Riverside Energy Park

Applicant's response to London Borough of Bexley Deadline 4 Submission

VOLUME NUMBER:

08

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE NUMBER:

EN010093

DOCUMENT REFERENCE:

8.02.51

August 2019 | Revision 0 (Deadline 5) | APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008 | Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

CORY
RIVERSIDE ENERGY

Riverside Energy Park

The Applicant's Response to the London Borough of Bexley Deadline 4 Submission

On behalf of **Cory Environmental Holdings Ltd**

Project Ref: 42166 | Rev: Draft | Date: August 2019

Office Address: 10 Queen Square, Bristol, BS1 4NT
T: +44 (0)117 332 7840 E: bristol@peterbrett.com

Contents

1 The Applicant's Response to the London Borough of Bexley Deadline 4 Submission

1.1 Purpose of Document

1.1.1 This document provides a response to the documentation submitted by London Borough of Bexley (LBB) at Deadline 4. Responses to comments on the **draft Development Consent Order** (**dDCO**) (**3.1, REP3-003**) from all interested parties including LBB are contained in a single submission document, the **Applicant's response to comments on the draft Development Consent Order** (**8.02.54**) submitted at Deadline 5. This response therefore provides comments on the following remaining matters raised by LBB:

- Applicant's responses to Written Representations (including those not covered in document **8.02.54** in respect of Requirements);
  - Waste need and capacity;
  - Proximity Principle;
  - Air Quality;
  - Noise;
  - Code of Construction Practice (CoCP);
- Applicant's response to the LBB Local Impact Report (LIR);
  - Air Quality;
  - Noise;
  - Outline CoCP;
  - Public Rights of Way;
- Post Hearing Note on Public Health and Evidence;
- Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP);
- Temporary Jetty Outage Review; and
- Middleton Jetty Ops Review Workshop Note.

1.2 Response to LBB comments on the Applicant's responses to Written Representations

Waste Need and Capacity

1.2.1 The Applicant addressed matters relating to throughput in detail in its Deadline 4 submission, specifically in respect of the potential maximum throughput, at **Paragraphs 1.2.13-1.2.17** and **1.7.3-1.7.5** in the **Applicant's response to London Borough of Bexley Deadline 3 submission** (**8.02.36, REP4-015**). These reiterate the basis of the assumptions on which throughput figures were derived and confirm that the effects reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) will be fully controlled through appropriate parameters which are not dependent on the annual waste throughput. The dDCO Requirements restrict potential impacts that may result in environmental effects (e.g. **Requirement 14**, transport movements of the **dDCO** (**3.1, Rev 3**)), whilst the annual tonnage throughput is an arbitrary number which itself does not give rise to any environmental effects and is only used to derive reasonable assumptions for each of the environmental disciplines in the EIA. The Applicant has had full regard to the assumptions and scope of the assessments undertaken for the EIA and from which appropriate controls have been derived for relevant technical topics.

1.2.2 **The Project and its Benefits Report** (**7.2, APP-103**) (and its **Annex A**, the **London Waste Strategy Assessment (LWSA)**) do not comprise part of the ES. The assessments reported in the ES derive parameters from a notional maximum waste throughput to provide a conservative basis of assessment, e.g. vehicle movements for a 100% by road scenario (i.e. based on 100% plant availability and low calorific waste value, etc.). All such assessments have been undertaken appropriately on a reasonable worst case basis. In contrast to the ES, the LWSA considers the need for additional waste treatment capacity in London and utilises the nominal throughput (655,000 tonnes per annum (tpa)) to assess whether realistic "day one" REP operations would address London's waste management deficit in varying future scenarios. In several scenarios, the LWSA found that there was a waste capacity need to manage not only the nominal REP throughput but waste in excess of 805,920 tpa. The LWSA is not intended to derive, support or consider the assessment of environmental effects.

1.2.3 The Applicant finds the final sentence of LBB's paragraph 3.16 unclear. The Applicant has previously confirmed that the throughput of 655,000 tpa represents a notional throughput based on typical operational parameters at the outset. A throughput of 805,920 tpa represents a 'maximum' throughput of waste to derive assessment parameters, given favourable operational conditions and low calorific values. Neither of the above precludes technological or efficiency improvements that could see the waste throughput increase further without undermining the effects assessed in the ES. Given the above, the Applicant therefore finds no basis for either marrying the EIA assessment to parameters derived from the lower notional throughput, or for using the maximum figure in the LWSA. Constraining the ES parameters to a

lower level would result in a less robust reasonable worst case and would stifle the ability of the plant to respond to efficiency and technology improvements over its lifetime. The LWSA found that there was sufficient need to support waste capacity above the 805,920 tpa (upper level throughput assumption considered in the ES).

Proximity Principle

1.2.4 As set out in **Paragraphs 1.4.3** and **1.4.4** of the **Applicant's response to London Borough of Bexley Deadline 3 submission** (**8.02.36, REP4-015**), LBB has provided no technical basis for its proposal for a 10% restriction related to the nominal waste throughput scenario. Furthermore, whilst RRRF (Riverside Resource Recovery Facility) serves the needs of LBB's local authority collected waste, there is a significant amount of commercial and industrial waste generated within the local area which requires treatment. REP will help recover value from this waste, moving it up the waste hierarchy and avoiding the need for landfill. Commercial and industrial waste located in the more immediate surrounding area to REP, where it would not be efficient to divert via a river-based transfer station, would be more efficiently transported to site directly by road, avoiding likely treatment at more distant facilities.

1.2.5 Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant has, throughout the consultation and post-acceptance phases, reiterated the commercial imperative that drives and incentivises it to maximise use of its entirely river-based logistics operation. This was embodied in the Applicant's proposal, at Deadline 3, of a substantial restriction (**Requirement 14** of the **dDCO** (**Rev 2, REP3-003**)) on Heavy Commercial Vehicle movements to/from REP via Norman Road. Whilst this restriction would fall well within the assessment envelope of the 100% by road scenario, which the EIA found to have Not Significant effects, the Applicant is willing to voluntarily offer an even greater restriction. Whilst not related to or needed to control any potential environmental effects of the scheme in respect of traffic, the Applicant proposes a restriction on the maximum tonnage that may be brought by road to REP, of 240,000 tpa in addition to the existing proposed restriction on movements of 90 vehicles in and 90 vehicles out. This additional constraint is contained in the **dDCO** (**3.1, Rev 3**) submitted at Deadline 5.

Air Quality

Air Quality (LBB heading 2.3.42)

1.2.6 The Applicant disagrees with the LBB that it is necessary to explicitly take into account the background exposure in the assessment for non-carcinogen risk. As stated on page 7-6 of the US EPA 2005_HHRAP protocol (the basis for the assessment): ' *background exposures may be an important consideration in setting HQ (hazard quotient)*'. *This is because you generally model non cancer effects as thresholds, and biologic systems (including human receptors) do not distinguish between exposures from regulated versus non-*

regulated sources. In certain cases, a permitting authority may elect to adjust the assessed facility-specific HQ downward, to account for any exposure that individuals may have from non-assessed sources.' In the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) for emissions from the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) (**REP2-040**), **Paragraph 3.5.7** explains that the Hazard Index (HI) is used as the non-carcinogen assessment criteria, with a value equal to 1.0 indicating a potential health effect. For the most affected receptor in the assessment (the Farmer East), the maximum for HI Farmer East adult and child receptors were estimated to be 0.00340 and 0.00502 respectively; i.e. 0.34% and 0.50% of the assessment level. If one were to apply significance criteria to these values alone, then they would be regarded as insignificant even with the conservancies that are built into the assessment and without specifically taking into account background exposure. However, if one were to specifically consider background exposure, background sources would need to provide a contribution of approximately 200 times that of REP for the maximum HI to be equal to 1.0. As there are not this quantity of similar facilities in the area then this is considered to be highly unlikely.

1.2.7 In terms of the risk calculated for dioxins and furans, this is on the basis of the excess cancer risk of emissions from REP alone in accordance with the US EPA 2005_HHRAP protocol. For the most affected receptor in the assessment (the Farmer East child), a value of 4.2% of the Committee on Toxicity Tolerable Daily Intake (COT TDI) was calculated. As a farmer receptor is assumed to consume most of their food from locally grown or reared sources (which is highly unrealistic given the nature of the area), a more realistic estimate of the risk is provided by a resident child receptor, where the predicted intake is approximately 0.25% of the COT TDI and therefore insignificant in its own right, regardless of the background exposure. As for the non-carcinogen risk, background exposure would need to provide a contribution of approximately 400 times that of REP for the COT TDI to be reached, which is considered to be highly unlikely. In terms of applying the thresholds of significance from the IAQM guidance to the results of the HHRA, Paragraph 7.11 of the IAQM guidance states that 'Any judgement on the significance of effects on health is part of the Health Impact Assessment and not the air quality assessment being described here'; in other words, it is not appropriate to apply the IAQM significance criteria to the results of the HHRA. From the assessment presented in the HHRA, and considering the background levels for both the non-carcinogen and carcinogen risks, it is not considered that there is risk to human health from REP.

Air Quality (LBB heading 2.3.43)

1.2.8 The Applicant disagrees with LBB and contends that the assessment of nickel concentrations has been undertaken in accordance with the assessment methodology described in **Paragraph 7.5.62** of **Chapter 7 Air Quality** of the **ES** (**6.1, REP2-019**). The overall assessment of the significance of effects takes into account a number of factors, not just the number of properties affected. As outlined in **Paragraph 7.5.62**, other factors include whether or not an objective or limit value is exceeded and the extent to which an

objective or limit value is exceeded. For nickel concentrations, the maximum Predicted Environmental Concentrations (PECs) are significantly below the assessment level and therefore there are no exceedances (the maximum PECs are less than 25% of the assessment level (**Table C.2.2.8** of **Appendix C.2** (**6.3, REP2-039**)). Whilst the number of properties affected was taken into account (by considering the area affected and the land use within that area), the fact that the maximum impacts are minor and that the PECs are well below the assessment level led to the judgement is that the overall effect is Not Significant.

Air Quality (LBB heading 2.3.44)

1.2.9 The Applicant disagrees with the LBB as to the validity of applying short-term significance criteria to the results of a modelling scenario that has been undertaken for a different reason, and which cannot occur in practice. The consideration of the impacts of emissions occurring over half-hourly periods is undertaken so as to assess whether or not these emission rates could cause a breach of the short-term objective, not to assess the significance of the impact of emissions from the development on short-term assessment levels. The Applicant also disagrees with the LBB that there is a gap in the assessment of short-term impacts; the potential impact of short-term emissions has been assessed for emissions from the ERF under normal operation where the emissions comply with the daily emission limits set out in **Table 7.17** of **Chapter 7 Air Quality** (**6.1, REP2-019**) in accordance with the relevant IAQM guidance. The results of this assessment are shown in **Table 7.34** of **Chapter 7 Air Quality** (**6.1, REP2-019**) where all of the predicted short-term impacts (including those of nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide) are not significant at the point of maximum predicted concentration from the ERF.

1.2.10 As stated in previous responses, and as explained in **Paragraph 7.9.31** of **Chapter 7 Air Quality** (**6.1, REP2-019**), the results presented in **Table 7.35** are for a scenario where higher short-term emissions occur from the ERF for half-hourly periods within a day. However, the assessment assumes that these higher short-term emissions occur continuously all year round, whereas to comply with the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive, they can only occur for half hourly periods within a day, with the overall (lower) daily emission limit also needing to be complied with. In the scenario where there is a higher emission that occurs over one or more half hourly periods in a day, for the daily emission limit to be complied with, the remaining emissions must be below the daily average. It is therefore not appropriate to apply the stated significance criteria to these emissions as the modelled scenario cannot occur in practice and therefore there are no 'moderate' impacts. In addition, the maximum predicted short-term concentrations arise from specific meteorological conditions which occur infrequently throughout the year; and the modelled peak half hour emission rate can only occur for a limited number of half hour periods during a day, with the remaining half hourly periods having much lower emissions (in order that the daily emission limit is complied with). The likelihood of the peak emission rate combining with the

meteorological conditions giving rise to a high short-term concentration is therefore very low, where-as the modelling assumes that the peak emission rate occurs continuously all year round. The results in **Table 7.35** are therefore judged on the basis of whether the assessment level is breached, not by applying the IAQM significance criteria (which is applied to the results presented in **Table 7.17**). In addition, in accordance with paragraph 6.40 of the IAQM guidance, in most cases it is not a necessity to define the significance of effects by reference to short-term impacts, never mind a short-term assessment that cannot occur in reality. In accordance with the IAQM guidance, the severity of a short-term impact will be substantial when there is a risk that the relevant Air Quality Assessment Level (AQAL) for short-term concentrations is approached through the presence of the new source, taking into account the contribution of other prominent local sources. In the case of the modelled peak emissions this is not the case, even if the modelled scenario could occur in practice.

Noise

Baseline Noise Survey

1.2.11 The Applicant maintains, as set out in previous submissions, that the assessment is appropriate and notes that surveys were agreed with the LBB Environmental Health Officer at the EIA Scoping stage and were undertaken over critical periods during the daytime and night-time for both a weekday and weekend. The measurements were undertaken during the middle of the night between 01:00 and 03:00, which is considered to be the quietest period of the night.

1.2.12 With respect to the requirement for longer term measurements the Applicant highlights that BS4142:2014 (the standard by which operational noise of this type would be assessed) does not require longer term measurements, only that the background sound levels on which the assessment are based are judged to be representative. The standard states in section 8.1.3:

"Ensure that the measurement time interval is sufficient to obtain a representative value of the background sound level for the period of interest. This should comprise continuous measurements of normally not less than 15 min intervals, which can be contiguous or disaggregated."

1.2.13 Measurements have also been undertaken over a weekend and weekday and covered the quieter part of the night to determine representative worst case noise levels. Whilst noise levels during the start or end of the night-time period are not covered, based on diurnal traffic patterns these are likely to result in higher noise levels due to the higher flows of traffic when compared to the time periods that have been measured i.e. the middle of the night. Therefore, any additional measurements outside of those that have been measured and assessed are likely to result in higher background levels which would result in a lower level of impact from that which has been reported in the ES. Therefore, it is considered that the measurement intervals are

suitable and appropriate to inform the assessment and that a long-term measurement is not necessary.

Appendix D

1.2.14 The majority of these matters are addressed in the **Applicant's response to comments on the draft Development Consent Order** (**8.02.54**) submitted at Deadline 5. Where technical matters are not addressed in respect of Requirements specifically, responses are provided below.

Noise

1.2.15 In respect of noise related comments on the revised **Outline CoCP** (**7.5, REP3-012**) submitted at Deadline 3, the Applicant notes:

- The nearest noise sensitive receptors are over 500 m from the REP site. Furthermore, the assessment of construction noise as presented in the **Chapter 8 Noise** of the **ES** (**6.1, APP-045**) concludes a Negligible effect and therefore requirements for monitoring were not considered, and are not considered, to be either necessary or proportionate.

1.2.16 The main REP site works are likely to involve slip form working during the night. Based on the assessment of these works during the night-time period, the potential effect on nearby noise sensitive receptors is concluded as being Negligible and not a significant effect. Therefore, specific mitigation measures outside of those presented in the embedded mitigation section of the ES are not required. With regards to the Electrical Connection route, as presented in the **Night-time Construction Noise Impact Validation Assessment (8.02.12, REP2-063)**, mitigation measures include the use of temporary sound reducing screens/enclosures around plant and activities. A requirement for monitoring of the night-time noise is not a proportionate response given the short time period envisaged for the works and that these works would only be undertaken in exceptional conditions. Matters in relation to night-time working on the Electrical Connection route have been addressed in an updated section (**Paragraph 3.8.2**) of the **Outline CoCP (7.5, Rev 3)** submitted at Deadline 5, as follows:

> *"Where works occur during night-time on the Electrical Connection route, additional stakeholder engagement will be undertaken and would include the following:*
>
> - *A night-time site contact for the public for the duration of the works will be appointed. The contractor will communicate with the community on construction noise issues through the following means:*
>
> - *There will always be a dedicated contact person available on-site during night-time works, and their contact details will be prominently displayed at the entrance to the siteworks/activities so that they are clearly visible to the public; and*

- *Prior to the works a newsletter or notice of the works will be distributed or displayed to properties within the vicinity of the works (ordinarily being those properties fronting the highway within 100m of where the works are taking place, and up to a maximum of 100m away from the highway depending on where noise may dissipate). The newsletter/notice will provide contact details and will describe the nature of the works and their likely extent/timings.*

- *Further information will be provided if the works extend beyond that originally proposed."*

1.2.17 An updated **Outline Code of Construction Practice** (**7.5, Rev 3**) submitted at Deadline 5 includes specific reference at **Paragraphs 4.4.3 and 4.4.4** to measures to reduce use of reversing alarms where practicable and safe, turning equipment off when not in use and the applicability of 'The Noise Emission in the Environment by Equipment for use Outdoors Regulations 2001' (as amended).

1.3 Applicant's response to the LIR

Air Quality (Paragraph 6.15 heading)

1.3.1 It is acknowledged that the Proposed Development would not have a positive impact on air quality, as would also be the case for most developments, however the impacts have been shown to be Negligible. The changes in air quality would not breach air quality standards and would comply with the Waste Incineration Directive. The Proposed Development has also incorporated Best Available Techniques abatement measures, all of the above being in accordance with paragraphs 2.5.41-2.5.45 of the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Renewable Energy EN-3. The NPS is the primary policy document in respect of DCO decisions.

1.3.2 It is acknowledged that the London Plan draft Policy SI1 seeks to improve air quality, and to do this it seeks to cause no further deterioration of existing poor air quality. At sub-part 3A of the Policy (Draft New London Plan showing Minor Suggested Changes, August 2018) it confirms that *'major development proposals must be at least air quality neutral and be submitted with an Air Quality Assessment'*. The Applicant considers that through compliance with the NPS and the finding of negligible effect in respect of air quality, that the Secretary of State can be confident that as a combustion-based generating station (for which achieving a positive change in air quality levels would be unrealistic in any location), the proposal achieves an acceptable Negligible effect which is far outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, in accordance with the assessment criteria outlined in **Table 7.21** of **Chapter 7 Air Quality** of the **ES** (**REP2-019**), imperceptible changes are considered Negligible no matter what the baseline level is. It should also be noted that pollutant reduction is further achieved through measures introduced in the Environmental Permit application, as set out in the **Environmental Permit and Air Quality Note** (**8.02.06, REP2-057**).

1.3.3 LBB's comments (set out in paragraphs 2.3.42 and 2.3.44 of its response) in respect of the Applicant's response to Paragraph 15 of its LIR are addressed in **Paragraphs 1.2.6 to 1.2.7** and **1.2.9 to 1.2.10** above respectively.

Noise (under Paragraph 12.4 and Paragraph 12.8 headings)

1.3.4 The Applicant has responded previously regarding the suitability of the background noise surveys, including at **Paragraph 1.2.11** of this response. The Applicant does not therefore consider it necessary or proportionate to reassess background noise levels through pre-operational surveys.

1.3.5 The Applicant provided a response to LBB's previous comments in **Paragraphs 1.5.2** to **1.5.8** of the **Applicant's response to London Borough of Bexley Deadline 3 submission** (**8.02.36, REP4-015**) which addressed all of the matters raised in LBB's latest response under the heading 'Paragraph 12.8'. In light of the above, the Applicant maintains that the assessment is appropriate and notes, in particular, that the Electrical Connection will be installed during the day, wherever possible, such that night-time works would be exceptional, at a limited number of locations along the route, where there are engineering or other constraints. Therefore, for the majority of the receptors along the Electrical Connection route, there will be no effect from night-time works. For those which are affected, the works will be short term and localised, meaning that if there are any residences that keep their windows normally open next to the road, then behavioural changes are highly likely to occur such that they would close windows during this period to minimise noise intrusion.

1.4 Outline Code of Construction Practice

Noise

1.4.1 Whether construction noise monitoring is required on any particular construction scheme depends on the likely significant effects expected to result from that scheme, as demonstrated by the EIA. In the case of REP, the potential effects from construction, as predicted in **Paragraph 8.9.46** and **8.9.47** of **Chapter 8** of the **ES (6.1, APP-045)**, are likely to result in negligible effects and are therefore below the levels where significant effects are likely. Therefore, given the likely effects and distance of noise sensitive receptors to REP, monitoring is not considered necessary and proportionate.

1.4.2 Main REP works are likely to involve slip form working during the night. Based on the assessments of these works during the night-time period, the potential effect on nearby noise sensitive receptors is concluded as being Negligible and not a significant effect. Therefore, specific mitigation measures outside of those presented in the embedded mitigation section of the ES are not required. With regards to the Electrical Connection route, as discussed in the night-time construction noise technical note, mitigation measures include the use of temporary sound reducing screens/enclosures around plant and activities. A requirement for monitoring of the night-time noise is not a

proportionate response given the short time period envisaged for the works and they only being undertaken in exceptional conditions.

Public Rights of Way (PRoW)

1.4.3 The Applicant is unclear on the specific matter being proposed in LBB's paragraph 3.42. The response refers to PRoW which may be temporarily diverted during the works. Diversion of footpaths, if it occurs, has been considered in the Applicant's assessment and no substantive concern has ever been raised by LBB on this matter or any suggestion of monitoring or modelling of their use. In respect of the construction of the Electrical Connection, the Applicant does not propose any diversions of the public highway, since this is a benefit derived from the selection of a predominantly dual-carriageway route. This means that whilst lane closures would be required, there is no expectation that the route of the Electrical Connection will require diversion due to a wholesale closure in either direction. In light of the above, the Applicant does not understand the basis on which modelling is requested by LBB for diversions.

1.4.4 The **Outline CoCP** (**7.5, Rev 3**) does not list every measure within documents (such as the London Mayor's SPG on The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition, 2014) that have been referenced, to provide flexibility at the time of approval to respond to relevant or applicable updates to guidance and to the nature of works being covered by an individual CoCP. The final CoCP(s) has to be approved by LBB under **Requirement 11** of the **dDCO** (**3.1, Rev 3**), meaning that LBB has the ability to influence its development. However, for clarity, the Applicant has changed **Paragraph 4.3.3** of the **Outline CoCP** (**7.5, Rev 3**) submitted at Deadline 5 to read:

"Additionally, standard mitigation measures for low risk sites, taken from the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) document 'Dust and Air Emissions Mitigation Measures' tables would also be applied. These include but are not limited to:"

1.4.5 In respect of control of air quality impacts discussed at the Issue Specific Hearing on the dDCO, the **Outline CoCP (7.5, REP3-012)** is clear that *"…good site management practices (e.g. adherence to guidance such as the London Mayor's SPG on The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition, 2014) during the construction works will help to prevent the generation of airborne dust".* This commitment provides sufficient scope for appropriate measures in the SPG to be secured at the time of CoCP submission through the approval process with LBB.

1.4.6 As set out in **Paragraph 1.2.15** of this response, an updated **Outline CoCP (7.5, Rev 3)** submitted at Deadline 5 includes specific reference to measures at **Paragraphs 4.4.3 and 4.4.4** to reduce use of reversing alarms where practicable and safe, turning equipment off when not in use and the applicability of 'The Noise Emission in the Environment by Equipment for use Outdoors Regulations 2001 (as amended).

1.5 Post-hearing note on public health and evidence

1.5.1 The Applicant welcomes LBB's confirmation that the Applicant's **Post-hearing note on public health and evidence** (**8.02.27, REP3-033**) provides *"…reassurance that waste to energy facilities which are designed, constructed, operated and maintained in accordance with current standards do not give rise to any detectable effects on health for local populations".*

1.5.2 The Applicant has previously responded in respect of Damage Costs in **Paragraphs 2.3.53, 5.6.21-5.6.23** of the **Applicant's responses to Written Representations** (**8.02.14, REP3-022**), and **Paragraphs 1.3.1-1.3.5** and **1.3.8-1.3.9** of the **Applicant's response to London Borough of Bexley Deadline 3 submission** (**8.02.36, REP4-015**). These responses are clear that the Damage Cost Guidance is not planning policy, is not supported by the NPSs and, for the reasons set out, is not applicable to individual projects including REP. LBB has provided no further information as to why a specific project contribution is justified, reasonable, necessary or appropriate on a damage costs basis. However, the Applicant confirms that it is willing to discuss support for air quality monitoring with the EA and LBB and is actively progressing this matter. In this regard, the Applicant has included a new **Requirement 17** (**Ambient air quality monitoring**) in the **dDCO** (**3.1, Rev 3**) at Deadline 5.

1.6 Appendix L to B1 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Rev 2)

1.6.1 At paragraphs 3.48 to 3.50, LBB considers the implications of the construction period effect on the Strategic Road Network of A2016/A206 and on Norman Road. It is understood that LBB's view is that the final traffic effects of the construction period cannot be fully assessed until the finalisation of Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs).

1.6.2 The **Outline CTMP**, **Appendix L** of **Appendix B.1**, the **Transport Assessment** of the **ES (6.3, Rev2, REP3-010)**, submitted to the Examining Authority provides a framework for the final CTMPs to accompany the management of traffic associated with the construction period for the REP site and the Electrical Connection. The assessment of traffic impacts for the construction period, operations and for decommissioning is, however, provided within **Chapter 6 Transport** of the **ES (6.1, Rev1, REP2-107)** and at **Appendix B.1**, the **Transport Assessment** of the **ES (6.3, APP-066)**. The scope of the assessment was agreed with LBB during the scoping exercise for the ES, starting in November 2017. LBB responded to the Transport Assessment scope in April 2018 which, amongst other matters, set the basis for the assessment of the construction period.

1.6.3 The resultant assessment concludes that there would be no residual significant effects on the road network. The assessment considered the reasonable worst case during the peak construction period based on current knowledge of the process, which has been informed by the experience of the Applicant's preferred contractor, HZI, which is highly familiar with this form of

development. The assessment of effects during the construction period is therefore considered to be suitably robust.

1.6.4 Through on-going engagement with Transport for London (TfL), the Applicant has committed to devise a method of further understanding the interface between local bus services along the construction route of the Electrical Connection. That method will consider mitigation such as: the specific position of the Electrical Connection within the selected corridor and how that could be adjusted to minimise disruption to traffic, where an appropriate alternative method of working could reduce potential effects; and whether there are better times during the day, or in exceptional cases at night, to undertake the work. The Applicant will consider appropriate and proportionate initiatives to minimise the potential effects of the construction period (including that of the Electrical Connection) and reflect these within the final CTMPs. The Applicant does not propose to undertake further modelling at the time of the finalisation of CTMPs as the focus would be on the careful planning and discussion of traffic management measures, cable route alignment (where practicable) and minimisation of works areas, cognisant of the fact that a lane closure will be required regardless.

1.6.5 The Applicant has committed to operating a Vehicle Bookings Management System during the construction period and will be able to provide data from that system to LBB. This would identify major departures from the predicted vehicle profiles and measures would be agreed with LBB to ameliorate these. Due to the nature of the work, there will be fluctuations in activity, such as during concrete pours or periods of movement of excavated material. On that basis an averaged figure should be reflected during reviews. The existing reference to a vehicle booking system has been bolstered in Paragraph 5.2.4 of the updated **Outline CoCP (7.5, Rev 3)** submitted at Deadline 5.

1.6.6 **Paragraph 12.1.3** of the **Outline CTMP**, **Appendix L** of **Appendix B.1**, the **Transport Assessment** of the **ES (6.3, REP3-010)**, provides for the submission of data to LBB (and other parties) and for that data to be reviewed and appropriate and proportionate remedial action to be taken.

1.6.7 A further revision of the **Outline CTMP (6.3, Rev 3)** is submitted at Deadline 5. That revision provides the outline for the method to understand the interface between local bus services and the construction of the Electrical Connection. It continues to provide the structure for the management of construction traffic associated with the REP site. Final CTMPs would be substantially in accordance with the **Outline CTMP (6.3, Rev 3)** and would be secured by **Requirement 13** of the **dDCO** (**Rev 3**) submitted at Deadline 5.

1.7 Temporary Jetty Outage Review

1.7.1 The EIA is based on a reasonable worst case approach, which is the accepted basis for assessing effects under a Rochdale Envelope approach. The EIA accordingly considered a 100% by road scenario (in respect of a

'reasonable worst case' by road scenario) in combination with baseline figures for RRRF.

1.7.2 In the 8 years of operation at the existing RRRF there has never been a jetty outage and such an outage would be considered very unlikely and an exceptional event. The jetty outage scenario where both REP and RRRF operate at their full consented temporary operations – as assessed in the **Temporary Jetty Outage Review (Simultaneous Operations Riverside Resource Recovery Facility and Riverside Energy Park)** (**8.02.31**, **REP3-036**) - does not therefore form part of the EIA as it is not a 'reasonable worst case' during operation.

1.7.3 Notwithstanding this, the **Temporary Jetty Outage Review (Simultaneous Operations Riverside Resource Recovery Facility and Riverside Energy Park)** (**8.02.31**, **REP3-036**) found that all potential effects were acceptable in such exceptional circumstances. Sensitivity testing is provided as **Appendix B** to the aforementioned note to demonstrate the magnitude of reserve capacity in the junctions on Picardy Manorway. That information summarises junction appraisals that have considered the operation of the junctions and their respective linking arms and demonstrated that the junctions on Picardy Manorway have ample spare capacity to handle a jetty outage scenario – including each and all arms of the junctions reviewed, having applied an increased distribution of traffic from Norman Road rather than a "global" increase in traffic across the junctions.

1.7.4 The increase in traffic within the **Appendix B** of the **Temporary Jetty Outage Review (Simultaneous Operations Riverside Resource Recovery Facility and Riverside Energy Park)** (**8.02.31**, **REP3-036**) was based on an increase in construction worker movements with the starting point being 552 Passenger Car Units (PCUs)/hr (equivalent to cars or vans) on the network. That flow was increased until the junctions just exceeded modelled theoretical capacity. The smallest increase for those junctions was 698 PCUs/hr with the largest being 2243 PCUs/hr.

1.7.5 Under a jetty outage both REP and RRRF would be capped at 30 Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCVs) per 1.5 hour peak period (i.e. 20 HCVs/hr per site) in accordance with **Requirement 14(3)** of the **dDCO** (**3.1, Rev 3**) for REP and Condition 27 of the planning consent 16/02167/FUL for RRRF. That quantum of vehicle flow equates to approximately 80 standard PCU movements for REP and 80 PCUs for RRRF – assuming 1 HCV is equivalent to 2 PCUs for transport modelling. Assuming that all movements went through the same junction during a modelled hour this would be a net increase of 320 PCUs in the junction. At worst this would see an increase in 160 PCU movements at any one arm e.g. Norman Road or Picardy Manorway.

1.7.6 These changes in traffic flow derived by a simultaneous REP and RRRF jetty outage scenario are significantly below the assessed impacts for the construction stage appraisal of 552 workforce vehicles – as included within

Chapter 6 Transport (**6.1, REP2-018**) of the **ES** and the **Transport Assessment** (**Appendix B1, 6.3, APP-066**). The flows are even further within the maximised flows used to demonstrate the supplementary sensitivity appraisal of the network.

1.7.7 The sensitivity appraisal is therefore sufficient to demonstrate that the network would not be materially affected by a simultaneous operation of REP and RRRF during a jetty outage capped scenario. On this basis the Applicant sees no justification for refusing to allow an emergency provision in the REP dDCO in respect of jetty outage, as was accepted in respect of the RRRF consent.

1.7.8 At paragraph 3.54 of LBB's Deadline 4 submission, LBB questions the projections for Heavy Commercial Vehicle visits to REP, as set out in the table of assumptions (**Table 3.1**) in the **Temporary Jetty Outage Review (Simultaneous Operations Riverside Resource Recovery Facility and Riverside Energy Park) (REP3-036, 8.02.31)**. In particular, LBB queries that the figure for ERF consumables does not accord with that presented at **Paragraph 5.3.10** of **Appendix B.1**, the **Transport Assessment** to the **ES (6.3, APP-066)**. **Paragraph 5.3.10** provides an indication of the likely visits of vehicles for consumables: some of the estimates are daily figures (e.g. Hydrated Lime); others are weekly (e.g. Aqueous Ammonia) and some are monthly (e.g. Hydrochloric Acid). At **Paragraph 5.3.11** of **Appendix B.1**, the **Transport Assessment** to the **ES (6.3, APP-066)** those figures for consumables are amalgamated into an estimated daily figure of 11 vehicle movements per day (i.e. approximately 6 HCVs per day). The 6 HCVs per day is thus taken into **Table 3.1** of the **Temporary Jetty Outage Review (Simultaneous Operations Riverside Resource Recovery Facility and Riverside Energy Park) (REP3-036, 8.02.31)**.

1.7.9 The use of a flat profile for assessment across the day for vehicle arrivals is questioned by LBB, at its paragraphs 3.55 and 3.56.

1.7.10 The Applicant does not contest that there will be daily and hourly variations in the number of vehicles visiting REP, however the assessments provided within **Chapter 6 Transport** of the **ES (6.1, REP2-107)** and at **Appendix B.1**, the **Transport Assessment (6.3, APP-066)** of the **ES** consider the 100% by road reasonable worst case scenario, as well as the 25% by road nominal scenario. Both scenarios conclude there would be no significant effects. The daily and hourly variation within HCV movements at REP would not exceed the 100% by road scenario.

1.7.11 As stated above, a jetty outage with both REP and RRRF operating at their maximum consented number of HCVs per day has been assessed and has been found to have a Not Significant effect on the local Strategic Road Network.

1.7.12 **Requirement 14** of the **dDCO** (**3.1**, **Rev 3**) secures a maximum of 90 HCVs per day transporting waste material to the ERF and Anaerobic Digestion

facility under normal operations. That Requirement further secures a maximum of 30 HCVs during the peak periods under a jetty outage scenario. There is no evidence to support the requirement for the Applicant to commit further to a peaked profile for HCV movements at REP either across the day or on a daily basis, which would unduly restrict operations at REP.

1.8 Middleton Jetty Ops Review Workshop Note

1.8.1 The assessment of scenarios with a road-based element in the ES establishes a reasonable worst case based on 100% of waste throughput being delivered by road using the typical delivery vehicle (i.e. a standard Refuse Collection Vehicle with a payload in the region of 7 tonnes and a Gross Vehicle Weight of approximately 26 tonnes). This ensures that the number of road deliveries, derived from a notional average tonnage, is robust and at the higher end of likely movements that would occur. Assessing the potential effects using these higher end vehicle movement numbers means that the assessment envelope includes likely movements that would be generated if vehicles smaller than 12-14 tonnes were used at any time. This matter was also addressed at **Paragraph 1.4.9** in the **Applicant's response to London Borough of Bexley Deadline 3 submission** (**8.02.36, REP4-015**).

1.8.2 The Applicant maintains that the controls set out in the **dDCO** (**3.1, Rev 3**) are appropriate and proportionate to ensure that effects remain within those assessed and presented in the ES. However, in recognition of requests from LBB and the GLA (among others) to maximise river use, the Applicant has agreed to include a parallel constraint, of 240,000 tpa, on the maximum annual tonnage of waste material that could be brought by road. This is set out in revised **Requirement 14** in the **dDCO** (**3.1, Rev 3**) to ensure that this value is not exceeded. Whilst not necessary from an EIA perspective, this constraint will ensure that the river-based benefits of the Proposed Development are irrefutably secured for a scheme operating at the notional, maximum or any tonnage throughput of waste material above these levels. Indeed, should the tonnage capacity of the ERF increase over time, through technology and/or efficiency improvements, within the limits of the Environmental Permit and the DCO consent, the Applicant will be bound to secure an increasing proportion of waste by river.