Boston Alternative Energy Facility

Statement of Common Ground between Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited and Port of Boston

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: EN010095
Date: February 2022
Revision: Version 2

THIS PAGE IS TO BE REMOVED FROM FINAL VERSION OF THE DOCUMENT

Document Control

Document Number	8.4 (2)
Author	Sarah Marjoram
Owner	Paul Salmon
Distribution	For DCO Application
Document Status	Draft

Revision History

Version	Date	Description	Author
0	19/10/21	First Draft	Royal HaskoningDHV
1	11/11/21	Second Draft	Royal HaskoningDHV
2	08/02/22	Third Draft	Royal HaskoningDHV

Reviewer List

Name	Role
Abbie Garry	Royal HaskoningDHV APM
Abbie Garry	Royal HaskoningDHV APM

Approvals

Name	Signature	Role	Date of Issue	Version
Paul Salmon	PS	Royal HaskoningDHV PM	19/10/21	0
Paul Salmon	PS	Royal HaskoningDHV PM	11/11/21	1
Paul Salmon	PS	Royal HaskoningDHV PM	08/02/22	2

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Appendices

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the proposed Boston Alternative Energy Facility (the Facility) made by Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited (AUBP) to the Planning Inspectorate under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (Planning Act).

1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application Documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website.

1.1.3 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties named in **Section 1.3**, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.1.4 It may be subject to further updates and revisions during the examination process.

1.2 Description of the Proposed Development

1.2.1 The Facility covers 26.8 hectares (ha) and is split in to two components: the area containing operational infrastructure for the Facility (the 'Principal Application Site'); and an area containing habitat mitigation works for wading birds (the 'Habitat Mitigation Area'). The Facility will generate power from Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) with the 'thermal treatment' process for generating power converting the solid fuel into steam, which is then used to generate power using steam turbine generators. It will have a total gross generating capacity of 102 megawatts electric (MWe) and it will deliver approximately 80 MWe to the National Grid. The Facility will be designed to operate for at least 25 years, after which it may be decommissioned.

1.2.2 The Principal Application Site covers 25.3 ha and is located at the Riverside Industrial Estate, Boston, Lincolnshire. This site is next to the tidal River Witham (known as The Haven) and downstream from the working docks area of the Port of Boston. The Habitat Mitigation Area covers 1.5 ha and is located approximately 170 m to the south east of the Principal Application Site, encompassing an area of saltmarsh and small creeks at the margins of The Haven.

1.2.3 The main elements of the Facility will be:

- Wharf and associated infrastructure (including re-baling facility, workshop, transformer pen and welfare facilities);
- RDF bale storage area, including sealed drainage with automated crane system for transferring bales;
- Conveyor system between the RDF storage area and the RDF bale shredding plant, part of which is open and part of which is under cover;
- Bale shredding plant;
- RDF bunker building;
- Thermal Treatment Plant comprising three separate 34 MWe combustion lines and three stacks;
- Turbine plant comprising three steam turbine generators and make-up water facility;
- Air-cooled condenser structure, transformer pen and associated piping and ductwork;
- Lightweight aggregate (LWA) manufacturing plant comprising four kiln lines, two filter banks with stacks, storage silos, a dedicated berthing point at the wharf, and storage (and drainage) facilities for silt and clay;
- Electrical export infrastructure;
- Two carbon dioxide (CO_2) recovery plants and associated infrastructure;
- Associated site infrastructure, including site roads and car parking, site workshop and storage, security gate, and control room with visitor centre; and
- Habitat mitigation works for Redshank and other bird species comprising of improvements to the existing habitat through the creation of small features such as pools/scrapes and introduction of small boulders within the Habitat Mitigation Area.

1.3 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 This SoCG has been prepared in respect of the Facility by (1) AUBP, and (2) Port of Boston, together the Parties.

1.3.2 **AUBP** is a privately-owned company, established for the purpose of securing development consent for the Facility and then developing and operating the Facility. The company team has been involved in industrial development at the site in Boston, Lincolnshire since 2004.

1.3.3 The **Port of Boston** is the Statutory Harbour Authority and Local Lighthouse Authority, with a jurisdiction, that extends from The Wash to Grand Sluice. The Port of Boston provides compulsory pilotage services for all commercial vessels over 30 m in length. The Port of Boston is responsible for safety of navigation and management of vessel movements within The Haven.

1.4 Terminology

1.4.1 In **Table 3-1** in the Issues section of this SoCG:

a) "Agreed indicates area(s) of agreement
b) "Under discussion" indicates area(s) of current disagreement where resolution remains possible, and where parties continue discussing the issue to determine whether they can reach agreement by the end of the examination
c) "Not agreed" indicates a final position for area(s) of disagreement where the resolution of divergent positions will not be possible, and parties agree on this point.

1.4.2 It can be assumed that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues section of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to the Port of Boston and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to Port of Boston.

2 Overview of Previous Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the principal meetings and correspondence undertaken between the Parties in relation to the Facility is outlined in **Table 2-1** below, this is also shown in **Appendix A**.

Table 2-1 Principal engagement activities between AUBP and Port of Boston

Date	Form of contact/ correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
8 February 2018	Meeting	Introduction to the project including discussion of the wharf features and turning the vessels. Next steps of the project were described. Included a site visit to Principal Application Site with representatives of the Port of Boston.
21 November 2018	Meeting	Navigational Risk Meeting discussing the Port of Boston's current operations, vessel limitations, future upgrades and dredging activities.
27 March 2019	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the Navigation Risk Assessment chapter of the PEIR.
17 July 2019	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the impacts and reach an agreement on the sensitivity and magnitude of each impact.
10 September 2020	Meeting	Presentation about the proposed changes to the scheme.
13 January 2021	Meeting	Discussion on interface between Port of Boston and AUBP proposals. Meeting discussed scope of future agreement.

Date	Form of contact/ correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
12 March 2021	Meeting	Meeting to discuss status of agreement between parties.
22 March 2021	Meeting	Meeting to discuss incorporation of the Habitat Mitigation Area and discuss any navigation requirements.
2 June 2021	Email	Email to confirm completion of co-operation agreement between Port of Boston and AUBP, covering how the parties will work together and the interface between AUBP's scheme and the Port.
7 June 2021	Meeting	Update meeting with Port of Boston.
21 September 2021	Meeting	Meeting with Anatec Ltd. (on behalf of AUBP Ltd.) to help inform the Navigation Risk Assessment.
15 December 2021	Call	Call to discuss berthing pocket and wharf.
21 January 2022	Call	Call to discuss Navigational Management Plan / Technical Note.

3 Issues

3.1 Introduction and General Matters

3.1.1 This document sets out the matters which are agreed, not agreed, or are under discussion between the Port of Boston and AUBP.

3.1.2 **Table 3-1** details the matters which are agreed, not agreed and under discussion between the Parties, including a reference number for each matter.

Table 3-1 Issues (as per the Port of Boston's Relevant Representation RR-017)

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	Port of Boston's Comment	AUBP's Comments	Status
1.0 Navigational Issues					
PoB 1.1	Navigational Risk Assessment and Navigation Management Plan	Navigational safety	The Port notes that the Facility operations have the potential to impact the safety of navigation to current and future river users, but that the development of a Navigation Management Plan (prepared by the Applicant and approved by the Harbour Authority), that is supported by a Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA), will ensure that the safety of navigation can be maintained for all Haven stakeholders.	AUBP is preparing a Navigational Management Plan (NMP) which will be supported by a Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) currently being undertaken. The NRA will assess the reported increase in vessels associated with the operation of the Facility and determine where safety issues may occur. It will then identify and recommend measures for inclusion in the NMP which will ensure navigational safety on The Haven is maintained for all users, current and future. The NMP will also cover construction activities (such as dredging) and will set out measures to be put in place to maintain safety during these activities.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	Port of Boston's Comment	AUBP's Comments	Status
				AUBP is committed to working with the Port of Boston to achieve this. AUBP has entered into an agreement with the Port of Boston that requires a NMP to be prepared in conjunction with and with approval of the Port (as statutory harbour authority). Communication from the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) has identified the NMP is also required as part of the deemed Marine Licence (DML) and therefore, that the NMP will also require separate approval by the MMO.	
2.0 Other matters					
PoB 2.1	ES (document reference 6.2) Draft DCO (document reference 2.1)	Dredging	The Port of Boston consents, pursuant to the terms of the Draft Order, to the carrying out by the Applicant of the Capital Dredging Works and the Maintenance Dredging	Capital and maintenance dredging will be undertaken as set out in the ES (document reference 6.2) and draft DCO (document reference 2.1), and in accordance	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	Port of Boston's Comment	AUBP's Comments	Status
			Works subject to the provisions of a separate legal agreement between the Applicant and the Port of Boston that governs how dredging will be undertaken.	with the Deemed Marine Licence and any separate provisions of the NMP.	
PoB 2.2	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1	Marine Consent	The Port of Boston is content that marine licensing associated with the construction and operation of the Facility shall be governed by means of the draft Deemed Marine Licence contained in the DCO document.	The Deemed Marine Licence (draft DCO (document reference 2.1(1))) has been prepared in consultation with the Port of Boston and the MMO.	Agreed
PoB 2.3	Navigation Management Plan	Navigational lighting and aid to navigation	The Port of Boston is content that the provision of navigational lighting and aids to navigation associated with the construction and operation of the Facility shall be governed by means of the preparation of a NMP in conjunction with the Applicant.	Navigational lighting and aids to navigation will be agreed with the Port of Boston and will be set out the NMP.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	Port of Boston's Comment	AUBP's Comments	Status
PoB 2.4	Indicative Wharf Plans (document reference 4.11, APP-021). ES (document reference 6.2) Draft DCO (document reference 2.1)	Form and design of the new wharf and approaches	The Port of Boston is content with the Indicative Wharf Plans contained in the Draft DCO, and with the provisions governing the development of the detailed design.	The layout of the wharf is set out in the Indicative Wharf Plans (document reference 4.11, APP-021). The Applicant agrees to co-operate with the Port of Boston on detailed design of the wharf within the parameters set out in the ES (document reference 6.2) and the draft DCO (document reference 2.1).	Agreed
PoB 2.5	N/A	Operational plans	The Port of Boston is content that operational plans will be developed in accordance with the provisions of a separate legal agreement between the Applicant and the Port of Boston that governs how these plans will be prepared.	The Applicant acknowledges that as part of its statutory obligations as the operator of the Facility it shall produce and maintain the following in relation to the Facility: (a) Oil Spill Contingency Plan; (b) Port Facility Security Plan; and (c) Waste Management Plan.	Agreed
PoB 2.6	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1)	Notices to Mariners	The Port of Boston agrees that it will issue Notices to Mariners in respect of the DCO Works at least 5 days before the works commence, and at two weekly intervals	The Applicant agrees to provide the necessary information for Notices to Mariners as required throughout in respect of the DCO Works. In accordance with the DML,	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	Port of Boston's Comment	AUBP's Comments	Status
			thereafter, or as otherwise agreed between the Port of Boston and the Applicant.	the Applicant is required to ensure that local mariners and fishermen's organisations are made fully aware of all licensed activities through local Notices to Mariners issued at least 5 days before commencement of the works.	
PoB 2.7	Pilotage Statement (document reference 9.73)	Pilotage Statement	A Pilotage Statement has been prepared by the Port of Boston (the Port) to inform the examination of the DCO and matters pertaining to navigation. This Statement has been provided to the Applicant for submission at Deadline 6.	The Applicant agrees that the Pilotage Statement provides a detailed description of pilotage at the port and how the increase in commercial shipping arising from the Facility will be safely managed by the Port of Boston.	Agreed

4 Agreement of this Statement of Common Ground

4.1 Statement of Common Ground

4.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by the Parties.

Signed……
[NAME]
[POSITION]
on behalf of Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited
Date: [DATE]

Signed……
[NAME]
[POSITION]
on behalf of Port of Boston
Date: [DATE]

Appendix A Previous Engagement

Meeting Notes

HaskoningDHV Nederland B.V.
Industry & Buildings

Present:	Phil Callen (Alternative Use Boston Projects Ltd); Alan Thompson;(Landlord); Gary Bower, Abbie Garry, Peter Beamish (Royal HaskoningDHV); Capt. Richard Walker, Andy Lawrence (Port of Boston)
Apologies:	
From:	Gary Bower
Date:	08 February 2018
Location:	Proposed wharf location, Riverside Industrial Estate, Boston
Copy:	N+P Ltd
Our reference:	PB6934-RHD-01-ZZ-MI-E-1002
Classification:	Project related
Enclosures:	

Subject: **Boston Alternative Energy Facility – proposed wharf – introduction meeting with Port of Boston**

Number	Details	Action
1 Project Description	Discussion held on the bank of the flood defence from the northerly point of the proposed location of the wharf frontage. An introduction to the overall project was provided to the Port of Boston Representatives as follows: • The Gasification unit facility will comprise 3 lines manufactured by an American company – Outotec. • The facility requires a Development Consent Order (DCO), so will be determined by the Secretary of State, not via the local planning regime. • The fuel will be household-type waste, known as RDF and there will be approximately 1,000,000 tonnes per year, sourced from elsewhere in the UK. • RDF supply will be from UK sources and will arrive by ship in bales. • The facility will need a new wharf for the ships to dock and unload the RDF bales for temporary storage then transfer by conveyor or truck to a waste processing facility. • The waste processing facility would split open the bales and shred the RDF to an appropriate size and remove inert contraries. • The shredded RDF would be fed into the gasification bunker by conveyor to generate energy via steam in the boiler. • The ash from the facility would be transferred into a lightweight aggregate manufacturing plant to make aggregate. • The aggregate is proposed to be transferred back to the wharf for removal to appropriate markets via ship.	

Number	Details	Action
	GB explained that the project is confidential until formal consultation is instigated by PINS (see section 2 below). GB will email the outline project description to Port of Boston. A copy of the indicative site boundary was provided to Port of Boston representatives. It was explained that the zones marked on the plan are illustrative only and don't demarcate the predicted extent of any of the proposed development features. AT identified that it would make sense for the wharf offloading facilities to be located as close to the waste processing facility to facilitate a more rapid transfer. GB identified that we are in the early stages of consideration of the wharf features and were open to comments on requirements from the Port of Boston. The proposed red-line boundary of edge of the Wharf follows the line of the mean high water spring (MHWS). GB identified that there will need to be an in-depth geomorphological examination of sediment processes to assess impacts of any proposed wharf design. It is proposed that the wharf would be approximately 300m long to accommodate two vessels. GB identified that the current metrics for the scheme were based upon seven vessels per week (but not necessarily one per day), each capable of carrying 3,500 tonnes. With each bale having a mass of 1 tonne and a volume of 1.6m^3 this would mean each vessel would need a capacity of at least 5,600m^3. Note – GB used the term 'barge' in terms of the vessel used to transfer the RDF to the site. This was corrected by Port of Boston representatives to refer to a ship. RW identified that the wharf positioning must ensure that docked ships do not impede the movement of other vessels on the Haven. RW agreed that the berths would probably have to be NAABSA, as it would be difficult to maintain sufficient water depth for the vessel to remain afloat at low tide.	RHDHV (GB) 16/02/2018

Number	Details	Action
	RW confirmed that the maximum length of vessel was 119m, which was the maximum size that could be turned. This was done in the basin. While the maximum draught was 5.5m, (max draught accepted at port has been 6.2m) a vessel of this draught could only access the port at Spring tides. At neap tides the maximum draught was around -3.5m. The minimum depth of the Haven was about -3.7m ODN, though the Port did not declare a depth. RW stated that it is unlikely that there would be a suitable ship that could take 3,500 tonnes of RDF up the Haven – a smaller ship would be more suitable. However, this is very much dependent upon vessel characteristics, length, beam, draught. Therefore, 3,500 tonne shipments should not be discounted without investigations into what vessels are on the market. On completion of the Boston Barrier Project in 2020 opportunities to discuss different size of vessels may well be available. RW indicated that there should not be a problem to accommodate an additional seven vessels per week in terms of the capacity of the navigation channel and turning ships. RW indicated that the port received approximately 400 vessel movements per year. RW stated that the ships would not be able to turn at the point of the proposed wharf, but would be able to turn either in the turning circle outside of the Port of Boston dock; or more likely within the dock itself. RW indicated that the Haven is surveyed periodically and the survey data could be made available to us. RW indicated that the Port of Boston has a licence to dredge 60,000 tonnes per annum, but they routinely only dredge approximately 30,000 tonnes. There is no maintenance dredging required along the location of the proposed wharf because of the dynamics of the flow of the river. RW advised that the Port has a tug. Vessels over 2,400 Gross Tonnage were required to use a tug.	
2 Next steps	GB explained that there was a defined and extensive programme of consultation required by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Meeting with PINS was held on 25th January.	

Number	Details	Action
	A formal scoping report would be submitted in a few weeks to identify which topics were likely to have significant impacts and which could be scoped out of assessment. When this is submitted, PINS have 42 days to respond, during which time they would formally approach consultees, including Port of Boston, for a response. An extensive environmental impact assessment would follow, combined with public meetings, with a view to an application being submitted at the end of the year. PINS would then determine the application including examination and decision processes, with an anticipated DCO decision mid 2020. After that there would be a period to discharge the DCO requirements and a 36 month construction period. RW requested that an indicative programme is provided to the Port of Boston so that they can be aware of key milestones.	**RHDHV (GB) to provide. (16/02/18)**
3. Other	A 90m, 3.4m draught vessel passed by as the meeting and site visit progressed. Cargo was approx. 1,900 tonnes. This is a useful benchmark of ship that could be used to transport the RDF. See below	
		

Number	Details	Action
		

Note / Memo

HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings

To: Internal
From: Sarah Marjoram
Date: 22 November 2018
Copy:
Our reference: PB6934I&BNT001D0.1
Classification: Project related

Subject: Navigational Risk Meeting with Port of Boston (21/11/2018) - Meeting Notes

---

On the 21st November 2018 an initial meeting on Navigational Safety was held at the Port of Boston (PoB). The meeting was attended by Gary Bower (Royal HaskoningDHV (RHDHV)), Sarah Marjoram (RHDHV), Neil Harris (Port of Boston (PoB)) and Richard Walker (PoB).

Below is a summary of the information that was discussed during the meeting.

NRA methodology:

The NRA for the Barrier project was produced in conjunction with PoB. A workshop was held which was attended by the EA, PoB and the advising contractor. The risks and mitigation established during this meeting fed directly into the NRA produced by the EA.

PoB advised that the potential range of mitigation measures for the BAEF project should be mapped out clearly so these can be included in contractor's proposals for the work. The range of mitigation should therefore allow some flexibility should the design or process of construction/operational activities change.

PoB Current Operation

The PoB is the Harbour Authority and the Lighthouse Authority for the Haven

- On average 14-18 vessels visit the port per week, however this varies dramatically over the year.
    - To allow this the port operates on a 24/7 basis to enable ship movements on every high tide regardless of the time of day.
- The Haven is largely one-way traffic apart from two main passing places which are located within the downstream 2.5 miles of the Haven. Passing is not possible in the upstream half of the Haven or within the S bend (Hob Hole).
- The Port currently receives approximately 400 vessels per year.
- They can move 4-5 ships per high tide.
- All ships are piloted.
- The tidal window for ship movements in and out of the Haven is 3.5 hours around high tide. It takes 1 hour for a ship to navigate the Haven to the Port.
- Ships time their arrival to arrive at the most appropriate time for a pilot to board. There is also a dedicated anchorage area within the Wash where ships can wait for a pilot and the tide.
- There is a speed limit of 6 knots on the Haven, although it is unclear where this originates from historically (PoB think this is from the EA, but there are no records). In the vicinity of the BAEF wharf location vessels are generally travelling at 4 knots or less in order to make the turn into the PoB safely.

Vessel limitations

- Max length: 119m – this is the largest ship that can be swung within the Wet Dock
- Max beam: 13.6m – due to the width of the dock entrance
- Max draft: depends on the tide. High tide ranges from 5 to 8.5m (Boston Sill Datum) and they advise a 1.5m clearance as the sides of the dock entrance are sloped. E.g. on a 5m tide a 3.5m draft vessel can enter Wet Dock. On an 8.5m tide a 7m draft vessel can enter Wet Dock.
- Boston Sill datum is 3.7m below Ordnance Datum.

- Currently only vessels visiting PoB are swung within the Wet Dock.
- Time taken to swing a vessel within Wet Dock is +/- 30 mins (incl. entering and exiting the dock).
- Time taken to swing a vessel within the river – 10-15 mins.
- Max length of ship that can swing in the river – 100m
- Ships turning in the Haven must have working bow thrusters

Future upgrades to Port facilities

As part of the Barrier project certain PoB facilities are being upgraded and should be completed by August 2020:

- The port entrance is being widened to 18m
- The approach berth is being upgraded
- The 'Knuckle' is being upgraded and strengthened
- The river berths are being strengthened to increase their load bearing capacity
- The river turning circle is being deepened and increased in diameter (the EA is disposing of the dredged material to land)

The benefits of these upgrades are:

- The maximum beam of a vessel able to enter Wet Dock will increase to 16.5m
- Upgrading the Knuckle will increase the ease of turning in the river
- Increasing the size of the river turning circle will also make it easier to turn in the river
- PoB will have increased ability to receive construction materials

Port dredging activities

- They have an annual licence to dredge 60,000 tonnes of silt using a grab dredger.
- PoB owns their own dredger with a 400 tonne hopper
- Material is disposed of at a disposal site at the entrance to the Haven. However, there is evidence that this is filling up so they are in discussion with the MMO to have the disposal site extended.

- The licenced dredge areas are the approach berth, river berths, the Wet Dock and parts of the S bend (Hob Hole).

- The PoB have extended their licenced dredge area to enable them to maintain the larger and deeper river turning circle (resulting from the Barrier) in the future. They have also applied for a variation to the dredge licence to allow ploughing of the turning circle.

- They currently only survey the centre line of the Haven with a single-beam sounder. They have never had a situation where the Haven has silted up and prevented the movement of vessels – it naturally self-scours, and a large flush of water from rainfall strips any accretion within the Haven more effectively than dredging.

- PoB do not consider that net accretion throughout the Haven will change as a result of the Barrier, although there will likely be some localised accretion at the Barrier site.

- PoB would like the scour and accretion impacts from the BAEF wharf to be considered carefully, although they consider that any effects will most likely be localised to the wharf area.

- The BAEF wharf currently sits outside of the port's licenced dredge area, so a variation would have to be sought to allow PoB to dredge this area. They would also like to reserve the right to be able to dredge the channel within the vicinity of the wharf at any point in order to keep navigation of the Haven open.

Next steps

RHDHV (SM) is to produce an outline document of the baseline environment for Navigation and a list of potential impacts arising during the construction and operational phases of the BAEF project. This will be shared with the PoB and used as the basis of a Navigational Risk Assessment workshop to be held in December or January and attended by RHDHV, PoB, the client and contractors.

Minutes

HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings

Present: Richard Walker, Michael Trafford, Gary Bower, Abbie Garry, Sarah Marjoram, Peter Beamish, Paul Blunden, Richard Woosnam, Phil Callen and Neil Harris (dial in)

Apologies: Click to enter "Apologies"
From: Abbie Garry
Date: 27 March 2019
Location: Port of Boston
Copy:
Our reference: PB6934-RHD-01-ZZ-MI-E-1036
Classification: Project related
Enclosures:

Subject: **Boston Alternative Energy Facility – Meeting with Port of Boston – 27/03/2019**

Number	Details	Action
1	**Overview of the project** GB provided an overview of the proposed Boston Alternative Energy Facility (the Facility). There will be two berths for receiving Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) and one for taking aggregate and receiving the clay. The wharf is proposed to be a suspended deck which will be open underneath. Currently we have a concept viewpoint of the wharf and will be working up a second stage drawing. Currently we are working towards a Development Consent Order (DCO) application and will have to submit an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in the form of an Environmental Statement (ES). Currently we are finalising the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). The DCO will be submitted in Q3 this year with construction completion around 2024. The project team has had a drone survey done and are waiting for the results of this. The construction site will be overlain onto this. 1.3m tonnes of RDF will be imported per year and approximately 275,000 tonnes aggregate, using approximately 610 ships per annum. The clay and aggregate will be delivered/ exported in 3,000 tonne loads. The same ships will bring clay in and take aggregate out. After the clay is delivered the ships will be washed out (in settling ponds) and then they can take the aggregate. We are considering having shore to ship power. We will be looking at having dedicated ships and will have supply potentially from Grimsby, Tilbury and Scotland. Need confirmation from N&P (who are the supplier of the RDF) on the proportions and	

	exact locations. There is the potential that some could come from the west coast of the UK. Currently the RDF gets shipped abroad for similar purposes (producing power). There is already an indicative agreement with N&P to provide the RDF supply. N&P is the largest European supplier of RDF. It will be cheaper to send the RDF to Boston rather than Europe. The shipment of waste overseas is impacted by Brexit because the EU rules for doing this are provided in an EU Regulation. This is causing uncertainty. The flood defence will need to be maintained at 6.8m (the same height as the Haven Banks Scheme). The flood line could be re-aligned if necessary, but space will be needed for RDF storage.	
2	**Navigation chapter of the PEIR** The Navigation Chapter gives an overview of the navigational features of The Haven and discusses potential impacts during construction and operation. The EIA methodology needs clarification. The methodology that the Environment Agency (EA) used for the Boston Barrier has been used as the source for Navigation chapter of the PEIR, based upon previous recommendations by the Port. This includes a Navigation Management Plan (NMP) which would include risk assessment workshops to look at how potential risks can be reduced. NH mentioned that the NMP should be written in conjunction with the Port, so effectively, the Port is joint-author. *Legislation, policy and guidance* The Harbour River Order covers the Port's anchorage points in The Wash as well (i.e. it extends further than the end of The Haven). Note that these anchorage points should be identified in any Figure that represents the study area for Navigation. There are some acts which have not been included (1812 Act, Boston Docks Act, Docks, Piers and Clauses Act) – **Action: RWa to confirm.** Text on the National Policy Statement for ports needs clarifying (NSIP due to power generation). The threshold for NSIP ports should be identified. The Port Marine Safety Code should be Boston port specific. The Port of Boston has issued guidance (not legislation) on mooring and bollard loading. PBl – there will be an operating procedure in place which will need to be in line with this guidance.	**RWa to confirm relevant legislation for consideration in the Navigation Assessment.**

	Pollution impacts should be considered such as in transferring the bales from the ships onto the quay. Need to update the guidance in the Local Plan as from the 8th March 2019 the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan was adopted has a different designation (RID employment area) and it refers to the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Management Plan. The Harbour Approach Guidelines (PIANC) are not specific to each river so reference to them should be used carefully. Specifically, with reference to river width guidelines, The Haven is likely to be narrower than recommended guidelines. The Navigation Risk Assessment will not be final until a contractor is established, acknowledgement that the document will be iterative. *Consultation Table* Need to make it clear of the reasoning behind using the EA Boston Barrier data for this project and why it can be relied on. During major capital dredge, the Navigation assessment must consider the impact on ships passing the site when this is taking place. The Port of Boston disposal site for dredged sediment in The Wash is reaching capacity. Therefore, it has been agreed with the EA that their dredged material will disposed to land rather than in The Wash. The EA used HR Wallingford to model their capital dredging process. There will be space for the Facility to take and use the dredge sediment during operation of the lightweight aggregate facility (LWA). During construction of the wharf, the capital dredge material will be brought to land. Some may be suitable for use on site (e.g. the flood defence). - This should be included within the ES. The capital dredge will be 150,000 m^3. The maintenance dredge will be used for the LWA. This will be excavated using a shore based grab, NH suggested that there may need to be a combination of onshore and from ships. The sedimentation profile will be modelled and will include the flow rates. There is a separate Chapter in the PEIR for this. Lighting should be considered for both shore based (influencing vessels) and in terms of navigation lighting. The lighting will be designed so that it won't affect or mask current navigational lighting for example, lighting will be provided that points downwards and does not cause any light splay outwards. The Port identified that there will not need to be signage as there will be navigational lighting and it is just a riverside quay.	

	The Port is the local Lighthouse Authority. However, for advice on lighting, the Port has to apply to Trinity House for permission to add or amend lighting for the approach and the Port. The experience of the Port is that Trinity House usually accepts any request. Advisory details will be given to all ships including details of other ships, weather conditions etc. The ships bringing the clay will carry approximately 3000 tonnes (however, quantity will be dictated by volume of the hold and not the mass being carried), and will be draught restricted. The ships will be controlled by the tides (there will be around 2 aggregate/clay ships per week). There needs to be space for two vessels passing, as there may be suction forces despite the slow speed. The distance from the wharf to the centre line would have to be consistent and may have to move the flood defence slightly at the aggregate wharf because of the narrow channel. This will be identified in the development of the next stage of the wharf drawing. RWa mentioned their concern of the proximity of the wharf to the deep water of the channel. The aggregate berth is near the narrowest part of the river. The Port requested that the Project team provide a plan to show a moored vessel, a fishing vessel (5m beam) and a commercial vessel with 10 m passing clearance between the vessels to identify whether there is adequate spacing. **PBe to provide this drawing.** *EIA Methodology* Will use EA methodology and will define the significance of impacts. Will present this to PoB and will make any changes if necessary. PoB queried what 'Transboundary effects' referred to. There is the requirement to include any impacts with other countries (transboundary impacts). Unlikely to be relevant to this scheme (more common for offshore windfarms), but has to be justified in the EIA. PoB tide timetables should be used as a reliable data source. They use the Boston Sill data. The Sill data should always be quoted alongside any references to AOD when presenting tide data. Regarding consultation, we will try to meet with other river users such as the yacht club and Boston Belle etc. Should also meet with the Canal and River Trust. The Port only monitors commercial vessels visiting the Port. *Existing Environment*	**PBe (RHDHV) to provide wharf and vessels drawing**

	The port's dredger has a plough/hopper attachment (add to section 18.5.12). Currently the port dredges 20-30,000 tonnes. Their licence allows up to 60,000 tonnes The theoretical maximum draught of vessels is 7 m however the practical maximum is around 6.3-6.4 m. There are 26 fishing vessels licenced at the Port of Boston. There may be more than 12 Marine leisure cruises – should meet these to confirm. The speed limit on the river is 6 knots, however the harbour authority do not enforce this. Harbour Master would advise a safe speed under the Collision Regulations (COLREGs). PoB will put a Notice to Mariners out before any works. In the NMP there should be weekly updates with PoB. *Potential impacts* **SM will send through the proposed impacts assessment methodology and the proposed impacts; and RWa will review.** In terms of decommissioning, the plant is assumed to run for 25 years. This is typical for these types of facility. At this point the facility would have been recommended for upgrade or will close. The wharf will provide the flood defence line so this will not be decommissioned. The assessment will have to consider the cumulative impacts such as lighting with the Boston One facility The main construction related impacts that PoB would want to avoid include, closure of navigation, minimising dredging from ships and would want piling to be done from the shore as well. The Port expects that this project will require no closure to river traffic. The Port was also concerned that construction and operation could lead to an increased requirement of maintenance dredging the channel. Regarding scour protection, this may be necessary to prevent the slope from under the suspended deck from being scoured and undermining the flood defence. Need to consider the type of scour protection. PoB noted that concrete mattresses have been placed elsewhere in the port and they have moved. The minimal clearance for the river bottom is based upon the river floor being mud, so that vessels are unlikely to be damaged if they touch the bottom or sides. Therefore, the Port of	**SM to send impacts, then RWa to send feedback.**

	Boston would not want any hard scour protection such as rock armour or concrete mattresses in the navigation channel. PBe will consider this as part of the next phase of wharf design. In the berthing pocket, it is a risk that the propellers/thrusters will create holes if the vessels always berth in the same place. Access/ egress of the crew at all states of tide should be considered, and how to manage port trips. The Port raised the issue of whether The International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (**ISPS** Code) in terms of palisade fencing should be considered, and unsecured river access. Could include a security fence and CCTV. As this wharf is only taking ships from the UK it may reduce the requirement to the basic level. **RWa will sent SM and RWo details for ISPS contacts.**	**RWa to send SM details of ISPS contacts**

Minutes

HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings

Present:	Richard Walker (Port of Boston), Michael Trafford (Port of Boston), Richard Woosnam (Fairport) Gary Bower (RHDHV) Sarah Marjoram (RHDHV). By phone - Neil Harris (Harris Consulting) and Richard Marsh (Eversheds Sutherland)
Apologies:	
From:	Sarah Marjoram
Date:	17/07/2019
Location:	Port of Boston
Copy:	
Our reference:	PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-2018_1
Classification:	Project related
Enclosures:	

Subject: **Boston Alternative Energy Facility EIA - Navigational impacts risk assessment discussion**

Number	Details	Action
1	**Introductions** GB introduced Richard Marsh from Eversheds Sutherland who will be drafting the Development Consent Order (DCO) which is a legal document.	
2	**The EIA process** GB provided an overview of the EIA impact assessment process and explained how the definitions of sensitivity and magnitude are used to determine the significance of an impact. The significance would then determine the need for mitigation. Impacts of moderate or major significance would require mitigation to reduce this to minor/negligible. Impacts of minor significance do not generally require mitigation, but if mitigation is available to reduce this it will be included. The Port agreed with the definitions	
4	NH confirmed that the port's critical interest is navigational safety. The EIA may not pick this up to the degree required (because there is insufficient detailed design to achieve this) and therefore a Navigational Management Plan (NMP) will need to be produced, supported by a Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA). Potential risks will be more defined when the design and contractor are in place. GB confirmed that at this stage the impact assessment and this meeting will secure the principles of the EIA at this concept stage and will be an iterative process as the design progresses.	

Number	Details	Action
	There was agreement that the NMP would be a supporting document to the proposed legal Heads of Terms agreement between the developer and the Port, which is required to ensure that the Port does not object to the scheme. This meeting forms part of the process to develop the NMP. RM enquired as to whether the NMP produced by the Environment Agency (EA) for the Barrier Scheme could be shared with us. NH confirmed that he can share this. **Action 1: NH to as the EA whether the NMP can be shared with the project; and to send it to GB & SM for distribution if so.**	1. NH to share EA's NMP
	GB confirmed that the commitment to producing a NMP will be included in the Navigation Chapter of the ES; and if we are provided with the EA's NMP, or a template NMP that meets the requirements of the Port, we will include a reference to this as an appendix to the Navigation Risk chapter of the ES, with a commitment to producing an NMP, to be approved by the Port as part of the requirements for the DCO. **Action 2: The framework for a NMP will be added to the Navigation Chapter in the ES.** The ES chapter itself will identify high level information and impact significances.	2. SM to include in chapter
5	**Impact Assessment** <u>Receptors</u> Port agree with the receptors but requested that the Pilots need to be identified in their own right because they are self-employed. **Action 3: ES chapter to clarify this.**	3. SM to add to chapter
6	**Mitigation** GB commented that there is embedded mitigation in the design of the project such as carrying out capital and maintenance dredging from land and carrying out construction from land. **Action 4: This will be made clearer in the ES chapter**	4. SM to clarify in chapter
7	**Construction impacts** <u>Capital Dredging</u> To be done from land. RW identified that the reach of the plant used to excavate is approximately 52m. Impacts on navigation would be inevitable using floating plant. Therefore, it is intended	

Number	Details	Action
	to create the berth pocket first, then if any floating plant is required to complete the berth, this can be done from the pocket, rather than the navigable channel. Possible impact of decreased river width however this was agreed to be unlikely. Port's sensitivity was agreed as **High** Magnitude of impact was agreed as **Low** as no obstruction of river anticipated. **Moderate** significance Potential mitigation measures would be development and agreement of working procedures in advance of operation; and providing 'Notice to mariners'. Impact of increased transit time past the facility was agreed to be negligible as ships passing this area of the river are already travelling slowly. <u>Installation of wharf</u> To be done from land, with no reduction in river width Sensitivity of port agreed as **High** Magnitude agreed as **Low/Very Low**. **Moderate/Minor** significance	
	Action 5: RHDHV to provide the Port with the Outline design for the wharf when this is completed.	5. RHDHV to share design with Port
	<u>Installation of scour protection</u> Anticipated that the berth will accrete rather than scour, NH identified that any mechanism for scour was unlikely. RHDHV engineers to determine whether scour protection is needed. Port would prefer that no scour protection was placed, but if it is needed would prefer mattressing that was assured to be self-contained to avoid risk of material mobilising into the channel. The Port observed that scour protection provided for the Boston Barrier has moved. Would be installed as part of the wharf construction. Port is of **High** sensitivity Magnitude – **Low/Very Low** as installation of scour protection would not impact river width. **Moderate/Minor** significance <u>Lighting</u>	

Number	Details	Action
	Navigational lighting (red beacon) would be required at either end of wharf to comply with safety requirements. There are current lighting issues with the constructed Biomass UK No.3 Ltd power station. These previously had non-direction lighting causing issues associated with glow and intensity of light. Lighting has been upgraded, however the LED lighting is very intense. Regarding lighting for construction: Port is of **High** sensitivity Magnitude is also of **High** sensitivity (required throughout construction period) = **Major** significance Mitigation through careful design of lighting structures, angling of light and intensity/colour of light required. Ensuring navigational lighting aids are not obscured by other lighting. Knowing who river users can contact during the construction period where lighting impacts occur will be important. <u>Importation of materials</u> Any construction materials that are shipped by boat would be delivered to the Port, not the Facility. It is expected that these would be very infrequent and would be dealt with as part of the normal commercial traffic visiting the Port. These would be booked well in advance of arrival. Port is of **Low** sensitivity – ability to adapt Magnitude is **Low** as so infrequent = **Minor** significance	
8	**Cumulative construction impacts with Barrier**	
	Boston Barrier is now scheduled to complete in August 2021. Closure of Dock to widen lock = Jan 2021 to August 2021 – all commercial vessels will berth at river berths. Potential to overlap with the start of construction for the Boston Alternative Energy Facility scheme. The widening of the dock is the final part of the Barrier scheme. The EA are not going to be bringing in additional ships to complete this work, other than one specifically for the Knuckle. Therefore, there are unlikely to be navigational issues caused by the overlap.	6. SM – to include in Chapter
9	**Operation impacts**	
	<u>Increased number of vessels in the Haven</u>	

Number	Details	Action
	Staged increase in the number of ships delivering to the Facility in the first year, because the three gasifiers will be brought online one at a time before the Facility is operating at full capacity. Increased number of vessels increases probability of navigational risks. Fog causes navigation issues and will slow access to / from The Haven. The increase in vessels may also require more anchorage points in The Wash. The Port has potential for increasing anchorage areas, this would need to be discussed with Natural England. Port agreed as having **Medium** sensitivity as has ability to adapt. Magnitude agreed as **High** as there is the potential for affecting use of anchorage in the Wash. = **Major** significance <u>Operation of the wharf</u> Greatest risk at the lightweight aggregate end of the berth as this is in a narrower part of the river. Agreed that design of the wharf would be shared with the Port, with the difference in river width before and after construction stated. Port can then make a judgement whether it is acceptable or not. There are design measures, such as moving the berth slightly upriver to remove this pinch point. Should consider passing vessels to be 17m beam. To await final design and Port response before confirmation of significance. Interim assumption is: High sensitivity Medium magnitude Major adverse significance. <u>Use of in-river turning circle</u> This could cause potential time impacts on river users. The EA has modelled impacts using HR Wallingford. The time taken is influenced by several factors: weather conditions, tide conditions (the stronger the tide, the longer the swing) etc. Time taken to swing is approximately 15 minutes. It would take 15 to 30 mins to access the swing point from the Facility. Port agreed to be **Medium** sensitivity as has ability to adapt Sensitivity agreed to be **Medium** as local but likely to occur. = **Moderate** significance.	

Number	Details	Action
	The Port stated that they want the flexibility to decide whether ships are turned before or after they have been unloaded. To be managed by Port Control and Pilot Operations procedures and knowledge, and requirements of the next tide. Turning in the wet dock will also be considered, particularly in bad weather, or where there could be impacts on the fishing fleet. Turning in the wet dock is likely to take 10 minutes longer. It is imperative that all ships have functioning bow thrusters. <u>Maintenance dredging</u> Potential requirement of dredging at the Facility or presence of the Facility causes an increase in dredging the channel. Facility to be dredged from land when a berth is free. Surveys to be undertaken to inform this and inform the water depth at each berth for Pilots information. The Port confirmed that they (and the Pilots) require regular surveys. Monthly surveys are carried out at Sutton bridge. This could be considered to be the 'norm'. Dredging requirements (blanket or target) will be dictated by pocket conditions. The Facility can receive all dredged material from maintenance dredging for processing in the lightweight aggregates plant. Sensitivity of the Port was agreed to be **Low** (ability to adapt) Magnitude of the impact was agreed to be **Low** as impact is short duration and unlikely to occur (low predicted accretion rates) = **Minor** significance <u>Lighting</u> Agreed as the same sensitivity and magnitude as Construction Lighting. = impact of **Major** significance Trinity House is the general Lighthouse Authority. Any permission for navigation lighting would have to be agreed by them, however, they would ask the Port for advice. Lighting beacons would be required at the extremity of the berthing pocket. <u>Accidental release of bales into river</u> The release of bales into the river could cause a hazard, particularly at night. This would also contravene Marpol litter requirements.	

Number	Details	Action
	Unlikely and easily mitigated through presence of safety boat to corral and recover escaped bales; and the use of night-watchmen to supervise offloading operation. Sensitivity of the Port was agreed to be **High** as risk of collision would be serious. Magnitude agreed to be **Very Low** as very unlikely to occur. = **Minor** significance	
9	**Cumulative impacts during operation** Port advised that there were no further planned projects on The Haven after the Boston Barrier and this project. Note: when the Barrier is closed, no fishing vessels can pass. The EA provide advance notice for Barrier closures (planned). For tidal surge events, the EA provide notice based upon long-range / short range forecasts (3 days, 24 hours, 12 hours). In such events, the Port will make a decision whether to allow vessels to access the Facility or not.	
10	**Decommissioning impacts** These are considered to be the same as construction impacts arising through importation (exportation in this case) of materials = **Low** sensitivity and **Low** magnitude. = **Minor** significance	
11	**Actions** 1. **NH to share the EA's NMP for the Boston Barrier Project** 2. **SM to include a commitment to producing an NMP in the ES chapter** 3. **SM to add the Boston Pilots as an independent navigation receptor** 4. **SM to ensure that embedded mitigation for navigation is clarified within the chapter** 5. **RHDHV to share the outline design of the wharf with the Port for the Port to determine whether the river width is acceptable for safe port operations** 6. **SM to include the final stage of the Boston Barrier project in Cumulative Impact Assessment**	

Meeting with Port of Boston – 10 September 2020

Via Teams

Present:

Richard Walker (RW), Port of Boston Harbour Master

Neil Harris (NH), NAH Consulting (official representative of the Port of Boston)

Gary Bower (GB), RHDHV – Boston Alternative Energy Facility project

Linda Elliott (LE), Athene Communications – Boston Alternative Energy Facility project

1. GB provided an update on the project, in particular the background to the decision to move away from using gasification technology to more traditional thermal treatment energy from waste technology. He explained how this will reduce the potential number of HGV movements but will see the introduction of the use of ships during the construction phase as well as during the operation of the Facility. Previously the proposal had been to only use ships during the operation of the Facility.

2. GB also provided an update on the timing of the project and how it is proposed that a Development Consent Order (DCO) will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate at the end of November. The Environmental Statement, which will be submitted with the DCO, will include a chapter on Navigation. Work will continue during the examination process on navigational risk assessment work and the project will work with the Port of Boston on this.

3. The session then opened for questions. Key issues raised were:

    - the fundamental reason why the project had targeted gasification in the first instance. GB explained that gasification from a plant perspective is more efficient and that there had been a desire to use gasification as it was a newer technology and offered the potential for the Facility to be the flagship gasification project in the UK. Ultimately, however, there was too much risk with being able to secure a supplier and so the decision had been made to move to thermal treatment energy from waste technology.

    - whether Phil Callen is still leading the project and, if so, whether his intention is to develop the Facility and then to sell it onto an operator. GB confirmed that Phil is still leading the project and that he intends to retain significant involvement in the project once the Facility has been constructed.

    - the likely reduction in shipping during the operation phase. GB explained that there would be around 130/132 ship movements during the two- year construction period and around 50 fewer ship movements (per year) than had previously been estimated during operation. The figures are currently being reviewed as part of producing the Navigation Chapter and GB will circulate them to the Port of Boston as soon as they are available – possibly within the next two weeks. Also agreed to send a copy of the Navigation

Chapter with changes highlighted and a "clean copy" without track changes. **Action – GB to share updated shipping figures and Navigation Chapter with Port of Boston**

- whether the fact that ships would be coming from a larger number of ports means that there will be more variety in the shipping travelling to the Facility. GB explained that the project was looking for consistency in the types of ships that would be used and offered to send NH and RW a list of ports that would be used. **Action – GB to send Port of Boston a list of ports**

- RDF packaging does not appear to fair well. How will the Facility ensure that plastic waste does not go into the river? GB explained that contracts will be clear that damaged bales should not be put onto ships in the first place. If the bales are damaged while on a ship they will be secured and then sent to a re-baling facility on site. Any overheating bales would be sent to the quarantine area and dealt with.

- Whether the shipping parameters would be the same under the revised proposals. GB confirmed that they would and agreed to send his presentation to NH and RW. **Action – GB to share presentation with Port of Boston**

4. NH also highlighted an underlying issue regarding the need to formalise a legal agreement on some key matters such as turning vessels in the river. NH had had initial discussions with Phil Callen about this building on the approach which had been used for the Boston Barrier where an agreement was signed with the Environment Agency. He said these were not contentious issues but there had been no progress on getting the agreement in place. He explained that at the point the DCO application is submitted the pathway becomes prescribed and the Port of Boston's current position is that it will object in the absence of a legal agreement.

5. NH said that he would drop Phil Callen a note to reinforce the Port of Boston's support for the scheme in principle but that it would have to object to the application if no agreement is in place at the point that it is consulted about the proposal. GB said that he would also contact Richard Marsh at BDB Pitmans about this and pass NH's contact details to Richard. **Action – GB to raise with Richard Marsh and pass NH's contact details to him**

Minutes

HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings

Present:	Richard Walker (RW) (Harbour Master Port of Boston), Paul Salmon (PS), Chris Adnitt (CA) and Abbie Garry (AG) (RHDHV)
Apologies:	Sarah Marjoram
From:	Abbie Garry
Date:	22 March 2021
Location:	Microsoft Teams
Copy:	
Our reference:	PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-1071
Classification:	Project related
Enclosures:	

Subject: **Port of Boston Habitat Mitigation Area Meeting**

Number	Details	Action
1	PS updated RW that the BAEF DCO would be submitted w/c 22nd March (that week). PS provided an explanation of the works at the Habitat Mitigation Area (HMA) with the following key points: - It is estimated to be 1 week of work using hand tools and a long reach excavator for shallow scrapes and reprofiling, which could be taken on a floating pontoon to the area. - There would be some rocks moved from the current position adjacent to the proposed wharf area to the HMA site – these would be placed further inland from the river and wouldn't impact on the river channel. RW noted that if there were pools these would fill up rapidly. CA confirmed that they would want the pools to be filled regularly with salt water. CA noted that there would be some maintenance of the pools. PS mentioned that the Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy which was submitted with the DCO application included details of the mitigation area and would be finalised as a landscape and ecological strategy in consultation with relevant stakeholders. It was confirmed by RW that it would be preferable to have a barge which transports the excavator to the site and then goes back to the dock basin (i.e. not left in situ whilst the works is taking place).	

Number	Details	Action
	RW mentioned that June – December is cockle season and therefore may be best to avoid. CA noted that the works must also be outside the overwintering bird season, therefore the ideal timing would be between April and May to avoid these seasons. It would have to be completed in advance of the wharf being constructed. Construction will begin around the end of 2022 to beginning of 2023. CA also confirmed disturbance at the mouth of the Haven with the baseline situation being that large vessels currently disturb the birds after one ship movement and then subsequently it is a similar level of disturbance.	
2	**Next Steps** PS noted that the next stages would be setting up a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) where Port of Boston can go through the application and agree and disagree with points in which they would cover in examination. PS noted that we will contact Port of Boston to put these discussions in place. RHDHV to send RW a link to register interest in application on PINS website.	RHDHV to arrange SoCG discussions. RHDHV to send RW a link to register interest in application on PINS website.

Minutes

HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings

Present:	Paul Salmon (RHDHV Project Manager, EIA lead and DCO lead), Abbie Garry (RHDHV Assistant Project Manager), Rahil Haq (BDB Pitmans Associate), Richard Walker (Port of Boston (PoB) Harbour Master), Neil Harris (Engineering consultant representing PoB and wider Victoria Group).
Apologies:	
From:	Abbie Garry
Date:	07 June 2021
Location:	Teams
Copy:	
Our reference:	PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-1072
Classification:	Project related
Enclosures:	

Subject: **Port of Boston Meeting 07.06.21**

Number	Details	Action
1	PS confirmed that the initial DCO application went in on 30th Nov 2020 which was withdrawn due to three main issues: HRA, Crown Estate Land and Funding statement. Application was re-submitted and accepted for examination on 20th April 2021.	
	We have sent out Section 56 Letters with details of the application documents for relevant representations to be made by the 18th June. Richard and Neil noted they had not received the letter. RHDHV will email across a copy of the letter and further details. PoB will check to see if they have received the letter. If the letter was not received we will re-send the letter and update the deadline for receiving the Relevant Representation (30 days after receipt of the letter). If the letter was received then the Developer will not be able to change the deadline, however this may be requested from PINS.	PoB to confirm if received S56 letter RHDHV to email the letter across.
	The Preliminary Meeting with PINS will be on the 7th September 2021, and the 6 month Examination period will follow. There will be topic specific hearings, possibly including Navigation.	
	PS confirmed we are having a meeting with the Boston and Fosdyke fishing society.	
	PS noted that as previously discussed there has been an introduction of a Habitat Mitigation Area 200m south of the Application Site.	
	Port of Boston confirmed they would be happy to fill out the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). PS confirmed we will base the SoCG on the Relevant Rep received, then will send the draft over to PoB for review. The SoCG can be updated throughout the examination period. NH stated that the consultation with the port had been good to date, that having	

Number	Details	Action
	the agreement in place with the port is very helpful, and that the port was supportive of the proposals. PS noted that we would like to start outlining the principles outlining the Navigational Management Plan alongside the Port. PoB noted they thought it wouldn't be appropriate to involve the Port of Boston directly in preparing the Navigational Management Plan. He mentioned that the NMP from the Boston Barrier was useful in gaining agreement from the fishing fleet for this project. NH noted that the detailed design of the wharf was sent a while back and he needed to review whether the red line boundary left enough room for the approach angle. PS confirmed that construction would likely begin in 2023 with operation beginning approximately 2027.	

Appendix B Glossary

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited	AUBP	The Applicant.
Development Consent Order	DCO	The means for obtaining permission for developments of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP)
Habitat Mitigation Area	-	A 1.5 ha located approximately 170 m to the south east of the Principal Application Site, encompassing an area of saltmarsh and small creeks at the margins of The Haven where habitat mitigation works will be provided.
Habitats Regulations Assessment	HRA	A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) refers to the several distinct stages of Assessment which must be undertaken in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) to determine if a plan or project may affect the protected features of a habitats site before deciding whether to undertake, permit or authorise it.
Lightweight Aggregate	LWA	Plant for the manufacture of lightweight aggregate used to produce lightweight concrete products such as concrete block, structural concrete and pavement.
National Site Network	-	Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) in the UK no longer form part of the EU's Natura 2000 ecological network. The 2019 Regulations have created a national site network on land and at sea, including both the inshore and

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
		offshore marine areas in the UK.
Principal Application Site	-	A 26.8 hectare site where the industrial infrastructure will be constructed and operated. It is neighboured to the west by the Riverside Industrial Estate and to the east by The Haven.
Refuse Derived Fuel	RDF	The fuel produced from various types of waste, such as paper, plastics and wood from the municipal or commercial waste stream.
Statement of Common Ground	SoCG	This document.