes those measures considered 'Best Practicable Means' in column 2 of **Table 4** which are cited as design and impact avoidance measures in paragraphs 8.5.1 – 8.5.7 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration). Column 3 of **Table 4** also describes how the monitoring strategy would be implemented in order to assess the effectiveness of mitigation measures, monitor the impact of construction works and take other actions necessary to enable compliance. The final CEMP under Requirement 16 (2) of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**) must be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority before commencement of the authorised development and must be in accordance with **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework CEMP) submitted. The final CEMP will also describe, under this section, the responsible party for each mitigation, enhancement measure or monitoring requirement (given that as a contractor has not yet been appointed, responsibilities cannot be assigned at this stage). In addition, should the local authority and the Applicant, at the detailed design stage, determine that some additional control or monitoring measures should be employed at the time of construction, these can be added to the final CEMP to be agreed. Given this, it is considered that the Framework CEMP provides as much detail as is possible, in the absence of a construction contractor being appointed, and is considered sufficiently detailed to provide confidence that the included design and impact avoidance measures can be satisfactorily discharged at the required stage. **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) explains that the Proposed Development would be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit issued and regulated by the Environment Agency. This will require operational noise from the generating station to be controlled through the use of BAT. A number of the design aspects and features of the Proposed Development cannot be confirmed until the tendering process for the design and construction of the generating station has been completed. The decision on the plant configuration and size of the enclosure or building would depend on the contractor's selection of plant and process equipment, as well as detailed design work. For this reason, as explained in paragraph 8.7.16 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) at the detailed design stage, the existing noise model will be reviewed and, if necessary, additional acoustic assessment will be undertaken in consultation with the design engineers, to determine the most

			appropriate mitigation options in accordance with BAT. The findings of the further assessment will inform the design to demonstrate that rating levels meet the target of no greater than +5 dB above the representative background sound level at each NSR, resulting in no more than a low magnitude of impact and no greater than a minor adverse effect, which would not be significant. The scheme of control for operational noise is to be agreed with the local planning authority through discharge of Requirement 22 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). This requires that no stage of the authorised development must be brought in to commercial use until a scheme for the management and monitoring of noise during operation has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. Noise from the scheme must not exceed 5dB above background levels at any existing residential property measured following commissioning of the authorised development. It has been agreed with West Lindsey District Council in the signed Statement of Common Ground submitted at Deadline 1 (**REP01-012**) and agreed through the Statement of Common Ground with Bassetlaw District Council, which will be completed and submitted at the subsequent Examination Deadline, that the design and impact avoidance and noise mitigation measures - including the means that these are to be secured via the draft DCO - are appropriate.
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?	The mitigation information used in **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) was based on detailed discussions with a number of potential equipment suppliers. Through such discussions, a range of noise attenuation measures that could be applied in order to reduce sound power levels were identified. The levels of reduction from a basic 'worst-case' that the manufacturers considered could be achieved were then given further consideration. Mitigated data presented by the manufacturer was cross referenced against the Applicant's appointed noise consultant (AECOM) staff experience and databases. In particular, actual receptor sound levels achieved by existing gas turbine based power plants such as Sutton Bridge (<30 dB L_A at 1 km and Great Yarmouth (<35 dB L_A at 200 m) were used for validation and checking of the mitigated data provided by the manufacturer. The assessment concluded that a mitigated scenario, applying reductions in sound power levels specified in **Table 8-35** of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration),

			would be capable of achieving rating levels that meet with a target of no greater than +5 dB above the representative background sound level at each NSR, resulting in no more than a low magnitude of impact and no greater than a minor adverse effect, which would not be significant. The effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed is evidenced in the submission of the models as part of the Environmental Permit application to the Environment Agency, which will be used in order to inform the determination of the Environmental Permit.
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 been scoped out of the assessment?	The justification for scoping in/out groups of species and relevant habitats due to disturbance effects including noise is explained in **APP-055** (**Appendix 9C**) and further explained in Table 9-7 (construction) and Table 9-8 (operation) of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology). The scope of surveys was designed using the preliminary ecological appraisal (**APP-055** (**Appendix 9C**). In the case of aquatic and riverine species, this included surveys for water vole and otter within the River Trent and other suitable wetlands and wet ditches. The surveys undertaken (**APP-062** – **Appendix 9I**) were then used to screen features in or out of the ecological impact assessment, taking into account the habitats and features likely to be lost/disturbed by the Proposed Development. CIEEM (2018) guidance states that it is not necessary in the assessment to address all habitats and species with potential to occur in the zone of influence of a proposed development. Instead, the focus should be on those that are *'relevant*'. CIEEM guidance states that there is no need to 'carry out detailed assessment of ecological features that are sufficiently widespread, unthreatened and resilient to project impacts and will remain viable and sustainable'. **Table 9-7** and **Table 9-8** of **APP-038** (**Chapter 9**: Ecology) provide justification for species and habitats scope in and out on the basis of disturbance due to noise. In relation to construction noise, propagation from the above ground works within the Site boundary to the river is such that no potential pathways have been identified that could affect riverine receptors. Further explanation of potential noise disturbance effects on any local otter population that may be using the River Trent and adjacent waterbodies is provided in paragraphs 9.6.36 – 9.6.38.
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	As explained in **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) detailed construction information is not yet available (given that the construction contractor has not yet been appointed). Therefore, this assessment draws upon the experience and assessments undertaken for other similar projects and includes the types of construction activities

		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]?	likely to be adopted by the contractor for the Proposed Development, including piling, if required. The assessment is based on the levels which might be expected when the busiest phase of construction is occurring at the closest part of the Site to each noise sensitive receptor. As such, each construction noise prediction represents a worst-case at that noise sensitive receptors. In this sense, the assessment is quantitative, and while only indicative, it is considered to be conservative and robust. Construction noise thresholds (limit values) have been provided in **Table 8-8** of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration), which are to be applied at local NSR and which, based on the conservative assessment undertaken, are considered to be achievable and that will not give rise to significant effects. Further assessment has been identified as being required pre-construction, to demonstrate that appropriate mitigation measures are developed to achieve the threshold values, once the contractor is appointed. This (and other mitigation measures detailed in **Section 8.7** of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration)) is secured by Requirement 21 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**), which will ensure that construction noise and vibration is minimised. Construction noise impacts will be further minimised through the use of the final CEMP, secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). Appointment of a contractor will follow completion of a tendering process for the design and construction of the generating station and once a commercial decision is made to progress the project.
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	It was determined that the potential effects of construction vibration due to piling, if required, would have the potential to affect buildings within the existing WB Power Station site, rather than buildings off-site. The rationale behind this is explained in paragraph 8.3.43 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration). A qualitative assessment, based upon professional judgement, has been undertaken which considers the significant distances to NSR (see **Table 8-5** of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) which illustrates that the nearest NSR is 0.9km from the Site, with other NSR up to 2.5km distant). At these distances, no significant vibration effects (medium or high magnitude impacts would be likely at nearby residential buildings from the proposed construction activities. For this reason, further assessment of the effects of vibration on such buildings is scoped out.

		approach to be appropriate for vibration impacts on residential buildings.	However, further consideration is given to the adjacent buildings within the West Burton Power Station site. This is based on the distance between potential piling activities and the buildings identified and experience of vibration propagation with distance. It is by no means certain, in fact is very unlikely, that any on-site buildings would be adversely affected, but the potential risk has been mentioned so that it is included within **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plant) for assessment and mitigation when the construction techniques and exact plant locations have been finalised. **Table 4** of **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plant) provided with the Application describes the best practicable means that would be applied to minimise (noise and) vibration during construction, including ensuring, for example, that where reasonably practicable, noise and vibration is controlled at source (e.g. the selection of inherently quiet plant and low vibration equipment). The final CEMP will be secured by Requirement 15 of the draft DCO (**APP-004 - Document 2.1**). No causes of potentially significant vibration associated with the operational Proposed Development are known and therefore further assessment of operational vibration was scoped out of this assessment.
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?	Yes. The most significant background sound sources during the night-time periods of the noise survey were the existing West Burton A and West Burton B power stations at times when each receptor was downwind of the West Burton Power Station site. However, other sources such as local roads, domestic sources and plant on commercial buildings were contributory, particularly at ML5.
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	The buildings within the West Burton Power Station complex are of an industrial nature and are therefore not subject to the same annoyance criteria as residential or other more sensitive receptors would be. BS6472-1:2008, *Guide to evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings Part 1: Vibration sources other than blasting,* states that the criteria for the *'likelihood of adverse comment for office and workshop areas are 2 and 4 times higher than those for residential properties respectively'*.

		Applicant justify the reason for omitting this assessment or provide such an assessment and if provided, how might any effects be mitigated?	It is acknowledged in paragraph 8.6.18 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) that there is the potential that vibration impacts could cause annoyance to occupants of building within WBB Power Station and exceed the LOAEL and SOAEL set out in **Section 8.3**. Construction activities that could give rise to vibration effects will be subject to the control measures contained in the final CEMP secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**) to minimise vibration effects both on and off site. In the very unlikely event that levels of construction vibration do risk potential annoyance or structural issues within the existing West Burton Power Station site, the Applicant will use their existing operational management systems to investigate and deal with such issues. Options may range from technical changes and engineering modifications to temporary relocation of personnel within the existing West Burton Power Station site.
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?	Construction activities will be undertaken between 07:00 and 19:00 hours on Monday to Friday and 08:00 and 18:00 hours on a Saturday), although some works may take place outside of core working hours, provided they do not exceed a noise limit at locations to be agreed with Bassetlaw District Council. This is proposed to be secured by Requirement 20 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). It is not possible to predict with accuracy how frequently works would take place outside of core working hours, however, only those works that would not give rise to noise disturbance or that are required to be continuous operations (for example, concrete pouring) would be undertaken outside core working hours. The potential noise effects of working outside core working hours have been incorporated into the assessment and are described in paragraph 8.6.10 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration). For weekend and particularly night-time working during construction, potential minor adverse (not significant) effects at NSR during evening and weekend working are predicted. Potential moderate adverse (significant) effects would be predicted at some NSR during night-time working if the same intensity of working as for the daytime is assumed. Therefore, construction activities taking place during night-time hours will be planned and restricted appropriately, so as not to exceed the Significant Observable Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) threshold values (defined as the level above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur); and reduce levels towards the Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL)

			(defined as the level above which adverse effects on health and quality of life can be detected at receptors) (or less) where practical, to avoid significant effects. This control will be secured through Requirement 21 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
9.	**Socio-economic**		
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?	Requirement 26 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**) states that the Applicant will work with Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils, as well as Bassetlaw District Council as the discharging authority, to develop a plan that seeks to promote employment, skills and training development opportunities for local residents during construction. It is intended that the Applicant will actively engage with the economic and skills departments of those authorities prior to the commencement of the development.
Q9.2	The Applicant	Paragraph 13.6.15 of ES Chapter 13 [APP-042] mentions that some specific receptors (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?	As outlined in Paragraph 13.6.16 of **APP-042** (**Chapter 13**: Socio-economics) detailed assessments of the impacts on landscape and visual amenity, noise and vibration, traffic and transport and air quality (dust) during construction of the Proposed Development have been completed as part of the EIA process and are reported in Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the ES (**APP-035** – **APP037** and **APP-039**) for potentially affected sensitive receptors identified as relevant for each topic. Combined effects in relation to the receptors considered in **APP-042** (**Chapter 13**: Socio-economics) are reported in **Table 16-16** of **APP-045** (**Chapter 16**: Cumulative and Combined Effects). It is confirmed in **Table 16-16** that with the avoidance measures and mitigation set out in each chapter, no significant residual combined effects from construction noise, traffic and dust are predicted to occur, with the exception of the significant effect on users of Bole FP3B/FP4 footpath (Viewpoint 4) as outlined in paragraph 13.6.19 of **APP-042** (**Chapter 13**: Socio-economics). The receptors identified are based on relative proximity to the Proposed Development as the amenity impacts referred to concern the combination of significant residual noise, sound, vibration, air quality, visual, transport and traffic impacts which are more likely to occur closer to the Proposed Development, or close to the routes from the Proposed Development. The receptors noted provide a representative sample to demonstrate that amenity impacts have been considered. Given that the related ES chapters do not record any significant residual effects (other than for Bole FP3B/FP4 footpath (Viewpoint 4)) there are not predicted to be any significant in-combination/amenity impacts.

			A plan has been provided to Deadline 2 (**Document 9.8**), as requested, to show the location of the businesses and residential receptors considered in the assessment. This is included as **Figure 13.1**: Relevant Local Businesses and Residential Receptors Considered in Chapter 13. For clarity, the three businesses considered in the assessment and shown on **Figure 13.1** are categorised as follows: • G Bartle and Son Dairy Farm (Dairy Farm); • W E Proudley & Sons (Mixed Farming); and • Heald T & Son (Butchers). Mill House and Middle Farm are residential receptors.
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?	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of noise and vibration effects associated with the Proposed Development. This is presented in **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration). As explained in paragraphs 8.3.36 and 8.6.18 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration), given the considerable distance to residential receptors, no significant vibration (medium or high magnitude impacts) is expected to result at residential receptors from the proposed construction activities. In addition, no vibration effects are expected to occur from the operational Proposed Development and such effects were scoped out of the EIA as set out in paragraph 8.3.52 of **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration). **Table 4** of **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plant) describes the best practicable means (BPM) that would be applied to minimise noise and vibration during construction, including ensuring, for example, that where reasonably practicable, noise and vibration is controlled at source (e.g. the selection of inherently quiet plant and low vibration equipment). The final CEMP will be secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). With regard to electromagnetic frequency (EMF) related impacts and effects, this has been assessed within **APP-067** (**Appendix 13A**: Human Health). Section 6.2 of **APP-067** (**Appendix 13A**: Human Health) concludes that EMF related effects would be restricted to a 50m radius of the proposed electrical connection to the existing 400kV switchyard. As no residential receptors are present and none are anticipated to be present in the future baseline, only workers and operational staff have a risk of

			exposure to EMF. With impact avoidance measures to protect construction works and operational staff from EMF related effects (outlined in paragraphs 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 of **APP-067** (**Appendix 13A**: Human Health)), no significant health effects in medium to long-term construction works or operational staff were predicted.
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?	'EMI' stated in paragraph 5.1.3 of **APP-067** (**Appendix 13A:** Human Health should state 'EMF'. The choice and design of plant and equipment will comply with standard industry guidelines set to protect human health, including construction workers and operational staff. EMF exposure of workers would be minimised through standard operating practices and permit to work procedures applied in the construction of any power station or interaction with high voltage systems. Work on the construction of the Proposed Development will be largely complete before the electrical connection is made. Worker activities around high voltage electrical connections are always restricted through permit to work procedures to minimise risk of exposure or electrical shock.
10.	**Transportation and Traffic**		
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?	**Table 7-7** of in **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) does not set out baseline flows for junctions; it sets out baseline 24-hour Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flows for the four highway links (roads carrying traffic between two junctions) which are likely to be susceptible to changes as a result of construction of the Proposed Development. For clarification please see **Figure 1** presented in **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) which illustrates where automatic traffic counts (ATC) on the four highway links (ATC 1 – 4) which correlate with **Table 7-7** were completed. **Figure 1** also illustrates where manual classified counts (MCC) at junctions (MCC 1 – 3) were undertaken. The three junction counts were collected in order to undertake junction capacity assessments to determine the magnitude of impact on the junctions during the peak month of construction. This analysis is provided within Section 9 of **APP-051** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment).
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?	No junctions are named in **Table 7-7** of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport). The references in **Table 7-7** are to highway links (not junctions). Paragraph 2.2.1 of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) explains the highway links chosen for automatic traffic counts and correlates with **Figure 1** of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) which shows where link counts (ATC 1 –

			4) were undertaken. These link counts correlate with **Table 7-7** of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport). **Figure 1** of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) also illustrates the locations for the junction counts (MCC 1 – 3).
Q10.3	The Applicant	Can the Applicant provide a figure that clearly depicts the transport assessment study area and the proposed construction traffic routes?	The study area for **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) comprises the C2/A620 from a point immediately north of Station Road in Sturton-le-Steeple to the A631 roundabout at Beckingham and the A620 immediately west of the C2/A620 roundabout. This has been used to assess highway link and junction capacities associated with the peak month of construction. As part of Deadline 2, the Applicant has provided a new **Figure 7.1:** Transport Assessment Study Area (**Document 9.6**) to illustrate the study area for **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment). **Figure 2** of the Framework Construction Transport Management Plan provided as **APP-140** (**Document 7.6**) shows the designated HGV construction route plan for the Proposed Development. Annex E of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) illustrates the five key routes used for the distribution and assignment of construction workers' traffic presented in **Table 14** of **APP-052**. **Figure 2** of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) show the routes that have been assessed for abnormal indivisible load 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 site, and if not, the reasons for this?	Current operations at West Burton Power Station require all HGVs to arrive and depart the West Burton Power Station site to/from the north via the A620. This is monitored and enforced and is in place to minimise the environmental impacts associated with HGV traffic on settlements south of West Burton Power Station including Sturton-le-Steeple. This traffic management measure has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development. **Figure 4** of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (document title amended as per the response at Q4.5(h) above) provided as **APP-140** (**Document 7.6**) shows the designated HGV construction route. The only exception to this is the delivery of abnormal indivisible loads. It is recognised that Highways England document '*Water preferred policy guidelines for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads*' published in January 2016 states that it is government policy to avoid road transport as far as possible by using alternative modes, such as

			water and that historically, abnormal indivisible loads to West Burton Power Station have been received at the Port of Hull, barged down the River Trent to a jetty at Cottam Power Station (owned by the Applicant) and then transported for the final six mile road journey through Treswell, South and North Leverton and Sturton-le-Steeple. The route shown on **Figure 2** of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) is therefore already an established potential route option and is considered suitable for the transportation purposes required. Detailed consideration would be given to the appropriate delivery option for abnormal indivisible loads during the detailed design. Any routing would be controlled by the Construction Traffic Management Plan secured by a Requirement of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). However, these movements would be isolated and very limited in number and would be undertaken at a time to be agreed with the local authority and/ or local police so as to minimise disruption on the road network. Therefore, no traffic counts were considered necessary on the route between Cottam Power Station and the Site, since normal HGV deliveries will be prevented from travelling on this road and there is no risk of the abnormal loads affecting the road capacity.
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?	As set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan secured by Requirement 18 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**), the road between Cottam Power Station and the Site will not be used for the delivery of construction materials. The only exception to this is the potential delivery of abnormal indivisible loads where policy requires that road transport is avoided, wherever possible. An assessment of options for delivery of abnormal indivisible loads is presented in **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment). Detailed consideration would be given to the appropriate delivery option for abnormal indivisible loads during the detailed design stage, in consultation with the local authority and/ or the local police. The timing of any abnormal load will be made so as to minimise disruption on the road network – typically occurring in the evenings or night-time. There would be a very limited number of abnormal loads required to be delivered to Site and therefore no significant effects have been identified. Any routing would be controlled by the Construction Traffic Management Plan secured by Requirement 18 (3)(b) of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).
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	Paragraph 7.3.9 of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) describes how the Rochdale Envelope has been applied within the traffic and transport assessment. A comparison of the single large gas turbine profile versus the up to five smaller gas

		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?	turbine profile was made during transport assessment scoping to identify which would result in worst-case impacts (on the basis that the higher number of daily HGVs and worker vehicles would result in worst-case impacts when compared to a lower number of daily HGV's and worker vehicles over a longer period). It is confirmed that the assessment of effects in **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) is based upon the worst-case that is the single large gas turbine profile, since the construction deliveries for smaller turbines are expected to be spread more evenly across the construction programme. Additionally, the worst-case assumptions relating to a construction year later in the programme, as described in paragraphs 7.4.11 – 7.4.14 of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) have also been considered. On this basis, it is considered that the assessment presented uses conservative assumptions and is robust.
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?	Highway safety is assessed by considering the frequency and severity of injury or accidents within the study area and the forecast increase in traffic. The Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (1993) *Guidelines on the Assessment of Road Traffic* state that '*professional judgement will be needed to assess the implications of local circumstances, or factors which may elevate or lessen risks of accidents'*. Analysis of the personal injury accident (PIA) data presented in paragraphs 7.4.6 – 7.4.10 of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) shows that 15 accidents have occurred within the study area over the five year period. Predicted increases in traffic flows on highway links during the Proposed Development construction result in a percentage increase in traffic volumes that is below the 30% rule threshold for assessment (very low magnitude). Given the low number of historic accidents and the very low magnitude of impact related to the temporary increase in traffic flow during the construction period, professional judgement has been used in conjunction with the assessment matrix (**Table 7-4**) to determine that effects on highway safety would not be significant. Section 9 of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) describes that in terms of driver delay, junction capacity assessments were undertaken at two key junctions as agreed with the local highway authorities - the 'A631/A620/Station Road Roundabout'

			and the 'A620/Saundby Road/Sturton Road Roundabout'. Analysis of the modelling outputs showed that with the Proposed Development and taking into account other committed development, both junctions continue to operate well within design capacity with minimal queues and delay. Professional judgement would be required if queuing and delay had been forecast, in order to gauge whether this impact was acceptable, based upon the magnitude of the impact. However, the modelling results clearly demonstrate no queuing or delay is predicted and therefore confirm the magnitude of impact to be very low and effects to be not significant.
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?	Paragraph 7.5.1 of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) notes that the Applicant is not yet able to fix certain parameters in the design and has therefore used the Rochdale Envelope to define building sizes and limits of deviation for building locations. Such parameters are not material to the transport assessment and worst case assumptions have been applied in the assessment. The assessment of effects in **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) is based upon the worst-case; that is the single large gas turbine profile. At the transport assessment scoping stage, consideration of the alternative build scenarios was undertaken and a realistic worst-case scenario (in highway capacity terms) chosen. It is considered that the detailed design work to be undertaken in the future will not affect the conclusions of the Traffic and Transport chapter because the build programme, profile of generation of the peak workforce and material delivery HGVs used for the purposes of assessment provide reasonable worst-case assumptions.
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?	The National Policy Statement EN1 (2011) paragraph 5.13.3 encourages early discussion on the scope of a transport assessment with the Highways Agency and relevant Highways Authorities. In the case of the Proposed Development, **Table 7-5** of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) describes the consultation undertaken with the relevant authorities in order to the scope of junction modelling. It was agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council (**REP01-013** provided at Deadline 1) that two key junctions should be assessed, given the trip generation and assignment characteristics of the Proposed Development; the 'A631/A620/Station Road Roundabout' and the 'A620/Saundby Road/Sturton Road Roundabout'. No other junctions to the south of the West Burton Power Station site entrance required examination as only 20 two-way vehicle movements per day are estimated to arrive and depart to the south. All consultees agreed with the junctions identified for capacity assessment. Once on the

			A631, baseline traffic flows are relatively low, and the impact of the Proposed Development is not considered to be a concern in highway capacity terms. Station Road forms the northern arm of the A631/A620/Station Road roundabout and therefore the reference to Station Road is correct. The location of Station Road is illustrated on Figure 7.1, provided to Deadline 2.
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?	Question 10.9 explains the rationale for agreeing the junctions to be assessed with Highways England and the Highways Authorities. No construction HGV traffic is expected to use the Gainsborough Road/Station Road junction and only 20 two-way construction worker vehicle movements per day are expected to use this junction. As such no further assessment of this junction has been undertaken. The approach taken by the Applicant to assess the effects relating to traffic and transport (including methodology, baseline data, assumptions, approach to junction modelling and data analysis) has been accepted by Lincolnshire County Council, West Lindsey District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council through the formal consultation process and signed Statements of Common Ground (**REP1-011** – **REP1-013)** provided at Deadline 1. Bassetlaw District Council has conferred responsibility, through the Statement of Common Ground, to the County Highways Authority to agree the approach and which will be formalised through the Statement of Common Ground once completed and submitted to the subsequent Examination Deadline.
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?	**APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) takes into account a study area defined with reference to the IEMA (1993) *Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic* and focuses on highway links where traffic flows are predicted to increase by >30% (or where the number of HGVs is predicted to increase by >30%) and other specifically sensitive areas where the traffic flows (or HGV component) are predicted to increase by >10%. These 'rules' are satisfied on all four highway links and show predicted increases in traffic to be below the 30% rule threshold. Furthermore, as explained in paragraphs 7.3.5 – 7.3.6 a desktop exercise was undertaken to examine the sensitivity of receptors. The rationale for classifying the sensitivity of receptors is explained in paragraph 7.3.6. No receptors classified as being of high sensitivity were identified by transport stakeholders during consultation on the Transportation Assessment scoping exercise.

			The study area for **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) was defined based on discussions with the relevant Highways Authorities during consultation on the Transportation Assessment scoping exercise. The study areas for both the Transport Assessment and Transport Chapter are therefore considered appropriate.
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?	Public footbath West Burton FP4 lies outside of the Order Limits. **APP-087** (**Figure 10.1**) does appear to show this public footpath within the Order Limits, however, this is due to the scale of the plan and its low resolution. Please refer to **APP-072** (**Figure 3.2**) and **APP-074** (**Figure 3.4** with inset showing public rights of ways). These plans show the Order Limits at a higher resolution. Public footpath FP4 can be seen to the east of the Order Limits, running along River Road. This footpath is therefore not being affected by the Proposed Development.
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.	Combined effects that may arise from the Proposed Development are discussed in **APP-045** (**Chapter 16**: Cumulative and Combined Effects) and it is recognised that several relatively minor effects could combine to result in a larger and potentially significant effect. **Table 16-16** reports the potential combined effects considered in relation to traffic and transport receptors. Consideration has been given to the residual effects of the Proposed Development reported in **APP-035** (**Chapter 6**: Air Quality) and **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration) on the receptors assessed within **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) and in particular, the potential for receptors located close to the road network to experience combined effects from traffic (severance, pedestrian, amenity, highway safety etc.), noise, vibration and air emissions during construction of the Proposed Development. Similarly, combined effects on users of FP4 public footpath have been considered. However, none of the traffic, air quality and noise assessments identify any significant residual effects on sensitive receptors located close to the road network and none of the predicted effects are close to being significant. Therefore, combined effects are not anticipated to be significant.
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-	For the purposes of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) in terms of highway/junction capacity, the worst-case scenario under the Rochdale Envelope would be activities commencing at the latest window in the DCO (i.e. 2027). This is

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>because the future baseline traffic flows would be higher than an earlier year in the programme, and thus the capacity for traffic associated with the Proposed Development could be more constrained.

For APP-036 (Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport), an earlier construction start date could in theory represent a higher percentage impact and a slightly worst-case for EIA due to lower baseline flows. For the purposes of consistency with APP-052 (Appendix 7A: Transport Assessment), the flows for the later construction year have been used in APP-036 (Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport); it was considered at the time of the Application preparation that the difference in effect of Proposed Development traffic against the different baseline flows of 2022 (the earliest peak of construction) and 2029 was not material.

A sensitivity analysis to illustrate the percentage difference between an earlier (2022) and later (2029) assessment year is shown below. The figures below include committed development flows and forecast growth.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">2022</th></tr>
<tr><td>Link</td><td>Baseline</td><td>Construction Traffic</td><td>% Increase</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2,693</td><td>20</td><td>0.7%</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>2,926</td><td>318</td><td>10.9%</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>5,007</td><td>20</td><td>0.4%</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>7,694</td><td>298</td><td>3.9%</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">2029</th></tr>
<tr><td>Link</td><td>Baseline</td><td>Construction Traffic</td><td>% Increase</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2,901</td><td>20</td><td>0.7%</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>3,153</td><td>318</td><td>10.1%</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>5,422</td><td>20</td><td>0.4%</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>8,317</td><td>298</td><td>3.6%</td></tr>
</table>

The results of the sensitivity analysis show the percentage increase in vehicle traffic arising from the Proposed Development to be only slightly higher in an earlier</td>
</tr>
</table>

			construction year than a later construction year when traffic growth is applied. Such an increase would not be material to the assessment and would in all cases constitute a very low magnitude of impact in accordance with **Table 7-3** of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport). Thus, the conclusions regarding effects not being significant in **APP-036**, (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) remain as reported.
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?	Cumulative effects that may arise from the Proposed Development with other committed developments are discussed both in **APP-045** (**Chapter 16**: Cumulative and Combined Effects) and in **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment). **Table 17** of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) reports that the maximum of 192 two-way HGV movements each day (96 loads into the site and 96 loads out of the site) from the quarry and also describes the flows forecast from other developments in Gainsborough. These flows are then taken into consideration in determining peak hours for assessment in **Table 18 - Table 21** (Section 8) of the transport assessment and the 2029 base plus committed development flows for the selected AM and PM peak hours included within **Annex J** of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment). Section 9, paragraph 9.2.4 and **Table 23** describe how these committed development flows have been considered in the junction capacity assessments. Paragraph 7.6.1 of **APP-052 (Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) reports that no Transport Assessment was submitted as part of the consented Local Development Order for the mixed use development at Gainsborough and has instead been conditioned. As no information has been provided on proposed vehicle generations or assignment to the network, any development traffic has been incorporated within background traffic growth applied to the 2017 baseline flows. **Table 16-7** of **APP-045** (**Chapter 16**: Cumulative and Combined Effects) reports how these committed developments have been considered in **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A:** Transport Assessment.
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	Requirement 18 and 19 of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**) are proposed to secure the measures set out in **APP-140** (**Document 7.6:** Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan) and **APP-141** (**Document 7.7:** Framework Construction Workers' Travel Plan).

		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 (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?	The draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**) has been amended so that Requirement 18 refers to *'framework construction traffic management plan'* instead of '*construction traffic and routing management plan'* or *'framework construction transport management plan'*. Requirement 18 has also been updated to require a *'construction worker's travel plan'* rather than a *'written travel plan for construction staff'* for consistency with the Application documents. The descriptions used in the ES chapter therefore should be taken to mean the plans mentioned in Requirements 17 and 18 and described above.
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.	Section 7.5 (design and impact avoidance measures) of **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) references the good practice measures to be implemented through **APP-140** (**Document 7.6:** Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan) and **APP-141** (**Document 7.7:** Framework Construction Workers' Travel Plan) which are provided with the Application. Please refer to the responses in Question 10.17 for how these will be secured and the revised naming of these plans within the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**). The Commitments Register provided as **Appendix 1** of the Planning Statement (**APP-135** – **Document 7.1**) provides further explanation of how these plans will be secured by Requirement. Section 11 of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) explains that the impact avoidance, mitigation and monitoring measures that are proposed to minimise the impact of the Proposed Development on the surrounding network during construction include a Construction Workers' Travel Plan (paragraphs 11.2.1 – 11.2.4) and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (paragraphs 11.3.1 – 11.3.2). Paragraph 12.3.1 explains that these plans will be secured by a Requirement of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B 1**). **Table 4** of **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan) signposts to and provides an overview of the measures specified in **APP-140** (**Document 7.6:** Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan) and **APP-141** (**Document 7.7:** Framework Construction Workers' Travel Plan), for the

			purposes of completeness. Neither **APP-036** (**Chapter 7**: Traffic and Transport) or **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) reference or rely on implementation of these measures through **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan).
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?	Arrangements for parking on-site have been considered and are presented in the Framework CWTP (**APP-141**, **Document 7.7**). In terms of HGVs, arrivals will be managed as far as reasonably practicable, such that they are spread evenly over the day between the hours of 07:00 and 19:00 Monday to Friday (except bank holidays) and 08:00 to 18:00 on Saturday (if required) to avoid on-site congestion, as noted in paragraph 1.8.3 of the Framework CWTP (APP-140, Document 7.6). The Applicant will also consider the possibility of allowing HGVs access to park on the West Burton site, in order to further reduce any risk of parking on the road, subject to operational circumstances at the time of construction allowing for the availability of suitable land and the practicality of meeting health and safety and site security requirements. In terms of construction workers' parking, paragraph 2.5.1 explains that a parking area would be set aside within the construction laydown area on Site and that in addition, satellite parking may be provided within the West Burton Power Station site and a shuttle system used to transport workers to the construction site. A responsibility of the Travel Plan Co-ordinator would be to monitoring parking to ensure no off-site parking is undertaken on any public highway leading to the Site, with sanction measures taken against those offending. It will be a condition of contract between the Applicant and the appointed contractor to ensure that anti-social behaviour policy is adhered to, by both HGV drivers and construction workers and the Applicant will emphasise the importance of this provision and its expectations regarding enforcement during the contract negotiations. This policy will also be reinforced during staff inductions and will include HGV drivers being made aware not to park on the local public highway, with sanctions put in place to deal with non-compliance with the aim of ensuring no repeat events. Full details of the

			proposed traffic management measures can be found in the Framework Construction Transport Management Plan (**APP-140**, **Document 7.6**). Any further details would be agreed with the local planning authority and highway authority through the discharging of the requirements.
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?	The Applicant notes the concerns of Bawtry Town Council. The Applicant undertook consultation with Doncaster Council (i.e. the host authority of Bawtry Town Council) to agree the scope of the Transport Assessment, including the assessment required for the A631 Bawtry Road/A638 junction. This was based upon worst-case assumptions, including a peak of construction lasting up to 3 months (over the anticipated 3 year construction period) and assignment of up to 26 and 34 construction worker vehicles over the AM and PM peak periods respectively, with up to 4 HGVs inbound/outbound in any one hour forecast. Doncaster Council agreed in July 2017 that no further assessment or modelling of the A631/A638 junction in Bawtry was required within the Transport Assessment (TA) presented as **APP-052** - **Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment). Based on the Transport Assessment, additional traffic generated by construction of the Proposed Development would not be likely to have a significant traffic and transport related effect on the Bawtry Conservation Area. Potential effects of noise and vibration are considered in **APP-037** (**Chapter 8**: Noise and Vibration). This includes an assessment of construction traffic related noise and vibration (paragraphs 8.6.11 – 8.6.16) which uses traffic data from **APP-052** - **Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment) and calculates the basic noise level (BNL) at 10m from the roadside at relevant roads. The assessment compares the change with and without the Proposed Development, including other committed developments, and predicts a maximum change in BNL of +0.7 dBA (refer to **Table 8-29** of **APP-037**) as a result of construction traffic associated with the Proposed Development. This BNL change is classified as a 'very low' magnitude impact (refer to **Table 8-10** of **APP-037**) and results in a negligible (not significant) effect on the affected roads (a Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) is set at a +3 dB and the Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) is set at +1 dB). Given that traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development at the A631/A638 Bawtry Junction would be lower than those flows at the affected roads within the scope of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment), it follows that the BNL change at the A631/A638 Bawtry Junction and within the wider Bawtry Conservation Area would also be classified as not significant. An incremental adverse impact on the historic character of the Bawtry Conservation

			Area as a consequence of the Proposed Development would therefore not be considered likely. A traffic routing analysis and junction capacity assessments for the junctions, agreed to be within the scope of the assessment, are provided within Section 5 and Section 9 respectively of **APP-052** (**Appendix 7A**: Transport Assessment). Construction worker routing is illustrated in **Annex E** of **APP-052**. An HGV routing plan is provided as **Figure 2** of **APP-140** (**Document 7.6:** Framework Construction Transport Management Plan.
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 Habblesthorpe and Sturton le Steeple?	The design and impact avoidance measures that the Applicant is committed to include HGVs arriving or departing the West Burton Power Station site travelling to/from the north via the A620 and onwards to/from the A631 near Beckingham. It is recognised that the A620 towards Retford is not an acceptable route due to a bridge height restriction in place at two locations and it is not proposed that this route be used by construction HGVs. Section 2 of **APP-140** (**Document 7.6:** Framework Construction Transport Management Plan)) describes the proposed arrangements for HGVs accessing the Site during construction. The standard control mechanisms to ensure that HGVs do not utilise other routes that pass through the villages of South Leverton, North Leverton with Habblesthorpe and Sturton le Steeple will include: • the HGV routing plan being distributed to all drivers during their induction; • it being a condition of contract between the Applicant and the appointed contractor to ensure that all construction HGV deliveries are instructed to use the designated route to access and egress the construction site; • the use of sanctions to deal with non-compliance with the aim of ensuring no repeat events; • maintaining the existing signage at the Site entrance, directing all HGVs to use the A620; • erecting additional new signage at the main junctions (see **Figure 2** of **APP-140 - Document 7.6:** Framework Construction Transport Management Plan) to ensure that all HGV traffic relating to the Proposed Development will be directed in the appropriate direction; and • requiring the contractor to maintain all the HGV route signage.

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?	The focus and content of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (**APP-140**, **Document 7.6**) is on the movement of transport by road. The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to consult the Trust in that context. If it is considered, in consultation with Highways England and the highways authority, that waterborne freight should be utilised, the Trust would be consulted at that time to ensure the necessary consents are in place to use the watercourse for transportation. This commitment is reflected in paragraph 3.1.8 of an updated version of the CTMP (**Document 7.6A** and **Document 7.6B**), submitted at Deadline 2.
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)	There is no specific identified need to temporarily stop up, alter or divert any streets and public rights of way at this stage. However, the ability to stop up streets and public rights of way is a standard provision for nationally significant infrastructure projects to ensure that the projects can be delivered without the delay that would otherwise arise from the local authority agreeing to promote stopping up separately under its powers. Please refer to the response to question 4.3(j) for further information.
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?	In **APP-028** (**Document 5.1:** Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary), CWMP is not correct and should refer to the Construction Workers' Travel Plan (CWTP), defined in the glossary of **APP-028**.
11.	**Water Environment**		
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?	Section 5.2 (paragraphs 5.2.1 – 5.2.12) of **APP-142** (**Document 7.8:** Outline Drainage Strategy) provides the calculations for the run-off rates based on the hardstanding areas proposed. As explained in paragraph 5.2.5, the runoff calculations are presented for the worst-case layout (up to five turbines) shown in Appendix A1 of APP-142 and have been used in **APP-041** (**Chapter 12**: Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources) and accompanying Flood Risk Assessment (**APP-026**). The Environment Agency, Nottinghamshire County Council as lead local flood authority and Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board have accepted the approach taken by the Applicant to assess the effects relating to potential flood risk, hydrology and water resources in relation to their assets and remit, as evidenced through the formal consultation process and signed Statements of Common Ground (**REP1-013, REP-015** and **REP-016**) provided at Deadline 1.
Q11.2	Environment Agency	Can the Environment Agency confirm whether it is content that the 2016 climate	No comment

		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?	As no potentially significant effects on minor watercourses were identified, and any potential risks are being managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (**APP-137**, **Document 7.3**) for construction effects, and the Environmental Permit for operational effects, it was not considered necessary to supplement publicly available data with site-specific monitoring data for minor watercourses. Impacts are quantified where practicable (for example in relation to flood risk) and the degree or magnitude of impact is assessed on a qualitative scale, to facilitate comparison with impacts on other environmental receptors.
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?	The definition of long-term is also set out in paragraph 2.7.10 of **APP-031** (**Chapter 2:** Assessment Methodology), where it states that long-term effects are associated with the duration of the operational phase. This underpins the technical assessments conducted in the EIA. The paragraph also states that short-term effects are considered to be those associated with the construction and decommissioning phases and which cease when construction or decommissioning works are complete. Given that the construction and decommissioning phases are expected to last for considerably less time than the operation phase, these are considered short-term. In the context of the assessment conducted in **APP-041** (**Chapter 12:** Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources), the effects are quantified temporally as being short-term (0-2 years) and medium term (2-5 years), which would correlate with the construction period, and long-term (>5 years) in line with the operational phase.
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	For the purposes of this assessment, a study area of 1km from the Order Limits has been considered, in order to identify surface waterbodies that could reasonably be affected by direct or indirect impacts associated with the Proposed Development. However, since watercourse flow and quality impacts may propagate downstream, where relevant the assessment has also considered a wider study area of up to 2km

		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 extent of the study area and the relevant waterbodies included within the assessment?	downstream of the Order Limits. Professional judgement has been applied to identify the extent to which such features are considered. **Figure 3**: Local Watercourses, appended to **APP-137** (**Document 7.3:** Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan), demonstrates the named and unnamed watercourses in close proximity to the Site that have been assessed. These watercourses are also shown on **APP-074** (**Figure 3.4:** Key Environmental Receptors within 2km and 5km of the Order Limits).
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?	The magnitude of impact and the significance of effect of the Proposed Development are assessed assuming that all embedded mitigation (e.g. surface water management systems and the use of impermeable surfacing) and standard industry mitigation measures (as presented in Section 12.5 of **APP-041** – **Chapter 12**: Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources) are adopted on-site during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. Dilution within the surface water network or drainage network has therefore not been used as a means to reduce the magnitude of an impact to low or negligible as the best practice measures have been included in the assessment to prevent pollution, contamination or sediment entering the surface water in the first place. In addition, the Proposed Development does not give rise to process effluent requiring treatment and disposal to sewer or drain. Therefore, the assessment of effects and significance, as reported in **APP-041** (**Chapter 12:** Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources), are in effect the residual effects and predicted level of significance as a worst-case scenario in the unlikely event of a pollution event occurring via leaks/spills etc. or sediment/contamination in run-off that then reaches the identified receptors.
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	Except for Burton Round Ditch, the Applicant concurs that the identified ecological receptors have been included in the ecological assessment, but not the flood risk/ hydrological assessment. Burton Round Ditch is referred to as an *'un-named watercourse'* in paragraph 12.4.13 in **APP-041** (**Chapter 12:** Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources) and paragraph 12.2.6 and is included within the assessment.

		not addressed in the flood risk/hydrology assessment?	Bole Ings Drain, Saundby Ponds, Mother Drain, Upper Ings Drain and Bole Ings Flood Pasture were deemed to not have hydrological connectivity with the Site and therefore were not included in the hydrology/ flood risk assessment, as no pathway was identified between the Proposed Development and these receptors.
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?	The MMO comment was made at the time when works were being considered directly in the River Trent or immediately adjacent to it. However, following a revision to the design of the Proposed Development, no works are required within the River Trent or adjacent to the flood defences as part of the Proposed Development. Therefore, no direct or indirect run-off pathways could occur between the Site and the river. The MMO recognise this change in design as shown in the signed Statement of Common Ground between the MMO and the Applicant and the fact that no Marine Licence is required for the Proposed Development. The Site is set back from the River Trent. Therefore, the potential for a direct impact on the River Trent from construction and/or operation of the Proposed Development is extremely low. Given the distance between the Proposed Power Plant Site and the river, with the planned mitigation measures in place, the potential for toxic effects on invertebrates and fish caused by compounds associated with suspended sediment is extremely low. Given the lack of works within and/or adjacent to the River Trent, it is unlikely that the re-suspension of sediment will occur. It is considered that the assessment undertaken in paragraph 12.6.15 of **APP-041** (**Chapter 12:** Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources) is therefore robust in this case. The signed Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and the MMO confirms that all matters previously raised have been suitably addressed or are no longer of relevance.
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	The option for foul drainage to be discharged to the West Burton Sewage Treatment Works located to the east of the Proposed Development and owned and operated by Severn Trent Water was initially considered in recognition of policy and Environment Agency preference favouring connection to the public foul sewer wherever it is reasonable to do so. Permanent welfare facilities are required for the operation of the Proposed Development (anticipated to create up to 15 operational roles, some of which are expected to be undertaken by existing West Burton/Cottam Power Station

		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?	employees). Given these employee numbers and the relatively infrequent use of such facilities, the initial position of the Applicant after engaging with the local sewerage undertaker was that connection to sewer was not reasonable in this case. Further discussions have been held between the Applicant and the Environment Agency on this matter in light of their Relevant Representation. It has been agreed with the Environment Agency that foul drainage should be directed to the mains sewage network where it is reasonable to do so and that further investigations into the possibility of discharging to the public sewerage system will need to be undertaken. It has also been agreed that a detailed justification will be provided by the Applicant if it is not possible to connect to the local foul sewer, following discussion with the local sewerage undertaker. It is agreed that the detailed scheme would be adequately secured through a requirement of the DCO. In light of these discussions, a new draft DCO requirement (Requirement 10 of **Documents 2.1A and 2.1B**) has been drafted by the Applicant and the Environment Agency to separate out the control of foul water discharge from that of surface water management. This draft requirement is considered to provide an appropriate mechanism to secure the necessary mitigation measures in relation to foul water discharge from the Proposed Development.
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?	Although the detailed design of any surface water attenuation system cannot be finalised at this stage, protection of controlled waters is a key consideration in **APP-142** (**Document 7.8:** Outline Drainage Strategy) which includes segregation of drainage to include an oily waste water drainage system, incorporating Class 1 full retention oil/water interceptors or containment pits, to drain all areas where oil spillages could occur. Similar oil/water interceptor arrangements are present at WBB Power Station, which are emptied periodically. As such, any attenuation pond required for the Proposed Development will contain only surface water run-off from the Site which will be essentially uncontaminated, as it is segregated from any process areas and storage areas of the Site. Nevertheless, in light of the Environment Agency comments, it is confirmed that the attenuation pond will be impermeable and will be lined, if required, so that it retains the water directed into it. The Environment Agency confirm that they welcome this proposed approach in the signed Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant. This is proposed to be secured through Requirement 9 (2) and (3) of the draft DCO (**Document 2.1A** and **Document 2.1B**).

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?	**APP-066** (**Appendix 12A**: Flood Risk Assessment) has assessed the potential effects of constructing and operating any of the three potential drainage options, including either of the northern or southern drainage connection corridors. All three options lead to insignificant effects on flood risk. It is recognised (and shown on **Figure 4** of **APP-066** (**Appendix 12A**: Flood Risk Assessment) that the drainage connections are located within Flood Zone 3. Therefore, Section 8 of the document includes mitigation for both construction and operational stages in respect of the drainage connection corridors and connections into the WBA purge line.
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?	No comment
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?	No comment