

Riverside Energy Park

Applicant's response to Mrs Margaret J White's Deadline 8b Submission

VOLUME NUMBER:

08

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE NUMBER:

EN010093

DOCUMENT REFERENCE:

8.02.102

October 2019 | Revision 0 (9 October 2019) | APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

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

1 Applicant's Response to Mrs M J White's Deadline 8b Submission

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Mrs M J White submitted a response at Deadline 8b titled '*Comments on any additional information/submissions received by the previous deadline*' (REP8b-028). The submission provides information regarding a planning application from Westminster Waste Limited (WWL) to the London Borough of Bexley (LBB) (LBB Reference: 19/00259/FULM), and suggests that traffic generated by the WWL proposed development should be taken into consideration "*when reading the proposed Cory [Construction Traffic Management Plan] CTMP and operational TMP [Traffic Management Plan] submissions*".

1.2 Response

1.2.1 The Applicant notes the information provided by Mrs M J White. The WWL proposed development (LBB Reference: 19/00259/FULM) was not known at the time of the REP Application and is subject to a separate application which does not form part of the Riverside Energy Park (REP) proposal. The application for the WWL proposed development is awaiting determination by LBB, and will be determined by LBB based on whether LBB considers the application is acceptable or not.

1.2.2 In accordance with Schedule 4 (Information for Inclusion in Environmental Statements) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations), the Environmental Statement for REP provides "*a description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment resulting from, inter alia...the cumulation of effects with other existing and/or approved projects...*" for plans and projects which are considered may give rise to potential likely significant cumulative effects (in combination with REP).

1.2.3 The Planning Inspectorate's (PINS) *Advice note seventeen: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects* (Version 1, December 2015¹) (AN17) sets out a staged approach to cumulative effects assessment (CEA) for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and provides template formats for documenting the CEA within an applicant's Environmental Statement. The cumulative effects assessment for REP has been undertaken in accordance with AN17; including consultation with the relevant local planning authorities on the developments to be included within that assessment.

¹ It should be noted that a revised AN17 has since been published to take into account changes occurring as a result of the introduction of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Version 2 was however published very recently (August 2019) and therefore has not applied to the REP application.

- 1.2.4 The WWL proposal was not an allocated development in plan policy or a known application at the time of identifying the other developments for consideration within the REP Application. The Applicant's process for determining which developments should be considered was undertaken as follows:
- July/August 2018 – initial 'long list' developed and refined based on AN17 and Zone of Influence (ZOI) approach;
 - LBB (and other relevant local authorities) consulted on 29th August 2018 with regards to the list of developments;
 - LBB provided detailed comments on 17th September 2018, which the Applicant had regard to and included in its revised list;
 - The Applicant finalised the list of developments after its 'cut-off' date of the end of September 2018; and
 - The Applicant submitted its application (including the EIA) on 16th November 2018, which was subsequently accepted for Examination on 14th December 2018.
- 1.2.5 The WWL proposed development (which was validated by LBB on 27th February 2019) was therefore not included in the Cumulative Assessment matrix in the **ES**. This is entirely in accordance with AN17.
- 1.2.6 Mrs White's submission references transport movements from the WWL proposed development, and in particular suggests these should be taken into account in the transport management plans for REP. **Table 4.3, Section 4.10 of Chapter 4 Assessment Methodology of the ES (APP-041)** notes that *"cumulative effects from transport are not intended to be assessed separately, as transport movements from 'Other Developments' are inherently included within transport models to allow accurate predictions of future transport scenarios. Accordingly, cumulative noise and air quality impacts from transport are provided for within the Transport Assessment model"*.
- 1.2.7 The Applicant therefore undertook a similar exercise with respect to the 'other developments' to be considered within the future baseline (the *Do Minimum scenarios for 2022, 2024 and 2039*) used in the **Transport Assessment (TA) (APP-066)**. The developments that were included within the future baseline are set out in **Table 6.2** and shown on **Figures 6.1 and 6.2** of the **TA (APP-066)**.
- 1.2.8 The Applicant engaged with LBB through the TA Scoping exercise to agree the developments which should be factored into the transport modelling. **Paragraph 6.3.7 of the TA (APP-066)** explains that *"...the traffic associated with committed and allocated developments, as indicated by LBB and Dartford Borough Council (DBC), has been included in the future baseline flows in addition to the TEMPro growth factors"*. TEMPro growth factors are derived from the Department for Transport's (DfT's) modelling tool for determining

traffic growth. Both growth factors and details from the committed developments as provided by LBB and the other relevant planning authorities have been incorporated into the transport modelling.

1.2.9 **Paragraph 6.10.2 of Chapter 6 Transport** of the **ES (REP2-017, Rev 1)** states: *“the traffic effects of approved developments in the area have been included as part of the Do Minimum scenarios for 2022, 2024 and 2039, against which the potential effects of the construction and operational phase of REP have been assessed. As such the assessment of cumulative effects is inherent to the assessment set out above”*. Further detail is provided in the **Transport Assessment (Appendix B.1 of the ES (APP-066))**.

1.2.10 The EIA Regulations require that, where necessary, WWL's cumulative effects assessment takes into account the traffic movements that would be generated by REP, because REP is a proposed development for which an application for development consent had been submitted prior to the WWL proposal being submitted. As such, the combined effects of the two proposals will be considered as part of the determination of that application which is currently before LBB.

1.3 Conclusion

1.3.1 The WWL proposed development is the subject of a separate application which is currently awaiting determination by LBB.

1.3.2 The Applicant undertook the EIA and TA in accordance with relevant guidance and in consultation with LBB and other relevant planning authorities; the WWL application was not known at the time that LBB were consulted on the lists of plans and projects to be considered within the EIA for the REP application, nor for the committed developments incorporated into the TA future baseline.

1.3.3 Environmental Regulations require that, if necessary, the WWL proposed development planning application will take account of traffic, and any other potential environmental effects from REP. The Applicant therefore concludes that the WWL proposed development is not a material consideration for the REP Examination.