



## Meeting note

<b>Project name</b>	The 'Net Zero Teesside Project'
<b>File reference</b>	EN010103
<b>Status</b>	<b>Final</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Date</b>	21 June 2021
<b>Meeting with</b>	Net Zero Teesside Power Limited and Net Zero North Seas Storage Limited
<b>Venue</b>	Microsoft Teams
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Project Update
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees

### Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

The application was received by the Inspectorate on 21 May 2021. On 10 June 2021 a signposting document was received from the Applicants. This was upon the request of the Inspectorate, seeking clarification in respect to the application documents. A note of the call made on 9 June 2021 is appended to this note. On 15 June the Inspectorate contacted the Applicants to advise that it had decided to progress to issue a decision not to accept the application. The Applicants decided to withdraw the application on 15 June 2021. The Applicants' withdrawal letter can be found [here](#).

The Applicants confirmed it intends to resubmit the application on or before 9 July 2021.

### Headline Issues

The Inspectorate outlined the headline issues which were leading to a decision of non-acceptance:

- The level of detail provided in the application in relation to the new substations at the power station site and at the existing Tod Point substation site. There was a lack of description of the physical characteristics of the new substations, with no parameters (and in the case of Tod Point, no visualisations) provided. There was also a lack of reference to these development components within the technical chapters (8-24) of the Environmental Statement (ES), meaning that the extent and nature of the impacts from these development components was unclear, as was the potential for likely significant effects.

- A lack of clarity as to how the electrical connection works would be controlled in the draft Development Consent Order (draft DCO) was also noted, with reference to Work no. 3 and Work no. 1 (e). In response, the Applicants confirmed that they would provide further description regarding the proposed substations in the ES, including a table setting out parameters (e.g. area and height), as well as an elevation for the Tod Point substation. The Applicants stated their view that these components were minor elements of infrastructure within an industrial context, which would be unlikely to give rise to significant effects including in relation to landscape and visual impact. The Applicants will, however, include a specific assessment of the impacts from these development components within each relevant technical chapter of the ES and will also explain, either through an overarching statement or within the other technical chapters, where an assessment is not required for a topic. The Inspectorate emphasised the importance of this in helping Interested Parties to understand the electrical connection infrastructure and its impacts, to inform Relevant Representations if the application is Accepted.
- A lack of description of the physical characteristics of the construction phase in terms of abnormal load requirements and of the resulting likely significant effects. The Secretary of State's Scoping Opinion stated: "*The ES should confirm the worst case number of abnormal loads required and the types of vehicles required. Any mitigation measures required to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads should be detailed in the ES and any resultant likely significant effects assessed*". This information was not addressed in the ES and the Applicants indicated (in the application) that this matter would be considered at a later design stage, as secured by draft DCO Requirement 18. The Inspectorate considered that in absence of the detailed information the assessment should have been undertaken using an assumption of the anticipated worst case number of abnormal loads required. On that basis the assessment should also have identified whether any mitigation measures are required to facilitate abnormal loads and any resultant likely significant effects.

In response, the Applicants confirmed they will add a specific sub-section to Chapter 5 of the ES regarding abnormal loads and will update relevant technical chapters of the ES to include a description of likely significant effects or confirmation that significant effects are not likely to occur. The Applicants explained how they had taken the industrial context of the site into account when considering the impacts of abnormal loads. The Applicants emphasised the use of the existing wharf, which would be the main means of transporting abnormal loads to the site and confirmed it was anticipating up to 40 abnormal loads would be received over a two year period. The ES assessment did not identify whether the potential use of other transport modes for abnormal loads (e.g. road/rail) could result in any likely significant effects, in the event that they are used. The Inspectorate stated that further detail should be provided in the ES to supplement this, on the basis that the nature and characteristics of the impacts could be markedly different.

- With regard to the description of the main characteristics of the operational phase of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate identified an inconsistency in that the electrical generating capacity utilised in the greenhouse gas assessment (ES Chapter 21: Climate Change (700MW)) was lower than the maximum parameter

specified in ES Chapter 4: Proposed Development and in the draft DCO, which refer to a capacity of up to 860MWe. The Applicants confirmed that this was a drafting error and that an updated assessment will be presented in the resubmitted ES, considering the maximum electrical generating capacity sought through the draft DCO.

- Lack of detail regarding the estimated quantities of spoil likely to be produced by the tunnelling works and insufficient information regarding its storage and disposal. It was noted that this information was requested in the Secretary of State's Scoping Opinion. The Inspectorate considers that provision of sufficient information regarding the estimated quantities, storage and disposal of spoil from the tunnelling works as part of the DCO application, is necessary to enable a robust assessment and examination of the significant environmental effects resulting from the use of natural resources and the disposal of waste. The Applicants confirmed that this information will be included in relevant chapters of the ES when the application is resubmitted and that movement of waste had been assessed as part of ES Chapter 16: Traffic and Transportation.
- Omission of information from the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) relevant to the baseline characteristics of the receiving environment, its relationship with the Proposed Development and the forecasting methods used to identify and assess effects on the environment. These omissions from the FRA, detailed as follows, create uncertainty in the findings of ES Chapter 9: Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources, which is supported by information presented in the FRA. There was also a lack of evidence in the FRA or ES to demonstrate agreement with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority on the approach taken in this regard.
  - The Inspectorate noted that whilst the main generating site is in Flood Zone 1, the information failed to address whether components identified within Flood Zone 3, are in Flood Zone 3a or Flood Zone 3b. It was therefore unclear whether any additional flood mitigation/compensation (for example in relation to floodplain storage) was required beyond that proposed and how this would be secured in the draft DCO. The Applicants were advised to clarify these points.
  - It was unclear whether the sequential test had been applied to all Proposed Development components located within Flood Zone 3 - specifically – parts of the CO<sub>2</sub> export pipeline, the water discharge options, the temporary construction and laydown areas, natural gas pipeline and above ground installation (if the National Grid or Trafigura options are pursued). These components appeared to be located in areas which have not been allocated for energy development under the Local Plan and were therefore outside of the areas considered in the sequential test for the strategic flood risk assessment in the Local Plan Process. The Applicants were advised to explain how the sequential and exception tests have been applied to Proposed Development components within Flood Zone 3. Confirmation should be provided that the approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority. If agreement cannot be reached, the FRA should be updated to demonstrate how the

sequential and exception tests have been applied in relation to the whole of the development subject to the DCO application.

- There was no reference within the FRA to sensitivity testing based on the maximum credible scenarios - for example, using H++ climate change allowances for peak river flow and sea level rise (if required). The Applicants were advised to agree with the Environment Agency whether the maximum credible scenarios for climate change should be modelled, in line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 (paragraph 4.8.8). Unless otherwise agreed, sensitivity testing should be provided for fluvial and tidal sources. The Applicants stated that the approach to maximum credible scenarios had been agreed with the Environment Agency and confirmed that these matters will be fully explained in the FRA and ES accompanying the resubmitted application.

## **Further Observations**

In undertaking the Acceptance checks, the Inspectorate has made further observations in relation to the application:

- Figures depicting the locations of the Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, River Tweed SAC and Tweed Estuary SAC have not been provided, as required under APFP Regulation 5(2). In addition, the proposed gas pipeline and CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline under the River Tees are described as being located under bedrock below the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. The extent of the Ramsar site in this area of the application site was not apparent from some of the figures in the application documents (e.g. Figure 3-4 in ES Volume II (Doc 6.3.5) and Figure 15-3 in ES Volume II (Doc 6.3.62)).
- The Works plans were difficult to decipher as differentiation between above ground and below ground hatching was unclear. The Inspectorate advised the Applicants to use graphic shading techniques that enable clear differentiation of each Works No.
- The Inspectorate commented that Figure 3-2 of the ES usefully clarifies the relationship between different "development areas". To assist Interested Parties, the Inspectorate advised that a single works plan of a similar nature to Figure 3.2 is provided to demonstrate the inter-relationship between: the CO<sub>2</sub> Export pipeline; Natural Gas Connection Corridor; Electrical Connection Corridor; Water Discharge Corridor, and the CO<sub>2</sub> Gathering Network.
- The Requirement numbers in ES Appendix 25A: Commitments Register do not align with the Requirement numbers in the draft DCO.
- There were inconsistencies with reference to the storage for captured carbon in the ES, sometimes referred to as a suitable offshore geological storage site and in other places named as the Endurance saline aquifer.

Further minor errors were also identified during the Acceptance checks. The Inspectorate confirmed it would provide these errors under separate cover.

## **Resubmission**

The Applicants set out their intention to resubmit the Application during week commencing 5 July 2021. It confirmed that it will provide a signposting document alongside the application, detailing the areas where amendments and clarifications have been made.

The Inspectorate acknowledged the relatively quick resubmission and highlighted the importance of checking the application documents and any cross referencing. The Applicants explained that the date on the front cover of documents that are not to be changed would not be updated to July 2021. The Inspectorate confirmed this would be fine as the May 2021 application documents would be archived and saved separately to the July 2021 submission – so there would be no confusion between the two submissions.



# Record of Request and Advice

<b>Project name</b>	The Net Zero Teesside Project
<b>File reference</b>	EN010103
<b>Status</b>	<b>Draft</b>
<b>Author</b>	The Planning Inspectorate
<b>Date</b>	09 June 2021 and 15 June 2021
<b>Parties present</b>	Net Zero Teesside Power Limited and Net Zero North Seas Storage Limited
<b>Venue</b>	Microsoft Teams
<b>Meeting objectives</b>	Clarification Request and Advice
<b>Circulation</b>	All attendees/ <additional circulation>

## Summary of clarification request and advice given

The application was received by the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) on 21 May 2021. On 09 June the Inspectorate contacted the Applicants to set out its request for clarification in respect of one aspect of the application documents.

The Inspectorate noted the reference to an additional “new Net Zero Substation” as described in Chapter 4 paragraph 4.3.66 of the Environmental Statement (Doc 6.2.4). The Inspectorate commented that it had experienced difficulty in identifying reference to this “new substation” elsewhere in the application. The Applicants confirmed that a new, small substation at Tod Point forms a part of the application. Therefore, the Inspectorate requested that the Applicants provide a signposting document, highlighting where reference has been made to the “new Net Zero Substation” within the application, most notably in the following documents:

- Draft Development Consent Order/ Explanatory Memorandum;
- Works Plans;
- Land Plans;
- Statement of Reasons; and
- Environmental Statement, wherever the “new substation” has been assessed.

The Inspectorate confirmed that the signposting document will assist in the Acceptance process for the Net Zero Teesside Application.

## Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Applicants to provide a signposting document by 12pm Thursday 10 June 2021

### **Follow up discussion held on 15 June 2021**

The Applicants provided a signposting document on 10 June 2021.

The Inspectorate explained to the Applicants that the call was not an opportunity to discuss the merits of the application.

The Inspectorate informed the Applicants of its intention to progress in issuing a decision not to accept the application.

The Inspectorate informed the Applicants that the decision would be published on Friday 18 June 2021. Therefore, if the Applicants wished to withdraw the application, they should communicate this in writing to the Inspectorate by midday on Thursday 17 June 2021.

# Net Zero Teesside Project

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010103

Land at and in the vicinity of the former Redcar Steel Works site, Redcar and in Stockton-on-Tees, Teesside

The Net Zero Teesside Order

Document Reference: 1.5 – Signposting Document for the Planning Inspectorate

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5(2)(q)



Applicants: Net Zero Teesside Power Limited (NZN Power Ltd) & Net Zero North Sea Storage Limited (NZNS Storage Ltd)

Date: July 2021



## DOCUMENT HISTORY

Document Ref	1.5		
Revision	1.0		
Author	Geoff Bullock (GB)		
Signed	GB	Date	July 2021
Approved By	GB		
Signed	GB	Date	July 2021
Document Owner	DWD		

## 1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Signposting Document has been prepared on behalf of Net Zero Teesside Power Limited and Net Zero North Sea Storage Limited (the 'Applicants') in respect of the application (the 'Application') for a Development Consent Order (a 'DCO'), that has been submitted (dated 19 July 2021) to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, under Section 37 of 'The Planning Act 2008' for the Net Zero Teesside ('NZT') Project.
- 1.1.2 The Applicants are seeking development consent for the construction, operation and maintenance of NZT, including associated development (together the 'Proposed Development') on land at and in the vicinity of the former Redcar Steel Works site, Redcar and in Stockton-on-Tees, on Teesside (the 'Site').
- 1.1.3 The Proposed Development will be the UK's first commercial scale, full chain Carbon Capture, Usage, and Storage ('CCUS') project and will initially capture up to 4 million tonnes (Mt) of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions per annum. It will comprise a number of elements, including a new gas-fired electricity generating station with post-combustion carbon capture plant; gas, water and electricity connections (for the generating station); a CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline network for collecting CO<sub>2</sub> from a cluster of local industries on Teesside; a CO<sub>2</sub> compressor station (for the compression of the CO<sub>2</sub>) and the onshore section of a CO<sub>2</sub> export pipeline.
- 1.1.4 The Signposting Document sets out how within the Application dated 19 July 2021, the Applicants have addressed a number of issues that were raised by the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') during the acceptance period in respect of an earlier application (dated 21 May 2021) relating to the Proposed Development. That application was withdrawn by the Applicants on 16 June 2021. These issues are set out within a meeting note dated 21 June 2021 that is available on the PINS website. In respect of the application dated 21 May 2021 PINS sought further clarification on the following matters:
- Details of the new electrical substations at the electricity generating station site and at the existing Tod Point substation site.
  - How the electrical connections works would be controlled within the draft DCO.
  - The physical characteristics of the construction phase in terms of abnormal indivisible load ('AIL') requirements and the resulting likely significant effects.
  - The electrical generating capacity for the electricity generating station used in the Greenhouse Gas Assessment.
  - The estimated quantities of spoil likely to be produced by the tunnelling works required for the Proposed Development and related storage and disposal arrangements.
  - The content of the Flood Risk Assessment ('FRA'), including in relation to flood zones, the Sequential Test and sensitivity testing.

## **1.2 Signposting**

- 1.2.1 Table 1.1 on the following pages sets out the issues and observations raised by PINS and set out in the meeting note dated 21 June 2021, how these issues/observations have been addressed and where that information can be found within the Application.

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
<p>The level of detail provided in the application in relation to the new substations at the power station site and at the existing Tod Point substation site. There was a lack of description of the physical characteristics of the new substations, with no parameters (and in the case of Tod Point, no visualisations) provided. There was also a lack of reference to these development components within the technical chapters (8-24) of the Environmental Statement (ES), meaning that the extent and nature of the impacts from these development components was unclear, as was the potential for likely significant effects.</p>	<p>A new sub-paragraph (xii) has been added to Work No. 1A for the electrical substation at the Low Carbon Electricity Generating Station.</p> <p>Work No. 3 (works for the export of electricity from Work No. 1A to the National Grid Electricity Transmission system) has been sub-divided into two parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Work No. 3A – the electrical connection from Work No. 1A to Work No. 3B, comprising 275 kilovolt underground and overground electrical cables and control systems cables, and the connection between Work No. 3B and the National Grid Tod Point substation; and</li> <li>2) Work No. 3B – a new electrical substation at Tod Point, including electrical equipment, buildings, enclosures and extension works at the National Grid substation.</li> </ol> <p>Additional clarification of the nature, scale and location of the electrical connection works has been included in the Electricity Grid Connection Statement, Explanatory Memorandum, and Design</p>	<p>Draft DCO – Schedule 1 ‘Authorised Development’ Work Nos. 1A and 3A and 3B, and Schedule 15 ‘Design Parameters’ (Document Ref. 2.1).</p> <p>Explanatory Memorandum - paragraphs 3.8.1 to 3.8.2 3.8.13 to 3.8.20 (Document Ref. 2.2).</p> <p>Works Plans – Sheet 5 (Document Ref. 4.4).</p> <p>Indicative Electrical Connections Plans – Sheets 1 - 7 (Document Ref. 4.8).</p> <p>Design and Access Statement – Table 5.1 and paragraphs 5.2.9 &amp; 5.2.10; Table 7.1 and paragraphs 7.4.5 &amp; 7.4.6) (Document Ref. 5.4).</p> <p>Electricity Grid Connection Statement (Document Ref. 5.5).</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
	<p>and Access Statement. Additional indicative layouts and elevations for the proposed new sub-station at Tod Point have been included in the Indicative Electrical Connections Plans (Document Ref. 4.8) and the Electricity Grid Connection Statement (Document Ref. 5.5).</p> <p>These documents include details of the components of the electrical works, comprising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A new electrical substation forming part of the Low-Carbon Electricity Generating Station (part of Work No. 1A);</li> <li>2) A new NZT electrical substation at Tod Point (part of Work No. 3B);</li> <li>3) Extension bays to the existing NGET substation at Tod Point (part of Work No. 3B); and</li> <li>4) Connection works between the aforementioned electrical substations (Work No. 3A).</li> </ol> <p>Additional clarification is also provided, along with details of the assessment of any likely significant effects of the electrical connection works. The EIA has assessed likely significant effects of the electrical connection works, for topics where it is</p>	<p>Works Plans – Sheet 5 (Document Ref. 4.4).</p> <p>Indicative Electrical Connections Plans – Sheets 1 - 7 (Document Ref. 4.8).</p> <p>The following Chapters (all ES Volume II, Documents Ref. 6.3) have been updated to provide further clarity on the extent to which the EIA has assessed the electrical connection works:</p> <p>ES Volume I - Chapter 4: Proposed Development (Documents Ref. 6.2.4) includes at paragraph 4.3.64 a description of the electrical connection works as part of the description of the Proposed Development and Table 4-1: Maximum Design Parameters which outlines the maximum substation dimensions used as the basis for the assessment.</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
	<p>considered that likely significant effects may arise. The basis of the assessment of the Electrical connection works is set out within the ES.</p> <p>Details of the development components, including the parameters of Work No. 1 (generating station) Work 3 (electrical connection and substation works) and Work No. 7 (CO<sub>2</sub> compressor station) (i.e. those works with substantial buildings) have been included in the ES Chapter 4: <i>Proposed Development</i> and taken into account in the ES assessments. Relevant parameters are included in Schedule 15 (Design Parameters) to the Order.</p>	<p>ES Volume I - Chapter 5: Construction Programme and Management (Documents Ref. 6.2.5) includes at paragraphs 5.3.56 – 5.3.64 information on the construction of the electrical connection, including proposed crossings.</p> <p>ES Volume I - Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (Documents Ref. 6.2.4) includes at paragraph 11.6.21 clarification on what has been assessed as part of the Noise and Vibration assessment.</p> <p>ES Volume I - Chapter 17: Landscape and Visual Impact (Document Ref. 6.2.17) includes at paragraphs 17.3.25, 17.6.4 and 17.6.16 text which clarifies the how the substations have been assessed in terms of landscape and visual impact, in the context of the wider development proposals)</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
		ES Volume II - Figure 3-2 (Document Ref. 6.3.3) and Figure 5-3 (Document Ref. 6.3.10).
<p>A lack of clarity as to how the electrical connection works would be controlled in the draft Development Consent Order (draft DCO) was also noted, with reference to Work no. 3 and Work no. 1 (e).</p>	<p>The new electrical substation forming part of generating station is part of Work No. 1A (paragraph (xii)), not Work No. 1E (the latter of which allows further development related to any of Work Nos. 1A to 1D).</p> <p>As set out above, Work No. 3 (works for the export of electricity from Work No. 1A to the National Grid Electricity Transmission system) has been subdivided into two parts (Work No. 3A and 3B) in order to provide greater clarity as to the nature of the works and where they may be carried out.</p> <p>The areas within which each of the Work Nos. may be carried out (including the electrical substation and connection works) are shown on the Works Plans. Article 4(3) of the DCO requires that the works authorised by the Order are situated in the areas and within the Limits of Deviation shown on the Works Plans.</p>	<p>Draft DCO – Schedule 1 ‘Authorised Development’ Work Nos. 1A and 3A and 3B, Schedule 2 (Requirement 3) and Schedule 15 (Design Parameters)(Document Ref. 2.1).</p> <p>Explanatory Memorandum - paragraphs 3.3.1 – 3.32, 3.8.13 to 3.8.20 , 3.8.27 – 3.8.28, 3.8.34 and 3.8.89 (Document Ref. 2.2).</p> <p>Land Plans – Sheet 13 (Document Ref. 4.2).</p> <p>Works Plans – Sheet 5 (Document Ref. 4.4).</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
	<p>The parameters set out in the ES are secured by Requirement 3(11) and Schedule 15 of the DCO, and in the Works Plans, as follows.</p> <p>In respect of the electrical substation at Work No. 1A, the maximum length, width and height (AOD) of the substation building has been provided in Schedule 15.</p> <p>In respect of the substations forming part of Work No. 3B, maximum heights (AOD) are set out at Schedule 15. The area of Work No. 3B already comprises a limited area on the Works Plans and there is accordingly certainty as to the approximate location of the new NZT substation and NGET extension bays as secured in the DCO.</p> <p>Details of the land rights required to construct and operate Work No. 3 (including Work No. 3A and 3B) are shown on the Land Plans. Article 25 (Compulsory acquisition of rights etc.) allows for rights over land to be acquired as well as (or instead of) the land itself, and also for new rights to be created over land for the benefit of the Applicants and for the benefit of statutory undertakers whose apparatus is required to be diverted or relocated (as identified in the table in</p>	



Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
	Schedule 7 to the Order). It provides for such rights as may be required to be acquired by the Applicants over land which it is authorised to acquire under Article 22 (Compulsory acquisition of land).	
<p>A lack of description of the physical characteristics of the construction phase in terms of abnormal load requirements and of the resulting likely significant effects. The Secretary of State’s Scoping Opinion stated: <i>“The ES should confirm the worst case number of abnormal loads required and the types of vehicles required. Any mitigation measures required to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads should be detailed in the ES and any resultant likely significant effects assessed”</i>. This information was not addressed in the ES and the Applicants indicated (in the application) that this matter would be considered at a later design stage, as secured by draft DCO Requirement 18. The Inspectorate considered that in absence of the detailed information the assessment should have been undertaken using an assumption of the anticipated worst case number of abnormal loads required. On that basis the assessment should also have identified whether any mitigation measures are required to</p>	<p>Additional clarification is provided in relation to Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) including the use of an existing industrial jetty (Redcar Bulk Terminal) for the delivery of AILs, thereby avoiding the use of public roads to deliver AILs to Site. The EIA has assessed the likely significant effects of AILs during construction of the Proposed Development, considering worst case ship movements and any associated navigation risks. Clarity is provided on the physical works required to enable delivery of AILs to Site from ships using Redcar Bulk Terminal; no marine or river works are required. In summary the ES and associated appendices concluded having assessed a worst-case scenario in relation to AILs no significant effects are predicted.</p>	<p>ES Volume I - Chapter 5: Construction Programme and Management (Documents Ref. 6.2.5) paragraphs 5.3.92 – 5.3.100.</p> <p>ES Volume I - Chapter 16: Traffic and Transportation (Document Ref. 6.2.16) paragraphs 16.2.20, 16.6.10 and Table 16-4.</p> <p>ES Volume III - Appendix 16A: Transportation Assessment (Document Ref. 6.4.36) paragraphs 16.6.41 – 16.6.44.</p> <p>ES Volume III - Appendix 16C: Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (Document Ref. 6.4.38) Paragraphs 16.4.1 – 16.4.7</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
<p>facilitate abnormal loads and any resultant likely significant effects.</p>		<p>ES Volume III – Appendix 20B Navigational Risk Assessment (Document Ref. 6.4.45) Section 2.5</p> <p>ES Volume III - Appendix 25A: Commitments Register includes commitment in respect of Requirement 18 of the draft DCO.</p>
<p>With regard to the description of the main characteristics of the operational phase of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate identified an inconsistency in that the electrical generating capacity utilised in the greenhouse gas assessment (ES Chapter 21: Climate Change (700MW)) was lower than the maximum parameter specified in ES Chapter 4: Proposed Development and in the draft DCO, which refer to a capacity of up to 860MWe.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 21: Climate Change (Document Ref. 6.2.21) has been updated to confirm that the Greenhouse Gas Assessment is based on the Low Carbon Electricity Generating Station (Work No. 1) having an electrical output of up to 860 megawatts. Clarity is provided on the derivation of the numbers used in the Greenhouse Gas Assessment and that it is based on conservative assumptions</p>	<p>ES Volume I – Chapter 21: Climate Change (Document Ref. 6.2.21).</p>
<p>Lack of detail regarding the estimated quantities of spoil likely to be produced by the tunnelling</p>	<p>Tabulated information is now provided on the expected and worst case quantities of spoil from</p>	<p>ES Volume I - Chapter 5: Construction Programme and</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
<p>works and insufficient information regarding its storage and disposal. It was noted that this information was requested in the Secretary of State’s Scoping Opinion. The Inspectorate considers that provision of sufficient information regarding the estimated quantities, storage and disposal of spoil from the tunnelling works as part of the DCO application, is necessary to enable a robust assessment and examination of the significant environmental effects resulting from the use of natural resources and the disposal of waste.</p>	<p>tunnelling works and how this will be managed including where possible its beneficial reuse within the Site to create the development platform.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is clarified that Chapter 16: Traffic and Transportation and Appendix 16A: Transportation Assessment have assessed a worst case in terms of HGV movements which includes those associated with transporting spoil for offsite treatment of disposal (if required).</p> <p>Requirement 18 (Construction traffic management plan) requires a construction traffic management plan to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Highways England and the highway authority, before commencement, save for permitted preliminary works. The plan submitted and approved must be in accordance with the updated Chapter 16: Traffic and Transportation of the ES (Document Ref. 6.2.16) and the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan in the ES (Document Ref. 6.4.37).</p>	<p>Management (Documents Ref. 6.2.5) paragraphs 5.3.71 – 5.3.81 and Box 5-2.</p> <p>ES Volume III - Appendix 5A: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document Ref. 6.4.5) Paragraphs 5.5.1 to 5.5.8 and 5.7 (Table 5A-2).</p> <p>ES Volume I - Chapter 16: Traffic and Transportation (Document Ref. 6.2.16) paragraph 16.6.4.</p> <p>ES Volume III -Appendix 16A: Transportation Assessment (Document Ref. 6.4.36) paragraphs 16.6.27 – 16.6.29.</p> <p>ES Volume III - Appendix 24C: Statement of Combined Effects, Table 24C-4 (Document Ref. 6.4.48)</p> <p>Draft DCO – Schedule 2 (Requirement 18) (Document Ref. 2.1).</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
		<p>Explanatory Memorandum - paragraphs 3.8.55 (Document Ref. 2.2).</p>
<p>Omission of information from the Flood Risk Assessment ('FRA') relevant to the baseline characteristics of the receiving environment, its relationship with the Proposed Development and the forecasting methods used to identify and assess effects on the environment. These omissions from the FRA, detailed as follows, create uncertainty in the findings of ES Chapter 9: Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources, which is supported by information presented in the FRA. There was also a lack of evidence in the FRA or ES to demonstrate agreement with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority on the approach taken in this regard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Inspectorate noted that whilst the main generating site is in Flood Zone 1, the information failed to address whether components identified within Flood Zone 3, are in Flood Zone 3a or Flood Zone 3b. It was therefore unclear whether any additional flood mitigation/compensation (for example</li> </ul>	<p>ES Appendix 9A: Flood Risk Assessment has been amended to address PINS' comments. Furthermore, ES Chapter 9: Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources has been updated to reflect the amendments to the FRA. The updates do not change the conclusions of the FRA or the assessment of likely significant effects presented in ES Chapter 9.</p> <p>The updates comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification that the PCC Site is entirely within Flood Zone 1 and which parts of the Proposed Development are located within Flood Zones 2 and 3a.</li> <li>Clarification with reference to the relevant SFRAs that no areas of the Proposed Development are located within Flood Zone 3b.</li> <li>Clarity that both the Sequential Test and Exception Test have been applied and met.</li> </ul>	<p>ES Volume I - Chapter 9: Surface Water Flood Risk and Water Resources (Document Ref. 6.2.9)</p> <p>ES Appendix 9A: Flood Risk Assessment (Document Ref. 6.4.9) Paragraphs 9.1.4, 9.2.1 - 9.2.2. Annex B Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Maps for Redcar and Stockton.</p> <p>ES Appendix 9A: Flood Risk Assessment (Document Ref. 6.4.9) Annex A Consultation</p> <p>ES Volume I - Chapter 9: Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources (Document Ref. 6.2.9) Section 9.4: Paragraphs 9.4.103 – 9.4.29. Section 9.6: Construction: Paragraphs 9.6.26 – 9.6.31 Operation: Paragraphs 9.6.69 – 9.6.80</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
<p>in relation to floodplain storage) was required beyond that proposed and how this would be secured in the draft DCO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was unclear whether the sequential test had been applied to all Proposed Development components located within Flood Zone 3 – specifically – parts of the CO<sub>2</sub> export pipeline, the water discharge options, the temporary construction and laydown areas, natural gas pipeline and above ground installation (if the National Grid or Trafigura options are pursued). These components appeared to be located in areas which have not been allocated for energy development under the Local Plan and were therefore outside of the areas considered in the sequential test for the strategic flood risk assessment in the Local Plan Process. The Applicants were advised to explain how the sequential and exception tests have been applied to Proposed Development components within Flood Zone 3. Confirmation should be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>H++ calculations have been included to present a worst-case assessment of Flood Risk (having regard to the latest Climate Change data)</li> <li>Clarity on consultation that has been carried out to date with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority and confirmation that the Environment Agency does not consider that flood risk is a significant issue for the Proposed Development</li> <li>Clarity on the mitigation measures proposed, specifically for works outside Flood Zone 1, which are secured by the CEMP and Requirement 12 of the draft DCO.</li> </ul>	<p>ES Volume III - Appendix 5A: Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (Document Ref. 6.4.5) Table 5A-2.</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
<p>provided that the approach has been agreed with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority. If agreement cannot be reached, the FRA should be updated to demonstrate how the sequential and exception tests have been applied in relation to the whole of the development subject to the DCO application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no reference within the FRA to sensitivity testing based on the maximum credible scenarios - for example, using H++ climate change allowances for peak river flow and sea level rise (if required). The Applicants were advised to agree with the Environment Agency whether the maximum credible scenarios for climate change should be modelled, in line with the requirements of NPS EN-1 (paragraph 4.8.8). Unless otherwise agreed, sensitivity testing should be provided for fluvial and tidal sources.</li> </ul>		

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
<p>Figures depicting the locations of the Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, River Tweed SAC and Tweed Estuary SAC have not been provided, as required under APFP Regulation 5(2). In addition, the proposed gas pipeline and CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline under the River Tees are described as being located under bedrock below the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site. The extent of the Ramsar site in this area of the application site was not apparent from some of the figures in the application documents (e.g. Figure 3-4 in ES Volume II (Doc 6.3.5) and Figure 15-3 in ES Volume II (Doc 6.3.62)).</p>	<p>For clarity new figures in addition to those referenced have been prepared and are included in Appendix D of the Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (HRA) submitted with the Application. These include the following:</p> <p>Figure 1: Relevant European Sites within 15km</p> <p>Figure 2: Designated Sites (all those listed in the HRA Report which include all those referred to by PINs)</p> <p>Figure 3: Location of Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Ramsar in respect of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (Document Ref. 5.13) (Appendix D).</p> <p>Figures in Appendix D to the HRA (Document Ref. 5.13) are also cross-referenced in ES Volume I - Chapter 3 Description of the Existing Environment, Table 3-1.</p>
<p>The Works plans were difficult to decipher as differentiation between above ground and below ground hatching was unclear. The Inspectorate advised the Applicants to use graphic shading techniques that enable clear differentiation of each Works No.</p>	<p>The Works Plans have been amended to provide greater clarity in respect of the differentiation between the different works.</p>	<p>Works Plans (Document Ref. 4.4).</p>
<p>The Inspectorate commented that Figure 3-2 of the ES usefully clarifies the relationship between different “development areas”. To assist</p>	<p>Figure 3-2 Development Areas has been refined to show the location of the alternative development option routes for the Natural Gas Connection</p>	<p>Works Plans (Document Ref. 4.4)</p>

Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
<p>Interested Parties, the Inspectorate advised that a single works plan of a similar nature to Figure 3.2 is provided to demonstrate the inter-relationship between: the CO<sub>2</sub> Export pipeline; Natural Gas Connection Corridor; Electrical Connection Corridor; Water Discharge Corridor, and the CO<sub>2</sub> Gathering Network.</p>	<p>Corridor, the CO<sub>2</sub> Gathering Network and Water Connections Corridors. The two alternative Electrical Connection Routes within Work No. 3A are shown on ES Volume II - Figures, Figure 5-3.</p> <p>Additional clarification of the development options has been included in Chapter 4: Proposed Development. The Explanatory Memorandum also includes additional clarification of the development options and how the related environmental assessments have been tied into the DCO.</p> <p>The Works Plans show the areas within which each of the Work Nos. may be constructed. Where there is optionality in respect of Work No.2 (gas connection), Work No.3 (works for the export of electricity from Work No. 1A to the National Grid Electricity Transmission system), Work No. 5 (wastewater disposal works in connection with Work No. 1) and Work No. 6 (CO<sub>2</sub> gathering network), Requirement 3 provides an effective mechanism for ensuring the relevant planning authority will have the relevant details of the selected development option for approval, before substantive works are carried out. In respect of Work Nos. 1, 3 and 7, the submitted details must comply with the maximum parameters set out in</p>	



Issue/observation Impact	Summary of how this has been addressed	Where the information can be found/document reference
	Schedule 15 – those match the parameters used in the Environmental Statement (Document Ref No. 6.1 – 6.4) to assess the Proposed Development.	
The Requirement numbers in ES Appendix 25A: Commitments Register do not align with the Requirement numbers in the draft DCO.	The Requirement numbers within ES Appendix 25A: Commitments Register have been checked and updated so that these align with the draft DCO.	ES Volume III – Appendix 25A: Commitments Register (Document Ref. 6.4.49).
There were inconsistencies with reference to the storage for captured carbon in the ES, sometimes referred to as a suitable offshore geological storage site and in other places named as the Endurance saline aquifer.	It is proposed to store the captured CO <sub>2</sub> within the Endurance saline aquifer. References to “ <i>a suitable offshore geological storage site</i> ” mean the Endurance saline aquifer. It is not therefore considered necessary to amend the Application document in this respect.	N/A