



Appendix JJ Summary Issue Tables

Table A1 Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
PIL(s)	Person(s) with an Interest in Land
SoCC	Statement of Community Consultation
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Impact Report
DIL	Document Inspection Location
PINS	Planning Inspectorate



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding air quality

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 1.1 Issues raised regarding air quality** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 1.1 Issues raised regarding air quality

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ01	Local Community	Concern that particulates and nitrogen deposition will affect soil quality within the local area which is an important food growing area.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development, including from traffic and chimney emissions and their potential air quality impacts on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The assessment considered impacts on nitrogen and acid deposition (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)) on sensitive ecological receptors and concluded that the effects are not significant. Impacts from heavy metal deposition on land, were assessed (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)), concluding that potential effects are not significant.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain. The assessment concluded that potential effects are not significant.</p> <p>Therefore, the assessment has considered potential impacts from deposition on land for all relevant parameters as required by the regulator, the Environment Agency (EA).</p>
AQ02	Local Community	Concern that pollutants such as PCPs, cannot be mitigated against as there are no safe levels.	<p>The HHRA assessment (Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) has considered Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins, polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs, Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) as B(a)P in line with Environment Agency's 'Air emissions risk assessment for your</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ03	Local Community Cambridgeshire County Council Wisbech Town Council	Concern that air pollution from an increase in traffic will affect the local community's health and well-being, specifically young people.	<p>environmental permit guidance'. Therefore, the assessment has considered the relevant persistent environmental pollutants.</p> <p>Pentachlorophenol (PCP) is not considered relevant to this assessment. PCP is listed as a priority substance and warrant monitoring in the European Water Framework Directive and therefore regulated as part of emissions to water. In addition, according to the UK's National Atmospheric Emission Inventory in the last 30 years emissions of PCP have reduced by 70%. PCP is currently banned, and it's use restricted in many countries.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic and its potential air quality impacts on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>
AQ04	Local Community	Opposition to the proposed development due to effects on air quality from an increase in smell, toxins and particulates that cannot be mitigated.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including odour and air quality have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>Detailed dispersion modelling has been included as part of the Air Quality assessment, including traffic and chimney modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives for a series of pollutants including metals and particulate matter, set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., dust) • Operational Odour Management Plan
AQ05	Local Community Walsoken Parish Council South Wootton Parish Council	Concern that the proposed development will be located on the south west side of the Wisbech causing pollution to be blown across the town.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including air quality within Wisbech have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>Detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken, including traffic and chimney modelling. The assessment has considered five-years of meteorological data and therefore considered the potential for emissions to be dispersed over Wisbech. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>
AQ06	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development will only add to the current poor local air quality from the existing factories within Wisbech.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including air quality within Wisbech have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>Detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken, including traffic and chimney modelling, demonstrating acceptable levels of impacts. The assessment has considered emissions from neighbouring industrial facilities as part of the baseline, which included a monitoring survey. The assessment concludes the significance of effect from the Proposed Development is negligible.</p>
AQ07	Local Community	Opposition to the proposed development due to its proximity to residential areas and local schools and the effects on air quality.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including modelling the potential air quality impacts on sensitive receptors, including schools and residential areas, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ08	Local Community Cambridge Friends of the Earth Cambridgeshire County Council Wisbech Town Council Fascinating Fens Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern that air pollution from an increase in traffic will affect the local community's health and well-being, specifically those with asthma and young people.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic and its potential air quality impacts on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health and concluded the significance of effect is negligible.</p>
AQ09	Local Community	Opposition to the proposed development due to their being no safe levels of particulates as identified by the World Health Organisation.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with particulates have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic and chimney modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation, with regards to particulate</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			pollution. In addition, it should be noted that the EfW CHP Facility is unlikely to emit ultrafine particles considering the fabric filter system, and the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) used to define emissions or particles was based on total particulate matter.
AQ10	Local Community Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk PIL	Concerns about the location of the proposed development due to its proximity to residential areas and local schools and the effects on air quality.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic and its potential air quality impacts on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>
AQ11	Local Community	Concerns that as with the EfW site in Plymouth the proposed development will not operate within its set limits for emissions effecting air quality and the community of Wisbech.	<p>MVV have a proven track record of safely operating EfW facilities in the UK.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p>
AQ12	Local Community	Request for clarification regarding the percentage of emissions which will come from the plant, compared to the current local area emissions.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including background air quality within the local area have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) presents the percentage process contribution from the Proposed Development from traffic and chimney emissions. The percentage values vary according to the receptor location and the pollutant under consideration.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ13	Local Community	Request confirmation that there will be no harmful particulates emitted from the proposed development.	<p>It is worth noting that the current background is included in the ES, informed by publicly available data and a site specific monitoring.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with particulates have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic and chimney modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation, with regards to particulate pollution. In addition, the ELVs used to define emissions was based on total particulates rather than a specific fraction.</p>
AQ14	Local Community	Concern that the air quality assessment relies too heavily on a comparison with current emissions, which are mostly vehicle emissions in the local area.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with background levels have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The methodology employed in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes predicted impacts from both traffic and chimney emissions. It also considered current baseline levels. The significance of impacts was assessed against the IAQM criteria, which is the industry standard. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>
AQ15	Local Community	Concern about the effects of the proposed development on Kings Lynn in relation to Air Quality.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with air quality have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The assessment presented in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) considered human and ecological receptors in line with the EA guidance 'Air Emissions Risk Assessment'. The receptors likely to experience the highest concentrations were modelled and these included receptors in proximity to the chimneys and receptors along the road links likely to experience the highest</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ16	Local Community	Request for clarification as to how many hours per year each of the following pollutants will be monitored for, PM _{2.5} , PCBs, Dioxins, Arsenic, Mercury, Lead, Chromium and Cadmium.	<p>increase in traffic due to the Proposed Development. The assessment concludes the significance of effect at the receptors likely to experience the highest concentrations is negligible, therefore those further afield too would experience negligible concentrations. consequently, the assessment concludes the significance of effect on air quality is negligible.</p> <p>Total particulate matter, of which PM_{2.5} is a component, will be monitored continuously using the Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems (CEMS) on each chimney.</p> <p>All other pollutants listed will be monitored periodically. For the first 12 months of operation, monitoring will take place every quarter, moving to every 6 months from the second year of operation. Periodic monitoring would be undertaken by an accredited test team certified to BS EN ISO/IEC 17025 under the Environment Agency's Monitoring Certification Scheme (MCERTS). Prior to any periodic sampling being carried out, a site specific protocol (SSP) will be developed by the test team under MCERTS requirements. The SSP will determine the minimum sampling time based on factors such as the sampling rate and limit of detection of the monitoring method. However, for mercury, lead, chromium and cadmium, the sampling time is typically in a range between 1 – 8 hours and for dioxins and PCBs in a range between 6 – 8 hours for each periodic test.</p> <p>These monitoring arrangements reflect the legal requirements in the Industrial Emissions Directive (2010/75/EU) and Commission Implementing Decision 2019/2010 (as implemented in the UK) establishing the best available techniques (BAT) conclusions for waste incineration.</p> <p>In addition to the stack emissions, a range of other process operating parameters will be monitored continuously (e.g., furnace temperature and oxygen content) to demonstrate the Facility is operating optimally to ensure limit values for all emissions in the permit are met.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ17	Local Community	Request for clarification as to the maximum permitted weight [in Kilograms] which could lawfully be discharged annually for each of the following pollutants: Arsenic, Lead, Cadmium, Mercury, Chromium, Cobalt, Nickel and Vanadium.	Process emissions and operational scenarios considered for the air emissions assessment are reported in Section 4.2 Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) .
AQ18	Local Community	Request for clarification as to what make and model of particulate filters does MVV intend to use.	High quality, temperature-resistant filter bags of Polytetrafluorethylene (PTFE) and Polyimide (PI) needle felt construction with a PTFE coating will be installed. In the Applicant's experience, these filter bags are highly efficient, durable and reliable, providing a long service life. The exact make and model will not be known until the detailed design stage.
AQ19	Local Community	Request for clarification as to what is the intended particulate filter's efficiency of trapping PM _{2.5} particles.	<p>Filter bag manufacturers do not provide efficiency figures. However, the removal efficiency for PM_{2.5} is expected to be better than 99.9%.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. Continuous emissions monitoring includes particulate matter (total dust including PM_{2.5}).</p>
AQ20	Local Community	If the plant is operating at full capacity, what would be the annual discharge for Oxides of Nitrogen.	Process emissions and operational scenarios considered for the air emissions assessment are reported in Section 4.2 Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) .
AQ21	Local Community	Please provide a copy of your emissions modelling map showing the predicted deposition concentrations for: Arsenic, lead, Cadmium, Mercury and Chromium.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development included a quantitative assessment of metal deposition on human receptor locations, representing the location of the maximum impact. These potential impacts have been assessed based on a worst-case scenario and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The assessment concluded that there is no exceedance of the maximum deposition rates.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ22	Local Community	Concern that the emissions from the proposed development will contaminate the surrounding Fenlands including the Welney Wetlands, the Wash and other sites of importance.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emission impacts to the surrounding fenland environment including designated and undesignated biodiversity have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) has assessed the potential impacts and concluded the significance of effect on the local environment or Internationally designated sites is negligible.</p>
AQ23	Local Community	Within the design of the Incinerator has MVA considered that the EfW plant will need to be upgraded to meet lower emission and particulate levels when they are introduced.	The EfW CHP Facility will be designed to comfortably achieve the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) defined in the environmental permit. If lower ELVs are required in the future, upgrades and adjustments will be made as necessary and within the timescales agreed with the Environment Agency.
AQ24	Local Community	Concern that emissions from the incinerator stack are being oversimplified by the developer and that emissions extend much further than just carbon dioxide and steam as suggested.	ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) has assessed all prescribed pollutants likely to be present within the chimney emissions. The assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.
AQ25	Local Community	Concern that the proposed high tech filter system is not fit for purpose.	The proposed filter achieves the performances necessary to obtain and maintain an environmental permit which would be issued by the Environment Agency before the EfW CHP Facility could begin to operate.
AQ26	Local Community	Concern about an increase in air pollution due to construction traffic and materials to be used during the construction period.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including air pollution during the construction phase have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>Assessment of construction traffic (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)) is included within the ES demonstrating that impacts are not significant. In addition, a construction dust assessment was also undertaken to inform the level of mitigation measures required. These measures are included in the Outline CEMP, Appendix A: Dust mitigation measures (Volume 7.12). The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) also includes mitigation measures to address</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			any potential impacts from the use of construction plant (non- road mobile machinery) to ensure any effects are negligible.
AQ27	Local Community	Concern that the extent of particulate emissions cannot be adequately assessed until the height of the chimney is confirmed.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions from the chimney have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) reports the chimney height modelling that was used to define an acceptable height to ensure adequate dispersion. The proposed height is no lower than 84m above finished floor level (FFL) and no higher than 90m above FFL.</p>
AQ28	Local Community	Concern about the pollutants from the chimney and the monitoring of emissions over the longer term	Monitoring would be undertaken as part of the regulatory requirements secured under the Environmental Permit and regulated by the Environment Agency. The monitoring will be defined by the environmental permit and apply for the durations of operations.
AQ29	Local Community	Request for additional information to identify what ongoing monitoring of AQ levels at Thomas Clarkson school will be implemented given that baseline monitoring has been undertaken.	The baseline for the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) has been informed by the continuous air quality monitoring station located within the grounds of the Thomas Clarkson Academy. The assessment has considered seven-month data from the survey that commenced in June 2021. The collected data were annualised, using the Defra's LAQM guidance so the data are reflective of a 12 month period.
AQ30	Local Community	Concern that any dust or additional heat will likely have an effect on the air filtration systems and the cooling systems in other local businesses near to the site of the proposed development.	The EfW CHP Facility includes high efficiency bag filters to remove particulates. ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) reports the chimney height modelling that was used to define an acceptable height to ensure adequate dispersion. This will ensure that emissions are diluted sufficiently to avoid impacts upon people and upon the operations, including air filtration and cooling systems, of local businesses.
AQ31	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concerned about the production and dispersal of dioxins and related compounds from the proposed incinerator.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including production and dispersal of dioxins and related compounds have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ32	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concerned with Cadmium emissions and other notably toxic heavy metals such as lead, arsenic and mercury.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) provides the HHRA. This assessment was completed (amount other matters) to assess bioaccumulation of dioxins and their potential effect on health.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ33	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concerns about the potential for potentially harmful concentrations of cadmium (and other metals such as lead and arsenic) to accumulate in the environment (particularly the soil) surrounding the proposed incinerator over its lifespan.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions of metal and related compounds have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concluded the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including baseline levels and emissions of metal and related compounds over the EfW CHP Facility's lifetime have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) included detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.
AQ34	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern about the cumulative impact of the ongoing addition of cadmium to the environment over a long period leading to the accumulation of significant, potentially highly toxic, concentrations in the surrounding environment.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including baseline levels and emissions of metal and related compounds over the EfW CHP Facility's lifetime have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concluded the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ35	PIL	Concern that Crown's factory fresh air intake and extract fans do not have filter elements, therefore breathing air quality could be compromised.	The EfW CHP Facility includes high efficiency bag filters to remove particulates. Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) reports the chimney height modelling that was used to define an acceptable height to ensure adequate dispersion. This will ensure that emissions are diluted sufficiently to avoid impacts upon people and upon the operations, including air filtration systems, of local businesses.
AQ36	Local Community	Concern that persistent organic pollutants (POPs), such as halogenated POPs and PFOAs need considerably higher temperatures (up to 1200°C) than the minimum working temperature of 850°C.	Combustion chamber temperatures are expected to be in the range of 850°C to 1100°C with temperatures on average, in the range of 950°C to 1050°C for optimum selective non-catalytic reduction efficiency. 850°C is the minimum temperature defined in the Industrial Emissions Directive and actual temperatures should always far exceed this.
AQ37	Local Community	Consideration should be given to any emitted pollutants where no limits are currently set.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including proxy assumptions where there are no pollution levels set have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ38	Local Community	Concern that consideration has not been given to checking for breakdown products from emerging pollutants such as PFOA which is known to be present in general household waste.	<p>The assessment has considered assessment criteria where available and acceptable proxy alternatives. These are detailed in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) is classed as a Water Framework Directive priority hazardous substance and as a ubiquitous persistent, bio-accumulative and toxic substance. Releases to the environment arise mainly from the use, washing and disposal of consumer products previously treated with PFOS related substances. Waste water treatment works (WwTWs) are a significant source of PFOS to the environment. Its use in fire training and major incidents has also resulted in historical contamination of soil, groundwater and surface water (Source: Environment Agency, 2019 - Perfluoro octane sulfonate (PFOS) and related substances: sources, pathways and environmental data).</p> <p>It is evident from the above that PFOA main source of emissions is WwTWs and therefore this pollutant is regulated through the Water Framework Directive. PFOA is not included as a pollutant in the EA guidance 'Air Emissions Risk Assessment' and therefore has not been considered in the air quality assessment.</p>
AQ39	Local Community	Concern that the proposals breach government limits for carbon emissions set for power plants.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including carbon emissions have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, in ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2); the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ40	CPRE	Suggestion that the assessment in the PEIR that air quality impacts are not significant is incorrect due to there not being an identifiable threshold below which PM _{2.5} would not pose a risk.	<p>reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions particulate matter have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ41	CPRE	Concern that the deposition and build up in soils of the fallout from the proposed development and the deposition onto the leaves of crops has not been considered.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including nitrogen and acid disposition have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The assessment considered impacts on nitrogen and acid deposition (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)) on sensitive ecological receptors and concluded that the effects are not significant. Impacts from heavy metal deposition on land, were assessed (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)), concluding that potential effects are not significant.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain, concluding that potential effects are not significant.</p> <p>Therefore, the assessment has considered potential impacts from deposition on land for all relevant parameters as required by the regulator, the Environment Agency (EA).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ42	CPRE	Suggestion that greater consideration be given to the deposition and airborne emission concentrations of toxic metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons as recommended in Directive 2004/107/EC.	<p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including nitrogen and acid disposition have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The assessment considered impacts on nitrogen and acid deposition (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)) on sensitive ecological receptors and concluded that the effects are not significant. Impacts from heavy metal deposition on land, were assessed (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)), concluding that potential effects are not significant.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain, concluding that potential effects are not significant.</p> <p>Therefore, the assessment has considered potential impacts from deposition on land for all relevant parameters as required by the regulator, the Environment Agency (EA).</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ43	CPRE	Concern about the potential risk of cadmium and nickel emissions from processing discarded batteries that cannot be easily separated from the proposed waste stream.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions of metal and related compounds have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			The assessment has considered potential emissions of cadmium and nickel from the EFW CHP Facility chimney, including metal deposition on land. The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.
AQ44	Public Health England	Support for the inclusion of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and mitigation measures to minimise air pollution.	Support noted. an Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) accompanies the DCO submission.
AQ45	Natural England	Satisfied that the details provided within the PEIR's chapter 8 Air Quality, Table 8.28, and Appendix 8B paragraph 1.1.23, that as the distances involved and predicted levels being less than 1% of the critical load, there is unlikely to be a significant effect to the Nene Washes and Ouse Washes SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites.	The satisfaction that there is unlikely to be a significant effect to the Nene Washes and Ouse Washes SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites is noted.
AQ46	Fenland District Council	Concern about the impact of increased traffic movements on routes with existing high volumes of traffic on local air quality.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic, its potential future growth and local air emissions have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ47	Huntingdonshire District Council	Satisfied that the proposed development would not lead to significant adverse impacts or national air quality breach in Huntingdonshire.	The satisfaction that the Proposed Development would not lead to significant adverse impacts or national air quality breach in Huntingdonshire is noted.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ48	Fenland District Council Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern about the increase in traffic movement and its effect on the air quality.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic, its potential future growth and local air emissions have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ49	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern about the emissions associated with construction and operation of the facility affecting the population in the area, who has a higher level of asthma and COPD levels compared to the rest of Cambridgeshire.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions generated during construction and operation on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling and consideration of sensitive receptors to predict potential impacts on human receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>
AQ50	Fenland District Council Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the impact of the proposals on air quality in the local area.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including local air quality impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling and consideration of sensitive receptors to predict potential impacts on human receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ51	Fenland District Council	Concern about the potential for dust and odour emissions from the proposed development to result in complaints received alleging statutory nuisance.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including odour and dust have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>Detailed dispersion modelling has been included as part of the Air Quality assessment, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives for a series of pollutants including metals and particulate matter, set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., dust and provide a complaints procedure); and • Operational Odour Management Plan
AQ52	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that the Odour Management Plan include details of mitigation measures in place during normal and abnormal operating conditions.	This suggestion has been noted and will be considered during permitting.
AQ53	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that the Odour Management Plan include confirmation that all vehicles delivering/removing material be sheeted at all times.	<p>The Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) confirms deliveries of waste feedstock and consumables, and the removal of residues, are undertaken by road in enclosed heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>The detailed Odour Management Plan will be secured by the DCO.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ54	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that the Odour Management Plan include details of how complaints received will be recorded and investigated.	<p>The Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) includes a complaints reporting procedure.</p> <p>The detailed Odour Management Plan will be secured by the DCO.</p>
AQ55	Wisbech Council	Complaint that the NTS is not clear what baseline data has been used to determine the likely significant effects, as the NTS states that additional air quality data is currently still being collected at several locations.	<p>The PEIR (referred to) was based on information available at that time. For the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2), the baseline information has been updated and includes recent monitoring data collected by local authorities and the Applicant specifically for the Proposed Development.</p>
AQ56	Wisbech Council	Concern about the proposal's effect on air quality given Wisbech's air quality is already poor.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including air quality within Wisbech has been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ57	Wisbech Council	Complaint that there is a lack of baseline traffic data which would have an effect on the air quality assessment.	<p>The PEIR (referred to) was based on information available at that time. For the ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), the baseline information has been updated and includes traffic counts undertaken in 2021. The date and time of these surveys was agreed with the Highways Authority. Furthermore, the traffic baseline for the Proposed Development has been agreed with National Highways and the Highways Authority.</p> <p>The latest information considered in ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transportation (Volume 6.2) has been used to inform ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2). ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2), concluded the significance of effect of the Proposed Development is negligible.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ58	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that no reference is made to odour in the NTS, despite acknowledgement that it cannot be concluded that significant odour impact would not occur.	<p>The PEIR (referred to) was based on information available at that time.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including odour has been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes consideration of odour and the assessment concluded the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible. However, to suitably manage potential odour during operations, an Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) accompanies the DCO submission.</p> <p>The detailed Odour Management Plan will be secured by the DCO.</p>
AQ59	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern about the generation and dispersion of dioxins among other chemicals which will be produced from the proposed incinerator.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including production and dispersal of dioxins and related compounds have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation,</p> <p>ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4) provides the HHRA. this assessment was completed (amount other matters) to assess bioaccumulation of dioxins and their potential effect on health. It concluded that potential effects are no significant.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concluded the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ60	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the incinerators won't work at high enough temperatures to combust the	As required by the Industrial Emissions Directive, the EfW CHP Facility will ensure that, even under the most unfavourable conditions, a minimum flue gas temperature of 850°C and a dwell time of two seconds is maintained. This will



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		feedstock without producing dioxins among other compounds.	ensure that dioxins are destroyed in the combustion chamber. Some reforming of dioxins is unavoidable as the flue gas cools towards the boiler outlet and to minimise this, the flue gas will be rapidly cooled and follow a torturous path. Prior to the filter bags, activated carbon will be injected which will adsorb the majority of dioxins that are reformed and ensure that the emissions meet the limits defined in the environmental permit.
AQ61	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the increased number of HGVs movements will impact on health and wellbeing.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic and its potential air quality impacts on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>
AQ62	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that it is only a fraction of the chemicals emitted from the combustion process that are measured continuously while other compounds are spot checked, meaning contamination spikes may be missed. Thereby contamination spikes may be missed.	The environmental permit to be issued to the EfW CHP Facility will stipulate the monitoring requirements and would be informed by the environmental permitting regulations. The requirements will take account of the risks relative to different pollutants.
AQ63	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the area of Wisbech would end up being listed as a zone where the target values for arsenic, cadmium, nickel or benzo(a)pyrene is exceeded.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions of metal and related compounds have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			The ES Air Quality assessment concluded the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.
AQ64	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that a justification be provided as to why the two Air Quality Management Areas in King's Lynn were not considered in air dispersion modelling in PEIR Chapter 8.	The road links considered in the traffic emissions modelling were informed by the IAQM indicative screening criteria that stipulate Annual Average Daily Traffic thresholds for undertaking a detailed assessment. As such, traffic associated with the Proposed Development along the two Air Quality Management Areas in King's Lynn is below the IAQM indicative screening criteria.
AQ65	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Request for clarification on why the 15km impact area has been chosen and whether it takes into account the topography of the area.	The EA guidance 'Air Emission Risk Assessment' stipulates the extent of the assessment area. In this case, it is set to 15km, due to the size and nature of emissions from the EFW CHP Facility,
AQ66	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the assessment that air quality impacts on Clenchwarton are insignificant is inaccurate due to existing health impacts on the area from Sahara sand.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including background concentrations have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling and background concentrations of particulates have been included inclusive of current levels and therefore transboundary transport of particulates is accounted for. Transboundary transport of particulates can have a much higher effect on particulate concentrations at ground level than that which would be expected from the Proposed Development given the emission controls and chimney height. The ES Air Quality assessment concluded the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
AQ67	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the assessment of air quality impacts have not considered the local geography and topography.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including local geography and topography have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling which accounts for local geography and topography. The ES Air</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			Quality assessment concluded the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.
AQ68	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that air quality impacts could be experienced further afield due to the low-lying and open nature of the area.	The spatial scope of the assessment is 15 km and was informed by the requirements set by the EA. The air dispersion modelling considered land uses as part of the model inputs and has therefore accounted for the low-lying and open nature of the area. The results presented in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) represent the worst case effects and therefore any effects further afield will be significantly lower and therefore do not require assessment.
AQ69	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the cumulative impact on air quality taking into account the local geography should be assessed.	<p>The air quality assessment has considered land use (i.e., surface roughness) when undertaking dispersion modelling of chimney and traffic emissions. As the area is relatively flat, no terrain was applied. The future traffic used in the dispersion modelling is inclusive of plans and projects and as such the assessment has considered local geography when assessing cumulative impacts from projects and plans.</p> <p>As detailed in ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2), there are no significant combustion sources that require consideration as part of the chimney modelling. Thus, demonstrating that the overall cumulative assessment has considered relevant geography, where appropriate.</p>
AQ70	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that particulates emitted will not be captured or monitored.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility includes high efficiency bag filters to remove particulates. Filter bag manufacturers do not provide efficiency figures, however, the removal efficiency for PM_{2.5} is expected to be better than 99.9%.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and will require the operator to continuously monitor total dust (particulates) and submit results to the EA.</p>
AQ71	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that an assessment of stack emissions in the event of a mechanical or filter failure be undertaken.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including abnormal operations have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ72	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the data gathered has only been conducted since June 2021 while the remaining data is modelled. This should have been continuously measured full-time.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) assesses potential impacts during abnormal operations. An abnormal operation could be, for example, a failure of a bag filter or mechanical failure of a lime dosing system. The assessment of these abnormal (short lived) operations concluded that the impacts on human receptors are not significant.</p> <p>Since PEIR, the suite of baseline data collected from the Applicant's diffusion tube monitoring of background NOx and continuous monitoring of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} has extended to 14 and 11 months respectively. This level of background data acquired by the Applicant and supplemented by existing library data from other sources, such as Defra and Fenland District Council, is considered comprehensive and consequently suitable to provide baseline information to undertake the Air Quality Assessment for the Proposed Development, reported in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2).</p>
AQ73	Steve Barclay MP	Suggestion that predicted emissions reductions generated by the facility displacing other forms of energy generation are significantly lower than that presented in the PEIR.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including carbon emissions have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, in ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. Further sensitivity assessment of carbon emissions associated with the Proposed Development is included in the ES, which includes consideration of emissions factors for the overall UK grid and future decarbonisation of the electricity supplies. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ74	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that graphical depictions of plume modelling be provided.	Visualisations of the potential plume's visibility are provided in ES Figure 9.6: Visible Plume ZTV (Volume 6.3) .
AQ75	Steve MP Barclay	Request for information on when results of modelling incorporating ongoing air quality modelling will be made available for consultation.	<p>The suite of baseline data collected from the Applicant's diffusion tube and continuous monitoring station are incorporated into the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>No further rounds of pre-application consultation are proposed. However, if the Proposed Development is accepted from Examination by PINS, stakeholders and the public are able to register as interested parties and submit their comments to PINS.</p>
AQ76	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on why meteorological equipment was not deployed to ensure air quality modelling was underpinned by robust data.	<p>In order to undertake a robust air quality assessment, five years of ratified meteorological data is required for air dispersion modelling.</p> <p>The dispersion model used five years of hourly sequential meteorological data from the Met Office's Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) model interpolated for the specific location of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The nearest synoptic weather station that provides model-quality monitored meteorological data is located at RAF Marham, approximately 27km to the east of Wisbech. Due to this distance, data from this station may not be representative of conditions within Wisbech and therefore NWP data have been used in this assessment.</p> <p>Therefore, deploying a local meteorological station would not have been appropriate or provide the necessary information.</p>
AQ77	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the proposal's increase in HGV movements, construction, and emissions are likely to decrease the air quality significantly.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including HGV movements during operation and construction and their impact on air quality been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives for a series of pollutants including metals and particulate matter, set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which includes a Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p>
AQ78	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for an independent review of the Air Quality and Noise Impact Assessment.	<p>During pre-application discussions with the Host Authorities, CCC decided to employ an independent air quality consultant (Air Quality Consultants) to review and agree the approach and methodology to the Applicant's Air Quality Assessment. Further details of the pre-application engagement are summarised in ES Appendix 8A: Stakeholder engagement and consultation comments on Air Quality (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>With regard to noise, the Applicant followed industry guidelines and best practice and has consulted FDC and KLWN's EHO to review and agree the approach and methodology to noise. Further details of the pre-application engagement are summarised in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2).</p>
AQ79	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to monitor the air quality in a number of pre-specified points prior to construction, during construction, and during operation, so if emissions go above a pre-agree point, construction or operation would have to stop until it is remedied.	<p>During the pre-application process, the Applicant has been working with the Host Authorities to agree a local air quality monitoring scheme. The scheme is subject to agreement, but likely to include diffusion tube monitoring in and around the Proposed Development and be installed 1 year prior to and 4 years post operation.</p>
AQ80	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that Table 8.4 in chapter 8 of the PEIR, incorrectly referenced the 2014 version	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) has been updated accordingly.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		of IAQM Construction Dust Guidance, as there is an updated version from 2016.	
AQ81	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to review the selected receptors prior to completing the ES to ensure they include any newly introduced or proposed receptors.	<p>During pre-application discussions with the Host Authorities, CCC employed an independent air quality consultant (Air Quality Consultants) to review and agree the approach and methodology, including identifying selected sensitive receptors to the Applicant's Air Quality Assessment. Further details of the pre-application engagement are summarised in ES Appendix 8A: Stakeholder engagement and consultation comments on Air Quality (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>The ES has considered a wider road network compared to the PEIR and therefore additional receptors have been considered along the road links added as part of the updated traffic emission modelling.</p>
AQ82	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the boundaries of the designated ecological sites are not clearly shown within chapter 8 of the PEIR, so it is not possible to know whether the ecological receptors are in the worst-case locations.	Table 8B4.8: Ecological receptor points in ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) provides the grid references of the points used in the dispersion model.
AQ83	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied with the approach to Honington House Farm CWS within the air quality assessment if traffic flows adjacent to it also fall below relevant criteria.	Comment noted.
AQ84	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the ES to include all roads within 200m of receptors in the road traffic model to ensure that total predicted environmental concentrations are representative of actual conditions.	A larger road network was modelled in this assessment based on traffic counts undertaken in 2021. Receptors within 200m from the affected roads have been considered.
AQ85	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the ES to give consideration to monitoring sites alongside the wider network and those included in the project specific monitoring survey.	The assessment considered all relevant monitoring sites managed by the relevant local authorities. The ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) presents the results of the monitoring survey as well as a summary of the local monitoring sites.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ86	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that it is not clear how the adjustment factor of 1.50, stated in Appendix 8B of the PEIR, was derived.	The ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) presents the results of the monitoring survey as well as a summary of the local monitoring sites.
AQ87	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to ensure that the traffic input data presented in Table 8B.5 models additional HDV traffic and HGVs.	Full details on traffic data inputs are presented in Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) . Table 8B7.5 presents a breakdown of traffic associated with the Proposed Development into %cars, % LGVs, % HGVs and % of Bus and Coach.
AQ88	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide justification for each of the Air Quality Assessment Levels used in the assessment, such as those in tables 8.2.8 and 8.29 in chapter 8 of the PEIR.	The assessment has considered the relevant AQAL levels, that are either legally binding standards/objectives or are included in the EA's air emission risk assessment methodology. Table 8B2.4 Air Quality Standards, Objectives and Environmental Assessment Levels (Volume 6.4) presents the applicable AQAL and identifies whether they form part of the UK's Air Quality Strategy (i.e. AQO) or whether they are part of the EA (i.e. EAL) air emission risk assessment methodology. Both AQOs and EALs need to be considered for industrial installations that require an Environment Permit.
AQ89	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to review and adjust NO ₂ diffusion tube monitoring data from Table 8.6 in chapter 8 of the PEIR, in order to account for normal conditions as the presented data was collected during the Covid-19 pandemic.	<p>A bespoke monitoring survey was undertaken, and the data collected used to define the baseline. The assessment has utilised the 2021 monitoring survey data in their verification exercise, presented in Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>In addition, a report by AQC, '<i>Trends in UK NO_x and NO₂ Concentrations through the COVID-19 Pandemic: January 2022</i>', reported that since autumn 2020 traffic flows have either matched or exceeded those seen prior to the pandemic, particularly for goods vehicles. The average NO_x and NO₂ concentrations measured since autumn 2020 appear relatively low, driven most likely by longer-term changes to emissions, including turnover of the vehicle fleet, which have continued during the pandemic. The report concluded that it seems unlikely that these levels will be exceeded in the near future regardless of the resumption, or otherwise, of historic travel patterns. Therefore, the assessment has utilised an appropriate baseline.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ90	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Air Quality Management Areas shown in Figure 8.3 in Chapter 8 of the PEIR are not labelled, meaning it is not possible to distinguish the boundary of the NO2 AQMA to be retained from the boundaries of the PM10 and SO2 AQMAs that are going to be revoked.	This is addressed within the ES in the updated ES Figure 8.3: Modelled Receptors (Volume 6.3) .
AQ91	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide more information on stack heights within the ES, as the Graphics 8B.1 and 8B.2 in the PEIR are not clear on how the specific values are derived.	This is addressed within ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) where detailed calculations are presented.
AQ92	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that it is not clear whether the Predicted Environmental Concentrations presented in Table 8.27 and Appendix 8C of the PEIR include baseline emissions from road traffic.	Clarification included within the ES, refer to the results table in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) where it presents the in-combination process contribution.
AQ93	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the total Predicted Environmental Concentrations (background + roads (all traffic) + stack PC) should be considered in relation to the AQAL.	It has been considered as part of the ES, refer to ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) for the full set of results that includes total Predicted Environmental Concentrations (background + roads (all traffic) + stack PC) assessed in relation to the AQAL .
AQ94	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint about a number of discrepancies between the results presented in Table 8.27 in Chapter 8 of the PEIR and Appendix 8C.	The ES presents a revised assessment and there are no discrepancies between the results in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) .
AQ95	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the information, in Table 8.27 in Chapter 8 of the PEIR, is not consistent with the IAQM guidance referenced in Table 8.16.	The ES presents a revised assessment and there are no discrepancies between the results in in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) .
AQ96	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for information in Tables 8.30 and 8.31 in Chapter 8 of the PEIR to be clarified to show whether the nitrogen deposition rates	This is addressed within the ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) . The nitrogen deposition calculations are inclusive of the



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		include inputs from ammonia, and whether acid deposition includes the HCl contribution.	contribution from ammonia. The acid deposition calculations are inclusive of HCL contribution.
AQ97	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to consider potential in-combination impacts with other plans and projects at internationally designated biodiversity sites, as the conclusion stating insignificant effects on these sites fails to take these into account.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including cumulative impacts has been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The future traffic baseline as reflected within ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) included within the dispersion modelling is inclusive of plans and projects. Therefore, the assessment of impacts on internationally designated biodiversity sites concludes that effects will not be significant. The Applicant has also screened the application for HRA.</p>
AQ98	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to consider the impacts of any diesel generator plants, as requested by Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council in consultation of the EIA methodology.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including consideration of back-up diesel generators during the operational phase has been assessed and reported in the ES, specifically in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) .
AQ99	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to rigorously check all of the PEIR's model inputs and results presented prior to the ES, due to a number of errors reported in the results.	This suggestion has been noted. A full review of the PEIR results were undertaken. New chimney and traffic data were provided for the ES and the assessment was completely revised. In order to ensure the transcription of the results into the report and Appendix is correct, the results are also provided as an excel file.
AQ98	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied that enough information has been provided at this stage to understand the likely air quality impacts of the scheme.	Comment noted.
AQ100	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the proposed continuous monitoring of particulate emissions.	Support noted.
AQ101	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the road traffic model in the Environmental Statement should ensure that additional Heavy Duty Vehicles are modelled	This suggestion has been noted and is applied in Table 8B.D2 Traffic inputs for 2024 with Construction and 2027 with Development scenarios (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex D: Traffic Modelling)



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		as Heavy Goods Vehicles as HGVs transporting waste have different emission characteristics than buses.	(Volume 6.4)) presents HDVs as HGVs and Bus/Coach to ensure appropriate emission factors are applied.
AQ102	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that air quality modelling in the PEIR was incomplete and that errors were found upon review.	All results have been revised as part of the ES to consider revised chimney and traffic modelling inputs as well as addressing the remaining parameters that were not addressed during PEIR. These include emissions during abnormal operations, odour emissions during abnormal operations, metal deposition on land, and a HHRA. The results are presented in Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) .
AQ103	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the inclusion of River Nene County Wildlife Site, and the Ouse Washes and Nene Washes SAC/Ramsar sites as part of the modelled receptors in air quality modelling.	The assessment presented in Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) has considered all relevant biodiversity sites in line with the EA guidance on 'Air Emissions Risk Assessment'. River Nene County Wildlife Site, and the Ouse Washes and Nene Washes SAC/Ramsar sites have been considered in this assessment.
AQ104	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the assessment of 'no' likely significant effects in Table 8.26 in PEIR Chapter 8 is incorrect as the scheme will result in an increase in daily NOx levels on international designation receptors at this stage.	All results have been revised as part of the ES and the overall impacts on daily NOx levels on international designation receptors is not significant (Table 8.30: Impact to air quality at ecological Receptors at internationally designated biodiversity sites in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2))
AQ105	Walsoken Parish Council	Concern about the impacts of potential fallout and acid rain on residential and agricultural land.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including air emissions and impacts on to the surrounding environment have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) assessment includes detailed dispersion modelling to assess impacts on sensitive receptors and includes consideration of nitrogen and acid deposition. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
AQ106	Local Community	Please quantify the dioxin emissions this plant is expected to make annually.	<p>Nitrogen and acid deposition have been considered as part of the air dispersion modelling for emissions from traffic and chimneys.</p> <p>Process emissions and operational scenarios considered for the air emissions assessment are reported in Section 4.2 Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4).</p>



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding climate change

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 2.1. Issues raised regarding climate change** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 2.2 Issues raised regarding climate change

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC01	Local Community Cambridge Friends of the Earth Shampers Dog Grooming	Concern about the impact of carbon emissions from the proposed facility on national and international carbon emissions targets.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment. The GHG assessment reports a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 kilotonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (ktCO_{2e}) in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC02	Local Community PIL	Concern about the impact of carbon emissions from increased HGV and traffic movements on national and international carbon emissions targets.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and those associated with traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the GHG assessment indicates higher carbon emissions from transport in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. However, transport emissions represent approximately 3.4% of total emissions over the lifetime of the EfW CHP Facility and the assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO_{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets. The GHG assessment assumes worst-case emissions for transport emissions (i.e., diesel fuel). Transport related emissions will reduce in the future with a move to electrification of collection vehicles.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC03	Local Community	Concern that the project will not help to reduce net carbon emissions like other renewable energy sources.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that in comparison to renewable energy technologies, the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, comparing the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill, the GHG assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO_{2e}. Embedded mitigation measures to further reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have also been considered in the assessment.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.
CC04	Local Community Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Icon Engineering Ltd	Concern about increased carbon emissions resulting from the project and the impact on climate change.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC05	Local Community Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern that the project does not represent an effort to respond to climate change.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets. Embedded mitigation measures to further reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have also been considered in the assessment.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC06	Local Community	Concern that the local area will be flooded in future due to climate change and that the proposals do not aid this.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with flooding and climate change, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 12 Hydrology (Volume 6.2). Appendix 12A (Volume 6.4) presents the Applicant's a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).</p> <p>The FRA identifies the extent to which the EfW CHP Facility and surrounding area could be flooded and has included for a climate change allowance. The Proposed Development has been designed to respond to the results of the hydraulic modelling. With the provision of embedded mitigation, such as an agreed finished floor level of 3.0 m above ordnance datum (AOD) the assessment concludes that there will be no significant effects on hydrology receptors as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Resilience measures have been incorporated into the climate change resilience (CCR) assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2).</p>
CC07	Local Community Wisbech Town Council	Objection to the proposals due to increased carbon emissions from the facility.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO_{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without</p>
CC08	Local Community	Concern that the increased HGV movements arising from the project will result in increased carbon emissions.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC09	Local Community	Concern about increased carbon emissions arising from the proposed facility and resulting additional traffic movements.	Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets. Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.
CC10	Local Community	Concern that the proposed facility generates a higher level of carbon emissions than the energy that it outputs.	
CC11	Local Community Shampers Dog Grooming	Concern that the proposed facility undermines current efforts to reduce carbon emissions	
CC12	Local Community Cambridge Friends of the Earth Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern that the energy-from-waste process produces increased carbon emissions and exacerbates climate change	
CC13	Local Community	Opposition to increased carbon emissions from the facility on local agricultural land	
CC14	Local Community	Suggestion that the project should seek to reduce carbon emissions and the impact of climate change.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets. Embedded mitigation measures to further reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have also been considered in the assessment.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p> <p>Resilience measures have been incorporated into the CCR assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). The assessment demonstrates the effects of a changing climate on the Proposed Development, including how the design will mitigate the anticipated impacts of climate change.</p>
CC15	Local Community	Concern about the impact of increased carbon emissions from the facility on local agriculture and wildlife.	<p>ES Chapter 8 Air Quality includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health and considered nitrogen and acid disposition at sensitive wildlife sites, such the Ouse Washes. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
CC16	Local Community	Suggestion that efforts instead be made to dispose of waste or create energy without creating additional carbon emissions.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy than the alternative 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC17	Local Community	Concern that the proposed mitigation measures will not be effective with regards to carbon emissions.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and embedded mitigation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have been considered in the assessment. The EfW CHP Facility has been designed to allow the export of steam and electricity to surrounding business users. The Proposed Development also allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a carbon capture storage (CCS) facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.</p>
CC18	Local Community	Request for information on how many tonnes of Carbon Dioxide will be emitted from the facility per year at full capacity.	<p>ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) includes a GHG assessment. The GHG assessment estimates annual operational GHG emissions for the EfW CHP Facility of 283,812 tCO₂e. Allowing for avoided emissions for the</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC19	Local Community	Concern that there are no plans to offset the carbon emissions generated by the proposed facility.	<p>EfW CHP Facility to replace gas turbine electricity generation, the annual net emissions for the EfW CHP Facility are estimated to be 203,731 tCO_{2e}.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and embedded mitigation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have been considered in the assessment. The EfW CHP Facility has been designed to allow the export of steam and electricity to surrounding business users. The Proposed Development also allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.</p>
CC20	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV should ensure that construction and supply vehicles serving the facility are electric vehicles in order to ensure carbon neutrality.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and embedded mitigation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have been considered in the assessment. This includes consideration of low carbon technologies in construction and operation, which may include the use of electric vehicles where practicable.</p>
CC21	Local Community	Suggestion that carbon capture technology should be incorporated into the scheme.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and embedded mitigation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC22	Local Community	Concern about the impact of construction activities on carbon emissions.	<p>The Proposed Development allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including construction activities, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. Emissions from construction activities are estimated to be 51,708 tCO₂e, contributing to 0.6% of carbon emissions over the lifetime of the EfW CHP Facility. Embedded mitigation measures to further reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have also been considered in the assessment, including use of low carbon technologies and materials for construction.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC23	Local Community	Query as to whether the proposed development can be adapted to accommodate carbon capture technology.	<p>The Proposed Development allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.
CC24	Local Community	Query as to whether MVV would voluntarily carbon capture technology into the proposed development or wait for it to become a legal requirement.	The Proposed Development allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO ₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.
CC25	Local Community	Query as to whether MVV would make budget provision for the inclusion of carbon capture technology in the proposed development.	The Proposed Development allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO ₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system.
CC26	Local Community	Concern that carbon emissions from the facility will not be monitored.	All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring and reporting requirements for the facility. CO ₂ emissions from the EfW CHP Facility will be continuously monitored and recorded in accordance with the requirements of the EP.
CC27	Local Community	Concern about the impact of carbon emissions from the facility on local residents and the environment.	<p>ES Chapter 8 Air Quality includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation,</p> <p>The Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC28	Local Community	Concern about the impact of carbon emissions from the facility on lime mortar on residential properties.	Carbon concentrations will not change as a result of the Proposed Development to any measurable degree that could be associated with damage to buildings.
CC29	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV develop a non-incineration waste plant in order to cut carbon emissions.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts of the Proposed Development compared to landfilling residual waste, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy than the alternative 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill.</p>
CC30	Local Community	Concern that carbon capture technology will not be incorporated into the proposed development to minimise carbon emissions.	The Proposed Development allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO ₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.
CC31	CPRE	Concern that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) underestimates the climate change impacts of the proposed development.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC32	CPRE	Concern about increased carbon emissions resulting from the proposed development and the impact on climate change.	<p>reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. Appendix 14C of the ES includes further analysis to consider the sensitivity of avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility compared to increasing decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
			<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC33	CPRE	Concern that the PEIR falsely assumes that waste would end up on landfill if not handled within the proposed development.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy than the alternative 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill. The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) identifies that landfill disposal is the reasonable alternative for the management of residual waste proposed to be used at the EfW CHP Facility. The WFAA also identifies that some residual waste may be incorporated in exports of Refuse Derived Fuel but highlights that Refuse Derived Fuel exports have been reducing and</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC34	CPRE	Concern that the PEIR overstates the amount of methane generated by landfilled waste.	<p>government policy is on applying the proximity principle (i.e. managing waste at a location as close as reasonably possible to where waste is generated).</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment. The GHG assessment for landfill methane is based on independent reporting from Defra factors for UK landfills and Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) survey of waste composition. Further sensitivity assessment of carbon emissions associated with the biogenic carbon content of waste contributing to landfill methane is included in Appendix 14C of the GHG assessment.</p>
CC35	CPRE	Concern that the increased HGV movements arising from the project will result in increased carbon emissions.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and those associated with traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the GHG assessment indicates higher carbon emissions from transport in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. However, transport emissions represent approximately 3.4% of total emissions over the lifetime of the EfW CHP Facility and the assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The GHG assessment assumes worst-case emissions for transport emissions (i.e., diesel fuel). Transport related emissions will reduce in the future with a move to electrification of collection vehicles.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC36	Natural England	Support for the assessment of GHGs outline in PEIR Chapter 14 and the proposed embedded mitigation measures.	Support noted.
CC37	Natural England	Suggestion that the ES should reflect the principles set out in the England Biodiversity Strategy (from Defra) and identify how the development's effects on the natural environment will be influenced by climate change, and how ecological networks will be maintained.	The effect of land take/land cover change and fragmentation of habitat on sensitive biodiversity receptors has been assessed in the Biodiversity chapter of the ES, and land take has avoided nature conservation sites and other high quality habitats. The Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Strategy includes features designed to maintain and enhance ecological connectivity in line with the Natural Habitat Network and local strategies, and provide refugia and foraging habitats targeted to species found in the locality. The Proposed Development will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain and the biodiversity and landscape planting following the completion of the construction period will be subject to a 30-year maintenance period, the first five of which will ensure establishment of the planting.
CC38	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Opposition to incineration as it contributes to climate breakdown due to its impact on climate change.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO_{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC39	Wisbech Town Council	Suggestion to provide further clarification on what constitutes a 'reasonable worst case	The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy than the alternative 'without



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		scenario', as there are other future baseline scenarios which could be considered.	Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill. The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) identifies that landfill disposal is the reasonable alternative for the management of residual waste proposed to be used at the EfW CHP Facility. The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) also identifies that some residual waste may be incorporated in exports of Refuse Derived Fuel but highlights that Refuse Derived Fuel exports have been reducing and government policy is on applying the proximity principle (i.e. managing waste at a location as close as reasonably possible to where waste is generated).
CC40	Wisbech Council	Town It is not clear in the PEIR about how emissions from traffic generated by the transport of incinerator bottom ash (IBA) have been considered.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the transportation of IBA, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) . Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.
CC41	Wisbech Council	Town Concern that the climate change assessment does not take into account the transport of IBA.	IBA would be collected from the EfW CHP Facility for recycling off-site at a suitably licenced facility and in the UK where possible. Emissions associated with transport of IBA for recycling are included in the GHG assessment
CC42	Wisbech Council	Town Suggestion to provide more information on the assumptions used to calculate the avoided emissions	Appendix 14A (Volume 6.4) provides a full list of assumptions made in the GHG assessment, reported in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) .
CC43	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Request that the emissions from the additional HGV activity will be added to the emissions from the incinerator for assessment and monitoring purposes.	<p>ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). GHG assessment includes emissions from HGVs.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and those associated with traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the GHG assessment indicates higher carbon emissions from transport in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. However, transport emissions represent approximately 3.4% of total emissions over the lifetime of</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC44	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Opposition to the fact that incineration is viewed as a clean/green energy as it is releasing more CO ₂ than conventional fossil fuels per tonnes of fuel/waste.	<p>the EfW CHP Facility and the assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The GHG assessment assumes worst-case emissions for transport emissions (i.e., diesel fuel). Transport related emissions will reduce in the future with a move to electrification of collection vehicles.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. The composition of residual waste means it contains less energy than conventional fossil fuels (i.e. natural gas/coal) and may be considered to be less efficient in the conversion of the fuel (waste) into energy when compared to the combustion of conventional fossil fuels. However, the benefits of the EfW CHP Facility compared to CO₂ emissions from conventional fossil fuels are that as well as generating energy, the EfW CHP Facility avoids the emissions that would otherwise result from landfill disposal. There is a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill. This delivers a net reduction in carbon emissions that is not achieved for energy generated from conventional fossil fuels.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC45	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the UK won't achieve the goal of a reduction of emissions by 3% per annum to reach its future targets when deciding to utilise EfW due to the potential to generate more than 2.5 times the CO ₂ that a coal fired power plant generates.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and those associated with traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets. The GHG assessment assumes worst-case emissions for transport emissions (i.e., diesel fuel). Transport related emissions will reduce in the future with a move to electrification of collection vehicles.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC46	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that no assessment has been made of the additional transportation of IBA and other products.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the transportation of IBA and Air Pollution Control (APCr), have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>IBA would be collected from the EfW CHP Facility for recycling off-site at a suitably licenced facility and in the UK where possible. Air Pollution Control (APCr) residues will be sent to a suitable facility for disposal. Waste disposal</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			emissions resulting from the transport of IBA and APCr are included in the GHG assessment.
CC47	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that clarification should be provided on whether the reprocessing of incinerator bottom ash and other products includes additional transportation journeys, and whether these journeys are scoped into the GHG emissions impact assessment.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the transportation of IBA and APCr, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>IBA would be collected from the EfW CHP Facility for recycling off-site at a suitably licenced facility and in the UK where possible. Air Pollution Control (APCr) residues will be sent to a suitable facility for disposal. Waste disposal emissions resulting from the transport of IBA and APCr are included in the GHG assessment.</p>
CC48	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the assessment of GHG emissions effect in PEIR Chapter 14 as both 'low (beneficial)' and 'high (beneficial)' be clarified and amended for the ES.	The GHG assessment within the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) concludes that the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The grading of significance has been updated to reflect the latest IEMA guidance on GHG assessments which includes one level of beneficial significance.
CC49	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Request for clarification on whether any incinerator bottom ash journeys are included in the traffic carbon assessment.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the transportation of IBA, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>IBA would be collected from the EfW CHP Facility for recycling off-site at a suitably licenced facility. Emissions associated with transport of IBA for recycling are included in the GHG assessment.</p>
CC50	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about increased carbon emissions resulting from the project and the impact on climate change.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and those associated with traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) . Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>The GHG assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions of - 2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC51	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that carbon capture and storage is an expensive and energy inefficient technology which cannot be relied on as a solution to carbon impacts of the proposal.	<p>The Applicant notes that CCS is supported by UK Government policy.</p> <p>The Proposed Development allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.</p>
CC52	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the binary comparison between incineration and crude landfilling by MVV is unrealistic.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy than the alternative 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill. The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) identifies that landfill disposal is the reasonable alternative for the management of residual waste proposed to be used at the EfW CHP Facility. The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) also identifies that some residual waste</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC53	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the assessment of carbon emissions from landfill should consider electricity generation potential from methane generated by decomposition or Mechanical Biological Treatment.	<p>may be incorporated in exports of Refuse Derived Fuel but highlights that Refuse Derived Fuel exports have been reducing and Government policy is on applying the proximity principle (i.e. managing waste at a location as close as reasonably possible to where waste is generated).</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the landfilling of residual waste, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>GHG benefits associated with combustion of landfill gas (LFG) to generate electricity have been included. The GHG assessment for landfill methane is based on independent reporting from Defra factors for UK landfills and WRAP survey of waste composition.</p>
CC54	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the landfilling of plastic waste produces less carbon emissions than the incineration of plastic waste due to landfilling effectively capturing the carbons from plastics and preventing their emissions.	<p>Plastic waste is not considered to contribute to emissions from landfills. Disposal of plastic waste in landfill is the least preferred option in the waste hierarchy and the focus should be on recycling plastics to move the management of plastic waste up the waste hierarchy. Plastics in residual waste in EfW facilities can contribute to a higher than optimal Net Calorific Value and an increase in corrosion and the resultant maintenance burden, therefore there is a strong preference to have less plastic in the residual waste entering the combustion process.</p>
CC55	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the UKWIN analysis shows that incineration of waste produces significantly more GHG emissions than a landfill-based alternative.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the landfilling of residual waste, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO_{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.
CC56	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the proposed development further encourages the manufacture of plastics and the carbon emissions from mining of fossil fuels for materials.	The focus should be on recycling plastics to move the management of plastic waste up the waste hierarchy. The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables (including plastics). Plastics in residual waste in EfW facilities can contribute to a higher than optimal Net Calorific Value and an increase in corrosion and the resultant maintenance burden, therefore there is a strong preference to have less plastic in the residual waste entering the combustion process.
CC57	Steve Barclay MP	The life cycle assessment calculations may be misleading and the Proposed Development provides a lower benefit than what is claimed.	<p>The PEIR highlighted that it was not possible to include all aspects for a full life cycle GHG inventory analysis, and further detail is presented in the ES. Further assessment of carbon emissions and savings is included in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2), including sensitivity assessment considering waste composition and the future decarbonisation of the UK energy supplies.</p> <p>The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO_{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy than the alternative 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC58	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the claim that the facility will reduce GHG emissions as it does not consider	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the landfilling and sensitivity scenarios around the



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		the improvements of landfills and the future technologies for capture and re-use of landfill gas is not evidenced in the PEIR.	<p>capture rate of landfill gas, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>GHG benefits associated with combustion of LFG to generate electricity have been included. The GHG assessment for landfill methane is based on independent reporting from Defra factors for UK landfills and WRAP survey of waste composition. A collection efficiency for LFG of 68% is assumed (for a subset of modern, large landfill operations in the UK).</p> <p>The GHG assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets</p>
CC59	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that carbon assumptions based on the displacement of gas fired generation are unrealistic as new gas fire generation will likely require carbon capture.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and displacement of gas fired generation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) . Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.
CC60	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that more realistic calculations of the carbon benefits of the project, using more realistic assumptions about gas fire generation and facility availability, be calculated and consulted on.	The GHG assessment assumes that electricity generated by the EfW CHP Facility would avoid emissions from electricity generation supplied by the UK Grid (average UK Grid electricity generation from all sources, using an estimated emissions factor of 182tCO ₂ /GWh). The sensitivity analysis in Appendix 14C considers three other scenarios for electricity generation emissions factors, taking into account plans for future decarbonisation of electricity generation and also the existing generation of electricity from fossil fuels. The first case considers electricity generation from gas-fired power stations as the source of electricity generation that would be avoided. Recognising the move towards long term decarbonisation of energy supplies and goals to achieve net zero by 2050, the two other scenarios consider



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC61	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that assertions that the proposed development will contribute to the aims of the 6th Climate Budget are misleading as the Budget assumes all EfW projects adopt carbon capture and storage to avoid increasing emissions.	<p>projections for the reduction in carbon emissions for UK Grid average electricity generation, based on forecast emissions factors for 2035 and 2050.</p> <p>Currently national policy (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)) requires combustion power stations (including gas, coal, oil or biomass) developments over 300MW to be Carbon Capture Ready (CCR). The Proposed Development is below this threshold; however, the EfW CHP Facility has been designed to allow sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required in the future and will house a steam turbine designed to be ready for installation of controlled low pressure steam extraction to enable CCS.</p>
CC62	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that the North Kemsley DCO decision found that the uncertainties of the Carbon benefits resulted with the emission reductions carrying little weight in the evaluation.	Need further guidance on response to this. The North Kemsley GHG assessment appears to include additional benefits for CHP. The assessment appears to identify that under most scenarios EfW would deliver a net reduction in carbon. The exception was a scenario where residual waste was transported to Europe - comparing UK EfW electricity generation only vs more efficient EfW with CHP in Europe.
CC63	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the relative inefficiency of energy-from-waste limits any carbon benefits.	The EfW CHP Facility represents a modern, more efficient energy generation process, which would reduce carbon emissions compared to older, less efficient EfW plants. It is acknowledged that the composition of residual waste means it contains less energy than conventional fossil fuels (i.e., natural gas/coal) and may be considered to be less efficient in the conversion of the fuel (waste) into energy when compared to the combustion of conventional fossil fuels. However, the benefits of the EfW CHP Facility compared to CO ₂ emissions from conventional fossil fuels are that as well as generating energy,



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>the EfW CHP Facility avoids the emissions that would otherwise result from landfill disposal.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment. There is a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill. This delivers a net reduction in carbon emissions that is not achieved for energy generated from conventional fossil fuels.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC64	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that information in the PEIR on carbon savings of the project were unclear and inaccurate.	The GHG assessment reported in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , uses a methodology for estimating GHG emissions in line with IEMA guidelines, considering each stage of the development (construction, operation and decommissioning). The GHG assessment for the EfW CHP Facility and comparison with landfill is based on similar approaches used in other studies (e.g. Zero Waste Scotland, 'The climate change impacts of burning municipal waste in Scotland' and in the application for the consented Riverside Energy Park Order 2020).
CC65	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that further information and consultation is required on the carbon savings of the project, to provide clarity and accuracy, and ensure robustness of the DCO application.	The PEIR highlighted that it was not possible to include all aspects for a full life cycle GHG inventory analysis, and further detail would be presented in the ES. Further assessment of carbon emissions and savings is included in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , including sensitivity assessment considering waste composition and the future decarbonisation of the UK energy supplies.
CC66	Steve MP Barclay	Concern about the impact of GHG emissions from the proposed development on the	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and sensitivity scenarios around the electricity network



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		electricity network decarbonisation goals and UK 2050 net-zero targets.	<p>decarbonisation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO₂e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC67	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that further details be provided on how carbon capture and storage and CHP will be secured as part of the scheme to ensure energy efficiency, and carbon savings in accordance with the 6th Carbon Budget.	<p>The EfW CHP facility has been designed to allow the export of steam and electricity to surrounding business users, see ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) for further details. The Proposed Development includes land set aside for the possible future inclusion of CCS technology, subject to technical viability and developing government policy.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and sensitivity scenarios around the export of steam to local businesses, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
CC68	Steve MP Barclay	Request for information on how GHG assumptions in PEIR Chapter 14 are aligned with the 6th Carbon Budget.	The GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO _{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.
CC69	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the GHG emission estimates within the carbon assessment in the PEIR were not accurate.	The GHG assessment reported in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , uses a methodology for estimating GHG emissions in line with IEMA guidelines, considering each stage of the development (construction, operation and decommissioning). The GHG assessment for the EfW CHP Facility and comparison with landfill is based on similar approaches used in other studies (e.g., Zero Waste Scotland, 'The climate change impacts of burning municipal waste in Scotland' and in the application for the consented Riverside Energy Park Order 2020).
CC70	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to include future plans towards the electrification of HGV traffic.	Emissions factors for transport emissions includes allowance for fleet renewal. Standard emission factors provided by the Defra Emissions Factor Toolkit have been used to inform the GHG assessment reported in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC71	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Draft WFAA cites no evidence to support the choice of a two-hour journey for the study area.	Professional judgement is that it is commercially viable to transport non-hazardous household, industrial and commercial waste from up to approximately 2 hours away from any treatment facility. Distances over 2-hours travel time become increasingly more expensive for individuals and organisations requiring disposal of waste. This application of professional judgement has been explained in paragraph 3.25 of the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) .
CC72	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that there is no explanation to how the distance of 48.9km has been derived from the referenced dataset for the 'without proposed development' average travel distance.	The PEIR used the average distance of 48.9 km travelled by HGV vehicles to a landfill obtained from the DfT dataset on domestic road freight transport by commodity and length of haul, which includes statistics on waste. Travel distances for landfill have been updated for the GHG assessment (ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2)) to 46.9 km based on the 2021 DfT data. This has been calculated as the average distance for a haul length up to 150 km (approximately the two-hour drive time) by dividing the goods moved (million tonne km) data by the goods lifted (million tonne) data for waste related products.
CC73	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the study area used in the Draft WFAA is oversized.	At PEIR stage, the study area was drawn to represent an approximate 2-hour drive time from the Proposed Development. However, for the submission Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) , the study area for the local assessment has been reduced to reflect the East of England region (the basis upon which a lot of publicly available waste arisings, disposals and capacities data is presented), and the 2-hour drive time has only been applied to validate this reduced study area.
CC74	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to exclude the following WPA from the study area within the final WFAA: Central Bed, Coventry, Essex, Hertfordshire, Luton, Milton Keynes, NE Lincolnshire, N Lincolnshire, Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire, Suffolk, Warwickshire.	As part of the drafting of the submission version of the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) , further consideration has been given to the scope of the study area for assessment. In line with the existing National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) and the emerging updated version of this, the WFAA now considers the availability of waste in the context of local and national need. In terms of 'local' need, the extent of the study area has been informed by the 2-hour travel time and is defined as being the former East of England planning region and selected close Waste Planning Authorities in the East Midlands (i.e., Leicester and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC75	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that there is no baseline against which the proposed development can be compared due to the contextualizing of the scheme's emissions within national budgets and assessment 'with development' and 'without development'.	Leicestershire; Northamptonshire, Lincolnshire and Rutland). The WFAA now excludes Coventry, NE Lincolnshire, N Lincolnshire, Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire, and Warwickshire.
CC76	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the developer is attempting to hide local impacts by considering emission within the context of national carbon reduction targets, on the basis that local carbon emissions from the development can be addressed by achieving national targets.	The GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , has no defined spatial boundary. The receptor (Earth's climate system) is global in nature, so there are no localised effects to consider. The assessment approach adopted is to assess the change in emissions in the context of national emissions and national policy: whether the change in GHG emissions will prevent national government achieving national targets (i.e., carbon net zero by 2050). This assessment is complemented by an assessment of the change in emissions in the context of regional/local emissions and regional/local policies where applicable. The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO _{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario.
CC77	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the assessment approach ensures emissions from the 'with proposed development' scenario appear beneficial to emissions from the 'without proposed development' scenario.	The GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , uses a methodology for estimating GHG emissions in line with IEMA guidelines, considering each stage of the development (construction, operation and decommissioning). The GHG assessment for the EfW CHP Facility and comparison with landfill is based on similar approaches used in other studies (e.g., Zero Waste Scotland, 'The climate change impacts of burning municipal waste in Scotland' and in the application for the consented Riverside Energy Park Order 2020).



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC78	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the 6th Carbon Budget sets out that one option for reducing emissions involves the reduction in residual waste sent to energy-from-waste.	In line with the waste hierarchy, the preferred route for managing waste should be prevention, re-use or recycling ahead of routes such as recovery EfW or the least preferred option, landfill disposal. The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste that would remain after other waste management options have been adopted, which as evidenced in the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) would otherwise go to landfill. The GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2), indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO ₂ e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario where the waste goes to landfill.
CC79	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the proposed development takes into account the Transport Decarbonisation Plan published by the Department for Transport.	The DfT's Transport Decarbonisation Plan is considered within Table 14.8 of ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) . Government emissions factors from the Emissions Factors Toolkit are used in this assessment to account for reducing emissions in the future.
CC80	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that Table 14.8 in the PEIR and reference to BEIS carbon factors be updated to reflect the latest 2021 dataset.	At the time the GHG assessment was carried out for the PEIR the emissions factors were based on the most recently available BEIS GHG reporting conversion factors. Emissions factors have been updated for ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) to reflect datasets available for 2021.
CC81	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the comparator approach in PEIR Chapter 14 is simplistic and does not account for future changes in the quantities and types of waste from policy drivers and actions already undertaken.	Sensitivity assessment of carbon emissions is included in the ES at Appendix 14C Sensitivity analysis (Volume 6.4) , including consideration of potential changes to waste composition in terms of targets to reduce food, plastics and other recyclables in residual waste.
CC82	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the assumptions of the comparator approach in PEIR Chapter 14 that the same quantity and composition of waste will be incinerated or landfilled during the operational phase, that the national energy mix remains unaltered during the operational phase, and that energy produced will always displace an equivalent quantity of fossil fuel.	The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) has considered future residual waste management needs both locally and nationally and has concluded that there is a need for additional residual waste management capacity – and especially capacity that offers an alternative to landfill (which is at the very bottom of the waste management hierarchy). Further sensitivity assessment of carbon emissions is included in the GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) ,



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			including consideration of potential changes to waste composition and decarbonisation of energy supplies.
CC83	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that Section 14.6 of the PEIR should make clear that the scope includes the full life cycle of the Proposed Development as described in Section 14.8.	The GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , is in line with IEMA guidelines, considering each stage of the development (construction, operation and decommissioning). The PEIR highlighted that it was not possible to include all aspects for a full life cycle GHG inventory analysis, and further detail would be presented in the ES.
CC84	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the reference to IBA sales to market in PEIR Chapter 14 be clarified regarding the type of emissions related to this activity that are included in the scope of assessment.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts from the transportation of IBA, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>IBA would be collected from the EfW CHP Facility for recycling off-site at a suitably licenced facility and in the UK where possible. Emissions associated with transport of IBA for recycling are included in the GHG assessment.</p>
CC85	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the assessment does not take into account the benefit or disbenefit to host authority carbon reduction targets.	The GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , has no defined spatial boundary. The receptor (Earth's climate system) is global in nature, so there are no localised effects to consider. The assessment approach adopted is to assess the change in emissions in the context of national emissions and national policy: whether the change in GHG emissions will prevent national government achieving national targets (i.e., carbon net zero by 2050). This assessment is complemented by an assessment of the change in emissions in the context of regional/local emissions and regional/local policies where applicable. The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO _{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario.
CC86	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the assessment assumes the positive contribution to national carbon reduction targets also represents a positive contribution to local targets.	
CC87	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the assessment demonstrate how the contribution to national carbon reduction targets impacts on local carbon reduction targets, considering that current local carbon budget does not include the proposed development.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC88	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the description of the future baseline scenario in the 'Likely significant effects' column of Table 14.10 of the PEIR be expanded to clarify that waste sent to landfill is not a continuation of the status quo but accounts for policy drivers reducing the use of landfill over the temporal scope of the assessment.	The focus of the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill. Therefore, the assumption that waste will continue to be sent to landfill if it is not diverted to the EfW CHP Facility (or any other EfW facility) is considered to be a reasonable assumption.
CC89	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the consideration of UK-wide carbon budgets in the PEIR assessment methodology is inappropriate as any development would appear insignificant in comparison to UK-wide emissions	The assessment approach adopted in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) is to assess the change in emissions in the context of national emissions and national policy: whether the change in GHG emissions will prevent national government achieving national targets (i.e., carbon net zero by 2050). This assessment is complemented by an assessment of the change in emissions in the context of regional/local emissions and regional/local policies where applicable. The GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO ₂ e in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario.
CC90	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the assessment methodology includes consideration of specific carbon trajectories for the waste, and materials and construction sectors from the 6th Carbon Budget.	The GHG assessment described in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050 (with the Climate Change Committee stating that sector emissions from waste reduced from today's levels by 75% by 2050), this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.
CC91	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to clarify the basis for determining GHG emissions under the 'without proposed development' case and ensure an accurate description of what constitutes 'with proposed development'.	The GHG assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) is based on a comparison of the 'with Proposed Development' case (i.e. the EfW CHP Facility) to the 'without Proposed Development' case. The GHG emissions for the 'without Proposed Development' case have been calculated assuming waste is collected and transported to available landfill sites.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC92	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint the logic of the information presented in Table 14.17 in Chapter 14 of the PEIR is flawed, as negligible change between 'with proposed development' and 'without proposed development' does not mean net zero.	The approach that has been taken for the GHG assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) is about contextualising the Proposed Development in line with national carbon targets. There is no policy requirement for the Proposed Development to be net zero at a project level and this is therefore not used in the GHG assessment.
CC93	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that what constitutes 'material' in relation to significance criteria is not set out in Table 14.17 in Chapter 14 of the PEIR.	The GHG assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) reports the magnitude of the impact of the Proposed Development has been evaluated based on the extent to which the Proposed Development materially affects the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon target and budgets. The GHG assessment does not provide a quantifiable definition of magnitude, however this is in line with IEMA guidance. The scale of the GHG emissions from all sources in the 'with Proposed Development' case has been contextualised within their overall impact on the UK Government's UK carbon target of 'net zero' in 2050 and the UK carbon budgets
CC94	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide a qualitative evaluation of what constitutes 'material' within the sub-section of Table 14.17 of the PEIR.	The GHG assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) reports the magnitude of the impact of the Proposed Development has been evaluated based on the extent to which the Proposed Development materially affects the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon target and budgets. The GHG assessment does not provide a quantifiable definition of magnitude, however this is in line with IEMA guidance. The scale of the GHG emissions from all sources in the 'with Proposed Development' case has been contextualised within their overall impact on the UK Government's UK carbon target of 'net zero' in 2050 and the UK carbon budgets.
CC95	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that grading of magnitude set out in Table 14.17 in Chapter 14 of the PEIR has been chosen to give the impression that the assessment is more nuanced than is the case.	The GHG assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) considers adverse, negligible and beneficial significance scenarios. The grading has been updated to reflect the latest IEMA guidance which includes one level of beneficial significance.
CC96	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for Table 14.17 in Chapter 14 of the PEIR to be amended to show the	The GHG assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) considers adverse, negligible and beneficial significance scenarios. The



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		significance parameters as 'adverse', 'negligible', and 'beneficial'.	grading has been updated to reflect the latest IEMA guidance which includes one level of beneficial significance
CC97	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide a qualitative evaluation of what constitutes 'material' within the sub-section of Table 14.17 of the PEIR.	The GHG assessment in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) reports the magnitude of the impact of the Proposed Development has been evaluated based on the extent to which the Proposed Development materially affects the ability of the UK Government to meet its carbon target and budgets. The GHG assessment does not provide a quantifiable definition of magnitude, however this is in line with IEMA guidance. The scale of the GHG emissions from all sources in the 'with Proposed Development' case has been contextualised within their overall impact on the UK Government's UK carbon target of 'net zero' in 2050 and the UK carbon budgets.
CC98	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to include some sensitivity analysis around the choice of normalization factor and how this affects the estimate of construction related emissions within the Preliminary Assessment of Climate Effects, e.g. per MW versus per tonne.	This comment is no longer relevant to the assessment as updates have been made to the methodology for embodied carbon. Benchmarking using other developments and normalisation factors is not part of the assessment.
CC99	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the Assessment of Climate Effects to include both tail pipe emissions and emissions associated with the production/refining of diesel fuel in relation to construction vehicle emissions.	Emissions factors for transport emissions in the PEIR are based on BEIS greenhouse gas reporting: conversion factors 2020. The ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) includes an updated assessment of transport related emissions, which uses the Defra Emissions Factors Toolkit.
CC100	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the consideration of optional additional mitigation include the future use of carbon capture and use systems as a means of delivery net-zero development.	The Proposed Development allows sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required by legislation in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO ₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed to be ready for installation of a controlled low pressure steam extraction, space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switch room CCS facility.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC101	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the ES should use the factor updates found in BEIS 2021.	At the time the GHG assessment was carried out for the PEIR the emissions factors were based on the most recently available BEIS GHG reporting conversion factors. Emissions factors are updated for the GHG assessment presented Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) to reflect datasets available for 2021.
CC102	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that there is no reference to consideration of additional mitigation to minimise carbon emissions, such as carbon capture and use systems.	Currently national policy (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)) requires combustion power stations (including gas, coal, oil or biomass) developments over 300MW to be CCR. The Proposed Development is below this threshold; however, the EfW CHP Facility has been designed to allow sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required in the future and will house a steam turbine designed to be ready for installation of controlled low pressure steam extraction to enable CCS.
CC103	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that data shows that segregated waste collects reduce the percentage of organic waste in the residual waste stream by half or more, compared to the percentage given in Table 14.22, and that a lower assumed organic content will change the NCV of the waste fuel in the 'with proposed development' case but will reduce the methane generation potential of landfilled waste in the 'without proposed development' case.	It is acknowledged that organic waste contributes to the biogenic content of residual waste, which contributes to the release of methane in landfills. The waste composition in the GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) is based on the latest available information from a WRAP survey in 2017, which compares well with other reported studies, so is considered appropriate for the GHG assessment. Further sensitivity assessment of carbon emissions is included in Appendix 14C of the ES, including consideration of potential changes to waste composition in terms of targets to reduce food, plastics and other recyclables in residual waste.
CC104	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the contextualisation of gross and GHG emission from the proposed development against UK carbon budgets masks the fact that the development will be a carbon emitter.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) . Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment. It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions when considering emissions from the EfW combustion processes compared to avoided emissions for energy generated by the EfW CHP Facility. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO _{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development'



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets</p>
CC105	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the quantification of avoided emissions reflect the proportion of fuel currently used to produce electricity and the Committee on Climate Change's Balanced Net Zero Pathway assumptions regarding future changes in the electricity generation mix and grid carbon intensity.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and sensitivity scenarios around the electricity network decarbonisation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>The GHG assessment assumes that electricity generated by the EfW CHP Facility would avoid emissions from electricity generation supplied by the UK Grid (average UK Grid electricity generation from all sources, using an estimated emissions factor of 182tCO₂/GWh). The sensitivity analysis in Appendix 14C considers three other scenarios for electricity generation emissions factors, taking into account plans for future decarbonisation of electricity generation and also the existing generation of electricity from fossil fuels. The first case considers electricity generation from gas-fired power stations as the source of electricity generation that would be avoided. Recognising the move towards long term decarbonisation of energy supplies and goals to achieve net zero by 2050, the two other scenarios consider projections for the reduction in carbon emissions for UK Grid average electricity generation, based on forecast emissions factors for 2035 and 2050.</p>
CC106	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the study area for emissions cover the former East of England planning region.	As part of the drafting of the submission version of the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) , further consideration has been given to the scope of the Study Area for assessment. In line with the existing National



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) and the emerging updated version of this, the WFAA now considers the availability of waste in the context of local and national need. In terms of 'local' need, the extent of the study area has been informed by the 2-hour travel time and is defined as being the former East of England planning region and selected close Waste Planning Authorities in the East Midlands (i.e., Leicester and Leicestershire; Northamptonshire, Lincolnshire and Rutland). This now excludes Coventry, NE Lincolnshire, N Lincolnshire, Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire, and Warwickshire.</p>
CC107	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the assessment should reflect the transport efficiency improvements relating to HGVs that are likely to occur over the next few decades.	The GHG assessment provided in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) , considers emissions factors for transport emissions including allowance for the renewal of the fleet. The Defra Emissions Factors Toolkit has been used in the assessment.
CC108	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that replacement of a future baseline with a landfill-only 'without proposed development' scenario is unrealistic in terms of waste management processes or spatial scope, and does not allow for comparison of GHG emissions with actual waste flows and current practices with and without energy recovery.	The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy than the alternative 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill. The WFAA (Volume 7.3) identifies that landfill disposal is the reasonable alternative for the management of residual waste proposed to be used at the EfW CHP Facility. Longer term developments in future waste management are uncertain and are beyond the scope of this assessment.
CC109	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the sensitivity analysis of changing waste composition on GHG emissions should take account of local findings.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and sensitivity analyses of waste composition, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>Waste composition used for the GHG assessment has been based on residual waste composition available from WRAP's national survey of municipal waste for England in 2017 (published in 2020) which is considered to be representative of waste that would currently be available for the EfW CHP Facility. Further sensitivity assessment of carbon emissions is included in Appendix 14C of the ES, including consideration of potential changes to waste</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			composition in terms of targets to reduce food, plastics and other recyclables in residual waste.
CC110	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the ES include relevant supporting worksheets showing the derivation of tabulated data in relation to annual GHG emissions of landfill with electricity generation using LFG.	A full list of assumptions made in the GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2) are appended ES Appendix 14A (Volume 6.4) .
CC111	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the assumption that energy generated by the development is only substituting fossil fuels is not consistent with the current energy mix where gas is used to generate only 41% of the electricity used in 2019.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and displacement of gas fired generation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>For the purposes of the GHG assessment, the sensitivity analysis considers three scenarios for electricity generation emissions factors, taking into account plans for future decarbonisation of electricity generation and also the existing generation of electricity from fossil fuels. The first case considers electricity generation from gas-fired power stations as the source of electricity generation that would be avoided. Recognising the move towards long term decarbonisation of energy supplies and goals to achieve net zero by 2050, the two other scenarios consider projections for the reduction in carbon emissions for UK Grid average electricity generation, based on forecast emissions factors for 2035 and 2050.</p>
CC112	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the assumption that gas-only electricity is being displaced for the entire operational lifespan is unrealistic.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and displacement of gas fired generation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>For the purposes of the GHG assessment, the sensitivity analysis considers three scenarios for electricity generation emissions factors, taking into account plans for future decarbonisation of electricity generation and also the existing generation of electricity from fossil fuels. The first case considers electricity generation from gas-fired power stations as the source of electricity generation</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CC113	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggest that the assessment of avoided emissions use figures in line with the forecasted carbon intensity of the grid.	<p>that would be avoided. Recognising the move towards long term decarbonisation of energy supplies and goals to achieve Net Zero by 2050, the two other scenarios consider projections for the reduction in carbon emissions for UK Grid average electricity generation, based on forecast emissions factors for 2035 and 2050.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and displacement of gas fired generation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>For the purposes of the GHG assessment, the sensitivity analysis considers three scenarios for electricity generation emissions factors, taking into account plans for future decarbonisation of electricity generation and also the existing generation of electricity from fossil fuels. The first case considers electricity generation from gas-fired power stations as the source of electricity generation that would be avoided. Recognising the move towards long term decarbonisation of energy supplies and goals to achieve Net Zero by 2050, the two other scenarios consider projections for the reduction in carbon emissions for UK Grid average electricity generation, based on forecast emissions factors for 2035 and 2050.</p>
CC114	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the assumption in the assessment of avoided emissions that gas-only generation will continue over the operational lifespan of the proposed development is unlikely.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and displacement of gas fired generation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment.</p> <p>For the purposes of the GHG assessment, the sensitivity analysis considers three scenarios for electricity generation emissions factors, taking into account plans for future decarbonisation of electricity generation and also the existing generation of electricity from fossil fuels. The first case considers electricity generation from gas-fired power stations as the source of electricity generation that would be avoided. Recognising the move towards long term decarbonisation of energy supplies and goals to achieve Net Zero by 2050, the two other scenarios consider projections for the reduction in carbon emissions</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			for UK Grid average electricity generation, based on forecast emissions factors for 2035 and 2050.
CC115	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that incinerator technology will soon be redundant, resulting in considerable GHG emissions for no reason, and that waste is better managed through the principles of 'reduce, reuse and recycle'.	The GHG assessment presented in ES Chapter 14 climate Change (Volume 6.2) , indicates a net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO _{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The EfW CHP Facility provides an option for the management of residual waste, remaining after the removal of recyclables, which moves the management higher up the waste hierarchy i.e., 'recovery' rather than the alternative 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill 'disposal'; the least favoured waste management option.
CC116	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the estimated distances waste fuel will travel to the facility, and impacts on GHG emissions and HGV movements.	The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) has been based upon a 2-hour travel time study area. Professional judgement is that it is generally commercially viable to transport non-hazardous household, industrial and commercial waste from up to approximately (~) 2 hours away from the Proposed Development. Distances over 2 hours travel time from the Proposed Development become increasingly expensive for those seeking to dispose of waste.
CC117	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that a smaller travel distance is used for assessing transport-related emissions in the 'without proposed development' scenario, but waste-related emissions in both scenarios are assessed using the same travel distance.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts and those associated with traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a GHG assessment. Distances travelled have been calculated based on the expected origin of residual waste identified in the WFAA.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the GHG assessment indicates higher carbon emissions from transport in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. However, transport emissions represent approximately 3.4% of total emissions over the lifetime of the EfW CHP Facility and the assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions of -2,570.80 ktCO_{2e} in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets. The GHG assessment assumes worst-case emissions for transport emissions (i.e., diesel fuel). Transport related emissions will reduce in the future with a move to electrification of collection vehicles.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding Construction

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 3.1 Issues raised regarding construction** below and are accompanied by an indication of which consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 3.3 Issues raised regarding construction

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CO01	Local Community	Concern that construction will cause significant disruption to local residents.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with construction activities, such as noise, dust and traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.2). Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and construction management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement, to include: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Volume 7.12); and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)).</p> <p>The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) provide a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage and be implemented for the duration of construction in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes management plans to be secured by a DCO requirement, specifically Dust Mitigation Measures (Appendix A) and Outline Construction Noise and Vibration (Appendix F). In addition, an Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) has been produced to support the Environmental Statement.</p>
CO02	Local Community	Concern that local residents will experience dust and noise & vibration effects during construction of the proposed development.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents, such as dust, noise and vibration, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth		<p>Summary (Volume 6.2). Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase and includes the following construction management plans, to be secured by a DCO Requirement.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) provide a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage and be implemented for the duration of construction in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes management plans to be secured by a DCO requirement, specifically Dust Mitigation Measures (Appendix A) and Outline Construction Noise and Vibration (Appendix F). In addition, an Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) has been produced to support the Environmental Statement.</p>
CO03	Local Community	Concern that nearby water courses could become contaminated during the construction phase of the proposed development.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with protection of watercourses during construction, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2) which concludes that effects would not be significant. A Water Management Plan accompanies the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12, Appendix B) containing standard and bespoke pollution control measures (Section 3) which will ensure the protection of water courses and groundwater during construction. Water quality monitoring procedures are also included.</p> <p>The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) also provides a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage, in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. Waste management, pollution prevention and protocols are considered within the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CO04	Local Community	Concern that the increased traffic during construction will make the area unsafe for the community.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with traffic and pedestrian and road safety and during construction, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) which concludes that with additional mitigation in place that effects would not be significant.
CO05	Local Community	Concern that the increased volume of traffic during construction will have an effect on local roads.	Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) provide a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage, in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes management plans to be secured by a DCO requirement, specifically Dust Mitigation Measures (Appendix A) and Outline Construction Noise and Vibration (Appendix F). In addition, an Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) has been produced to support the Environmental Statement.
CO06	Local Community	Concern that the nearby stream could be compromised by construction processes and present flood risk to nearby properties.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with protection of watercourses and flood risk during construction, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2) . Appendix 12A (Volume 6.4) presents the Applicant's Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The assessments conclude that effects would not be significant. An Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) has been prepared and is submitted with the DCO application. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes waste management, pollution prevention and flood risk protocols along with outline management plans relating to: Water Management (Appendix B), Ecology (Appendix D), and Site Materials and Waste Management (Appendix E) to be updated at detailed design stage and secured by a DCO Requirement, in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CO07	Local Community	Concern that there will be an impact to human health from potential contaminants during construction of the proposed development.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with protection human health during construction, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2). The assessments conclude that effects would not be significant.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase and includes the following construction management plans, to be secured by a DCO Requirement.</p> <p>An Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) has been prepared and is submitted with the DCO application. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes waste management, pollution prevention and flood risk protocols along with outline management plans relating to: Water Management (Appendix B), Ecology (Appendix D), and Site Materials and Waste Management (Appendix E) to be updated at detailed design stage and secured by a DCO Requirement, in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase.</p>
CO08	Local Community	Concern that vibration during construction of the proposed facility will cause damage to nearby property and infrastructure.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with noise and vibration during construction, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2). The assessments conclude that effects would not be significant with additional mitigation in place.</p> <p>To minimise potential vibration effects, driven piling does not form part of the Proposed Development, instead the Applicant's EPC contractor will be required to use a continuous flight auger piling technique.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) provide a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage, in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. The Outline CEMP</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CO09	Local Community	Opposition to the proposed development due to the significant disruption to local residents.	<p>(Volume 7.12) includes management plans to be secured by a DCO requirement, specifically Dust Mitigation Measures (Appendix A) and Outline Construction Noise and Vibration (Appendix F). In addition, an Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) has been produced to support the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>For all technical assessments reported in the ES Chapters 6 to 18 (Volume 6.2), the impacts associated with the construction of the Proposed Development were assessed. In order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase there are two outline management plans that accompany the DCO submission, there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Volume 7.12); and • Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) <p>The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) provide a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage and be implemented for the duration of construction in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes management plans to be secured by a DCO requirement, including Dust Mitigation Measures (Appendix A) and Outline Construction Noise and Vibration (Appendix F). In addition, an Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) has been produced to support the Environmental Statement.</p>
CO10	Local Community	Request that the health and wellbeing of residents are fully considered during construction of the proposed development.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with protection human health and wellbeing during construction, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapters 6: Traffic and Transport; 7: Noise and Vibration; and 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2). ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) considers the cumulative effects upon health and wellbeing.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CO11	PIL	Concern that installation of poles and overhead cables will have a detrimental effect on livestock.	<p>The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) provide a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage and be implemented for the duration of construction in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes management plans to be secured by a DCO requirement, including Dust Mitigation Measures (Appendix A) and Outline Construction Noise and Vibration (Appendix F). In addition, an Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) has been produced to support the Environmental Statement.</p>
CO11	PIL	Concern that installation of poles and overhead cables will have a detrimental effect on livestock.	<p>The Grid Connection no longer includes for the installation of poles and overhead cables along the Grid Connection Route.</p> <p>The description of the Grid Connection is provided within ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2). It describes the Grid Connection as an approximately 3.8km underground cable connection to the Walsoken DNO Substation.</p>
CO12	National Grid	Suggestion that drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they could disturb or impact on the foundations of any existing pylon tower.	Subsequent to Statutory Consultation, in an email dated 6 September 2021, National Grid confirmed that based upon the Order limit boundary provided to it at that time (the Order limits including the Grid Connection to Walsoken Substation) it would have no assets affected by the Proposed Development.
CO13	National Grid	Suggestion that written permission is required from National Grid before any works commence within the easement strip.	
CO14	National Grid	Suggestion that the position and depth of the pipeline must be established onsite in the presence of a NG representative should any embankment or dredging works be proposed,	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		or excavations be planned within 3 metres of National Grid High Pressure Pipeline or 10m of an AGI.	
CO15	National Grid	Suggestion that a safe working method should be agreed with National Grid prior to works taking place close to the High Pressure Pipeline or AGIs to minimize damage risk and ensure final cover depth does not impact pipeline integrity.	
CO16	National Grid	Suggestion that excavation with handheld power tools is not permitted within 1.5 metres of National Grid apparatus and the work be undertaken under NG supervision.	
CO17	Natural England	Suggestion to use Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites in the design and construction of the development.	The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) provides a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage and be implemented for the duration of construction. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes an Outline Soil Management Plan (Appendix C) and confirms the Defra's code of practice will be considered in preparing the final CEMP, to be secured by a DCO Requirement.
CO18	Natural England	Suggestion that an experienced soil specialist is used advise on, and supervise soil handling, including identifying when soils are dry enough to be handled and how to make the best use of soils on site.	The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) provides a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage and be implemented for the duration of construction. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes an Outline Soil Management Plan (Appendix C) and confirms the Defra's code of practice will be considered in preparing the final CEMP, to be secured by a DCO Requirement.
CO19	Norfolk County Council	Objection to the TCC2 option for access as the narrowness of the road, along with known difficulties turning right, makes the access too hazardous and unsuitable for use as an	Since the Applicant no longer proposes a Grid Connection to the Walpole DNP Substation, Temporary Construction Compound 2 (TCC2) no longer form part of the Proposed Development presented in ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Norfolk County Council Highways	alternative to providing a formal ghost island right turn lane.	
CO20	Norfolk County Council Norfolk County Council Highways	Objection to the TCC3 option due to visibility issues unless hedgerow removal is agreed with the council prior to submitting the application.	Since the Applicant no longer proposes a Grid Connection to the Walpole DNO Substation, Temporary Construction Compound 3 (TCC3) no longer form part of the Proposed Development presented in ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) .
CO21	Norfolk County Council	Complaint that it is not clear whether the underground cables will need to cross other ordinary watercourses under IDB jurisdiction.	The description of the Grid Connection consisting of underground cables is provided within ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) . It describes the Grid Connection as an approximately 3.8km underground cable connection to the Walsoken Substation. ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2) and associated figures identify the watercourses crossed by the Grid Connection. Consultation has been ongoing with the IDBs since Statutory Consultation such that any requirements for watercourse crossings are clearly understood.
CO22	Norfolk County Council	Complaint that there is no information about the typical time that the groundworks for the construction of the grid connections would be open for.	The description of the Grid Connection consisting of underground cables is provided within ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) . It describes the Grid Connection as an approximately 3.8km underground cable connection to the Walsoken Substation. Typically, installation of the cables along the Grid Connection Corridor will take place at night using an open cut construction technique. Up to a 200m longitudinal section will be excavated and restored each night.
CO23	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern about effects from the vibrations during construction.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with noise and vibration during construction, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) . To minimise potential vibration effects, driven piling does not form part of the Proposed Development, instead the Applicant's EPC contractor will be required to use a continuous flight auger piling technique.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CO24	Fenland District Council	Concern that the proposed layout of temporary construction facilities in PEIR Chapter 3 includes land in the ownership of Fenland District Council within the scheme, despite there not being an agreement with the Council to include this land.	<p>The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) provide a framework for detailed management plans to be prepared at detailed design stage and be implemented for the duration of construction in order to minimise and mitigate impacts and/or disruption that may arise from the construction phase. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development including the construction phase. The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes management plans to be secured by a DCO requirement, specifically Dust Mitigation Measures (Appendix A) and Outline Construction Noise and Vibration (Appendix F). In addition, an Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) has been produced to support the Environmental Statement.</p>
CO25	Steve Barclay MP	Request for clarification on the timescale for agreement with Network Rail for the installation of CHP infrastructure.	<p>The Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can co-exist. To date the Business Clearance has been approved by Network Rail and the Applicant is currently in discussions about the Technical Clearance process. The Applicant is confident that agreement can be reached with Network Rail.</p>
CO26	Cambridgeshire County Council	Should Byway Open to All Traffic No.21, Wisbech (Halfpenny Lane) be used for construction, the bollards currently preventing vehicular access, would require replacing on completion of the works.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the Proposed Development whilst ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and the Outline CTMP (ES Appendix 6A: Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4)) explains the access routes to be used by construction traffic. Access to construct the Grid Connection will be taken from the A47</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CO27	Fenland District Council	Concern about the challenges of working within and alongside current live rail infrastructure, such as the nearby track bed.	<p>which will be the subject of overnight traffic management measures as such there will be no requirement to use Halfpenny Lane as a construction access.</p> <p>The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local businesses. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can co-exist. Protective provisions will be agreed with Network Rail to ensure that any works within proximity of any future live rail infrastructure comply with Network Rail's health and safety procedures.</p>



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding Consultation

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 4.1 Issues raised regarding consultation** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 4.4 Issues raised regarding consultation

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS01	Local Community	Concern that the engagement is flawed. Information has to be more open and clear.	<p>The Applicant produced a Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) in December 2019, and this was discussed and reviewed together with the Host Local Authorities. The SoCC was agreed with the Host Local Authorities and the Non-Statutory Consultation was undertaken between 16 March and 4 May 2020. From the outset, the Applicant viewed consultation as critical to the success of the project and committed to extending the Non-Statutory Consultation period due to Covid-19 restrictions, which necessitated the initial planned public exhibitions to be postponed. The SoCC was revised after consultation with the Host Local Authorities to take account of changing Covid-19 restrictions.</p> <p>As set out in the SoCC, the Applicant undertook a three stage consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stage 1 (Non-Statutory Consultation) -Stage 1b (extension to Non-Statutory Consultation) -Stage 2 (Statutory Consultation). <p>This provided the relevant local authorities, statutory bodies, local community and wider stakeholders with numerous opportunities to comment on the proposals as they were developed.</p> <p>The Applicant provided clear and concise technical and non-technical information during each stage of consultation; this included a non-statutory consultation booklet (Consultation Report Appendix X, Volume 5.1) which summarised consultation materials in a plain English format and was also available on the Applicant's website.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS02	Network Rail	Objecting to the proposal due to an absence of formal engagement.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken best endeavours to formally engage with Network Rail during the pre-application period. Following receipt of Network Rail's representation to the Statutory Constatation, the Applicant contacted Network rail in August 2021 to confirm the steps of engagement that had taken place since December 2019. Dialogue with Network Rail is ongoing.</p>
CS03	Local Community	Complaint that very little information has been provided and was provided at short notice.	<p>The Applicant undertook a 3 stage consultation process with Stage 1 commencing on 16 March 2020 and concluding on 4 May 2020, Stage 1b commencing on 18 September 2020 and concluding on 29 October 2020 and Stage 2 commencing on 28 June 2021 and concluding on 13 August 2021. All consultations were advertised through a variety of channels including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcements in the local press • Digital advertisements in local media • Via the project website • Mailshot to the local community (distribution agreed with the Host Local Authorities) • Banners outside exhibition venues one week in advance • Posters at exhibition and other local venues advertising the public exhibitions and placed one week in advance <p>Stage 2 statutory consultation was also notified and publicised in accordance with s.42 and s.48 of the Planning Act 2008 and the relevant provisions of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>Information provided at the public exhibitions, on the website and at document inspection locations included a consultation booklet (Consultation Report Appendix X, Volume 5.1) in plain English which summarised the project. At Stage 2 a full Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and associated appendices was published and made available at the public exhibitions, document inspection locations and on the project website.</p> <p>Opportunities to speak directly to the Applicant were provided via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a dedicated email address



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a local rate telephone line • the project website. and • at public events where staff were available to answer questions.
CS04	Local Community	Complaint that information provided is incorrect.	<p>The Applicant provided a range of information in a variety of formats. All information provided was based on the Applicant's industry knowledge and extensive experience of the development and operation of EFW CHP facilities and the professional expertise of the competent expert advisors who prepared the consultation information, including the PEIR. The information provided was developed and augmented by ongoing ecological investigations, surveys and assessments as well as engagement with Statutory Undertakers such as the Environment Agency, local drainage boards, highways authorities and utilities providers. The Applicant provided clear and concise technical and non-technical information through a range of channels relevant to the stage of consultation and the development of the project.</p> <p>The local community were given the opportunity to talk directly with members of the Applicant's team during the 2 rounds of public exhibitions (at Stage 1b and Stage 2 consultations).</p> <p>Members of the Applicant's team could also be contacted to answer questions directly at all stages of consultation via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dedicated email address • Local rate telephone number • The project website. <p>Stage 2 Statutory Consultation materials included updated information based on initial assessments and was further developed following the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation to reflect comments received.</p>
CS05	Fascinating Fens Local Community	Concern that the information provided is biased/misleading.	
CS06	Local Community	Concern that MVV is trying to hide the truth behind large amounts of documents and information.	
CS07	Local Community	Complaint that the quality of the documents were poor.	
CS08	Local Community	Complaint that the information on the facility is deliberately misleading.	
CS09	Local Community	Concern that MVV is withholding information therefore making the consultation not transparent.	
CS10	Local Community	Complaint that the communication of information has been poor.	
CS11	Steve Barclay MP	Concern as the documentation contains inaccurate information and missing key details and is being presented in an inaccessible way.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS12	Local Community	Concern that MVV have used the Covid pandemic to deny proper consultation and scrutiny.	<p>Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the associated social restrictions, the public exhibitions proposed as part of the Non-Statutory Consultation (Stage 1) were postponed. In postponing the exhibitions, the Applicant committed to rearranging them as soon as possible and subsequently provided an extension to the Non-Statutory Consultation (Stage 1b) prior to the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant followed prevailing Government guidance as well as seeking legal advice in order to ensure that the public exhibitions were Covid-secure.</p> <p>The Applicant also provided a virtual exhibition via its website at both Stage 1b and Stage 2 consultations to provide for members of the public who were vulnerable, or not comfortable attending the exhibitions in person.</p> <p>A full set of consultation documents was available to download free of charge from the Applicants project website.</p>
CS13	Local Community	Complaint that there is too much information to go through and it is difficult to get a simple overview.	
CS14	Local Community PIL	Complaint that the information is too difficult to understand.	<p>The Applicant provided the necessary information in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and associated regulations (including the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p>
CS15	Local Community	Complaint that too much information has been produced and it is difficult for the public to read and understand.	<p>This included the PEIR which by nature is a comprehensive technical document. However, the Applicant also provided clear and concise technical</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS16	Local Community	Complaint that information is difficult to locate.	and non-technical information during each stage of consultation this included a non-statutory consultation booklet (Consultation Report Appendix X, Volume 5.1) which summarised consultation materials in a plain English format which was also available on the Applicant's website.
CS17	Local Community	Complaint that the consultation has been patronising.	At the public exhibitions the Applicant displayed a series of banners summarising the content of the PEIR in plain English, and experts from the Applicant's team and its technical advisors were available to discuss the information and answer questions (Consultation Report Appendix P, Volume 5.1).
CS18	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that the PEIR is too long, and the information is too difficult for readers to understand and engage with.	It was important for the Applicant to share as much information on the proposals as possible at the time of the consultation so that stakeholders would be able to provide informed feedback.
CS19	BC of King's Lynn of West Norfolk	Concern that consultation documentation and display materials were incomplete and difficult to understand.	Where possible, written information was supported by diagrams, images or illustrations to make it more accessible and understandable.
CS20	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the developer has not meet the consultation requirements as the technical and non-technical information is not presented in a clear and concise way.	The Applicant also provided a virtual exhibition via its website at both Stage 1b and Stage 2 consultations to provide for members of the public who were vulnerable, or not comfortable attending the exhibitions in person. This included an opportunity to book a one-to-one virtual or telephone meeting with a member of the project team.
CS21	Wisbech Town Council	Concern that the consultation was insufficient as it is unreasonable to expect members of the public with limited understanding of the proposal and limited expertise to read a 3,000-page document and provide a meaningful response.	The Applicant provided information about the proposal in accordance with the agreed SoCC, the legislative requirement and Planning Inspectorate (PINS) guidance.
CS22	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the data provided in the consultation as it is not presented in a clear and concise way.	
CS23	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the PEIR is unclear to consultees as much information is regarding assessment methodologies rather than indication of likely effects and mitigations.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS24	Steve Barclay MP	Objection to the proposal as the information is provided in a way which appears designed to disguise negative impacts and is not compliant with Government guidance.	
CS25	Local Community	Complaint that information on lorry access is difficult to find.	
CS26	Local Community	Complaint that information for the lorries needed to remove ash has not been provided.	Information on HGV access and proposed routes was provided in Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport of the PEIR, including Appendix 6A: Preliminary Construction Traffic Management. This information was also summarised in the Consultation Booklet (Consultation Report Appendix X, Volume 5.1) and on banners displayed at the public exhibitions.
CS27	Local Community	Complaint that the representative was unable to advise on where waste ash would be transported to.	
CS28	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that there is a lack of detail on the disposal of ash waste in landfills.	Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development of the PEIR described how the Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) would be recycled. The Applicant was unable to specify exactly where the IBA would be taken for recycling as it was too early in the development process.
CS29	Local Community	Complaint that MVV employee will not pick up the phone to discuss the impact of the proposals, when calling the associated number on the letter.	The final location for IBA processing will be a commercial decision between the Applicant and operators of appropriately licenced facilities.
CS30	Local Community	Complaint that the red line maps do not have keys and are therefore difficult to understand and uninformative.	A project contact point (local rate telephone number) was set up for questions relating to the Proposed Development. Although the contact point was not manned 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, consultees were able to leave messages, request a call back or request hard copies of project documents. The Applicant aimed to respond within 10 working days to all queries related to the consultation and the Proposed Development.
CS31	Local Community	Concern that the compulsory purchase letter are being used as a bullying tactic.	All maps and figures provided in the PEIR included a key to assist consultees in understanding different components



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			For some figures provided in other consultation documents, keys were not included. Where this was the case labels and/or supporting text was added to explain what the figures represented.
CS32	Local Community	Concern that the statements from MVV about the town are insincere.	<p>The Applicant was required to send out letters in accordance with the requirements of S42 of the Planning Act 2008. These letters included reference to compulsory acquisition powers as standard text.</p> <p>During the public exhibitions, the Applicant spoke to a number of attendees who had received such letters and were able to explain them in context. The Applicant's preference has always been, and remains, to reach a voluntary agreement with affected parties.</p>
CS33	Local Community	Complaint that the consultation leaflets look misleading.	Throughout the pre-application process the Applicant has sought to engage openly and honestly with the residents and businesses of Wisbech. The Applicant has good relationships with the local communities around its existing facilities and is committed to ensuring it is a good neighbour and gives back to the local community of Wisbech. At the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation reference was made to the establishment of a local liaison committee and it is the Applicant's intention that this would be formed once the application has been accepted for examination. An Outline Community Benefits Plan (Volume 7.14) has been provided as part of the DCO application documents.
CS34	Local Community	Objection to the design of the leaflet/documents given the potential impacts of the proposal.	The Applicant designed the leaflets (Consultation Report Appendix K, Volume 5.1) for a specific purpose, to inform the local community that the consultation was taking place and when/where public exhibitions were being held so that they could attend and respond to the proposals; it described how stakeholders could get involved and where more information could be found, including a list of Document Inspection Locations (DILs).
CS35	Icon Engineering Ltd Local Community	Concern that the consultation is not adequately promoted.	All consultation materials were prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and accompanying regulations. Additionally, the Applicant produced plain English materials, such as the consultation booklet (Consultation Report Appendix X, Volume 5.1) and invitation flyers (Consultation Report Appendix K, Volume 5.1) in their own house style. The



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS36	Local Community	Suggestion to increase education about the proposal to show the benefits.	<p>Applicant strived to produce materials which would be easy to read and encourage consultees to access the more formal consultation documents, in a similar fashion to those used on other DCO applications.</p> <p>As part of its preparation for the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation, the Applicant engaged with the Host Local Authorities the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). Feedback was sought on the approaches proposed (including the methods of promotion) in order to draw upon the Host Local Authorities expertise of consulting people in the local area.</p> <p>A range of methods were used to promote the consultation and encourage stakeholders to provide feedback. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A mailout to all addresses in Consultation Zone A (Consultation Report Appendix U, Volume 5.1). • Publication of statutory notices in a range of local and national publications (Consultation Report Appendices H, I, N and S, Volume 5.1). • Advertisements in local newspapers (Consultation Report Appendix R, Volume 5.1). • Press releases issued to local news and media (Consultation Report Appendix AA, Volume 5.1). • Publication of news updates on the project website (Consultation Report Appendix M, Volume 5.1). • The placement of posters in the local area (Consultation Report Appendix W, Volume 5.1), including at event venues and document inspection locations.
CS37	Local Community	Complaint that consultation has not been done for those north of Wisbech.	<p>The Applicant provided a number of channels for consultees to contact them before during and after the three formal consultation periods (1, 1b and 2). These included:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a dedicated email address • a local rate telephone number • the project website, and • at public events where staff were available to answer questions (during Stage 2). <p>The purpose of this was to encourage ongoing dialogue with consultees to ensure they had adequate opportunity to pursue those matters of most interest to them in more detail.</p>
CS38	Local Community	Complaint that consultation has been done during typical working hours so fewer people can participate.	Public exhibition events were held to the north of Wisbech at Walpole Community Centre, which was added following feedback from the Non-Statutory Consultation, and Walton Highway Village Club; a Document Inspection Location was also hosted at Walton Highway Village Club. The consultation was open to all who wished to provide feedback, and consultees were not limited by their geographic location due to the Applicant's virtual exhibition on the project website.
CS39	Local Community	Concern that online consultation prevent many members of the community from participating.	As part of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation eight public exhibitions were held. Recognising that not all consultees may be able to attend public exhibitions during normal working hours the Applicant timed the majority of its events during the week to run from 14:00 to 20:00. In addition, an event was also held on Saturday 17 th July to provide an opportunity for stakeholders that couldn't attend during the week. Where possible, the Applicant chose venues that were on public transport routes and all venues were DDA compliant.
CS40	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the consultation was not accessible to those without cars or computer access, including the older and more deprived who are more likely to suffer from adverse air quality impacts.	Recognising that not all consultees may be able to attend public exhibitions, the Applicant's website also included an interactive virtual exhibition. This allowed consultees to browse the exhibition boards and consultation materials. The virtual exhibition also included details on how to arrange a telephone appointment with a member of the Project team to discuss the Proposed Development and/or consultation materials.
CS41	Local Community	Concern that older people cannot participate as much as not all have access to computers/phones.	
CS42	Local Community	Satisfied that the website is designed well.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			A community contact point (01945 232 231) was also established. This was set up for questions relating to the Proposed Development and will remain active for the duration of the project.
CS43	WEP Fabrications Ltd Local Community	Concern that non-English speaking/migrant residents have not been addressed.	The Applicant takes note of this comment and welcomes the support for website design.
CS44	Icon Engineering Ltd Local Community	Complaint that representatives have given different answers to the same questions/not answered questions truthfully.	At all stages of consultation the Applicant made available a translation service to provide documents in alternative languages on request. This information was provided in the SoCC at paragraph 4.6.22.
CS45	Local Community	Complaint that MVV representatives have not acted professionally when receiving questions at events.	At each public exhibition event the Applicant ensured there were specialist representatives covering the different aspects of the Proposed Development. If one representative was not able to provide an answer to a certain question, they directed consultees to other colleagues who would have been able to help.
CS46	Local Community	Complaint that questions were not answered sufficiently and with evidence.	
CS47	Local Community	Concern that consultation events were not held widely enough.	
CS48	Local Community	Suggestion to hold week-long consultation events.	As part of its preparation for the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation, the Applicant engaged with the Host Local Authorities on a draft of the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). Feedback was sought on the approaches proposed (including the number and locations for the public exhibition events) in order to draw upon the Host Local Authorities expertise of consulting people in the local area.
CS49	Local Community	Complaint that even the closest residents to the proposed site have not been contacted/addressed.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS50	Local Community	Complaint that MVV's land agent was misinformed.	<p>Eight public exhibition events were held at a variety of venues in and around Wisbech, these were widely advertised, for example in the invitation flyer (Consultation Report Appendix K, Volume 5.1).</p> <p>Recognising that not all consultees may be able to attend public exhibitions during normal working hours the Applicant timed the majority of its events during the week to run from 14:00 to 20:00. In addition, an event was also held on Saturday 17th July to provide an additional opportunity for stakeholders that couldn't attend during the week.</p>
CS51	Local Community	Satisfied that MVV staff have been polite and respectful and explained the proposals well.	<p>A consultation invitation flyer was sent to all residential and business addresses in Consultation Zone A (Consultation Report Appendix U, Volume 5.1) during the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation in the week commencing 5 July 2021 and prior to the consultation events taking place. The flyer provided an overview of the consultation, details of the public exhibitions and explained where the information on the Proposed Development could be viewed and how feedback could be provided. The Applicant also publicised the proposed application in the local and national press in accordance with s.48 of the Planning Act 2008 and associated regulations.</p>
CS52	Local Community	Complaint that the website programmes was insufficient and did not answer any questions.	<p>All engagement with Landowners who may be potentially affected by the proposals has been undertaken in a consistent and comprehensive manner, with opportunities for ongoing engagement throughout the process. If landowners were concerned that agents were misinformed information was provided for stakeholders to engage directly with the project team either by phone or e mail to request a meeting or discuss the issues that were causing concern.</p>
CS53	Local Community	Concern that hard feedback forms will be disregarded and become waste.	<p>The Applicant welcomes the positive feedback on the conduct of its staff at exhibition events.</p> <p>The Applicant employed a number of ways by which information on the Proposed Development could be disseminated and made available to the public. The project website included a 'Frequently Asked Questions' page as well as a 'Get in Touch' page for consultees to contact members of the Applicant's staff with any further questions they may have.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS54	Local Community	Suggestion for consultation with additional parishes.	During the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation 44 hard copy feedback forms (Consultation Report Appendix Y, Volume 5.1) and letters were received. All responses were reviewed and analysed and used to help refine the Proposed Development. Copies of the hard feedback forms and letters received have been securely stored in accordance with GDPR requirements.
CS55	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that affected communities such as King's Lynn, West Lynn and Clenchwarton have not been included in the consultation.	The SoCC set out how the Applicant intended to consult the public and local communities in the vicinity of the Proposed Development. The approach taken to the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation was developed in consultation with the Host Local Authorities, with whom the draft SoCC was shared. Comments from the Host Local Authorities on the draft SoCC (Consultation Report Appendix E, Volume 5.1) were taken into account in the preparation of the final SoCC as published.
CS56	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that MVV consult in the area around King's Lynn and the Wash.	
CS57	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the selection of exhibition venues in small villages and not in King's Lynn.	Kings Lynn, West Lynn and Clenchwarton are outside of the identified consultation zone for the Proposed Development, at a distance greater than 5km away of the main site boundary and grid connection. Outside of this consultation zone, the Proposed Development was not considered to have significant direct or indirect effects, either permanently or temporarily as a result of the construction or operation of the Project. However, the Applicant prepared and offered a bespoke presentation to King's Lynn Borough Council, who did not take up this offer.
CS58	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the consultation zone did not extend to the 15km air quality study area including impacted communities.	
CS59	Local Community	Concern that responses were being sent to MVV and not an independent body, so unfavourable responses could be discarded.	The analysis of consultation responses at each round of pre-application consultation (Stage 1, Stage 1b and Stage 2 Statutory Consultation) was undertaken by independent consultants. All representations received were securely transferred to the consultants who were responsible for their review and analysis. Quality Assurance measures were put in place at different stages of the data entry and analysis process to ensure that all representations were accurately captured and analysed. Following the analysis all coded feedback was provided to the project team for
CS60	Steve Barclay MP	Request for clarification on how MVV intends to comply with the legal duty to respond to consultation and ensure alignment with DCO guidance.	
CS61	Local Community	Concern that the public views are not being taken into account.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS62	Local Community	Complaint that fire risk/fire engine availability has not been discussed or considered.	<p>consideration in the development and refinement of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>As part of the iterative development of the Project, the Applicant undertook three stages of pre-application consultation. All responses received to each of the stages of consultation have been carefully considered.</p> <p>The Consultation Feedback Reports, published following the Stage 1 Non-Statutory Consultation and the Stage 1b Non-Statutory Consultation, set out details of the responses received and the Applicant's responses with regard to the evolution of the Proposed Development. The Consultation Report (Volume 5.1), published following the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation, sets out details of the responses received and whether they resulted in a change to the Proposed Development.</p>
CS63	Local Community	Concern that the consultation questionnaire limits the ability of consultees to express views and concerns.	<p>Under the Planning Act 2008, the relevant fire authorities (Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service) are defined as Prescribed Consultees. As such they were consulted on the Scoping Report, as well as at all three stages of public consultation</p> <p>As part of the DCO application the Applicant has prepared an Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10).</p> <p>Fire, and the means by which it would be prevented and controlled, also forms part of the consideration undertaken by the Environment Agency before issuing a permit for the EfW CHP facility to commence operation. The Applicant is preparing a permit application which will be submitted after the DCO application. This will include a Fire Prevention Plan.</p>
CS64	Local Community	Suggestion that a scale model of the proposed facility should have been provided at consultation events.	<p>The consultation feedback form (Consultation Report Appendix C, Volume 5.1) was structured to elicit comments from stakeholders on specific aspects of the Proposed Development. The final question on the form was free text, enabling consultees to provide any other comments on the Proposed Development and the consultation.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			In addition to the feedback form, consultees were able to provide comments via email, in hard copy submitted to the Freepost address, or via the telephone contact point.
CS65	Local Community	Concern that MVV have applied to the Secretary of State in order to avoid consideration from the local district and county councils.	The Applicant considered the production of a scale model for the purposes of supporting the consultation events. However, technology enabled the Applicant to produce a much better 3-D virtual model which allowed consultees to view the Proposed Development from any number of locations and across a much larger geographical area.
CS66	Local Community	Satisfied that the consultation documents and website were well designed and effective.	Large scale developments relating to energy, transport, water/and or waste which meet certain thresholds are classed as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). The Medworth EfW CHP Facility is classified as an NSIP because it will have a generating capacity of more than 50 megawatts. As a result, the Applicant must apply to the Secretary of State for a Development Consent Order (DCO).
CS67	Local Community	Concern that the consultation documents did not include information on how waste reduction and recycling would be achieved.	The Applicant notes the support for consultation documents and the design of the Proposed Development's website.
CS68	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School	Concern that the documents contain vague assurances rather than concrete promises that can be carried out and that can be held to account for.	<p>The purpose of the consultation and the information provided was to give consultees details about the Proposed Development, an assessment of the potential impacts and, where necessary, the required mitigation measures.</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility handles the waste which is left over after waste reduction and recycling measures have been implemented. Energy is generated from this residual waste that would otherwise be sent to landfill or other energy from waste facilities abroad.</p>
CS69	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that due to the lack of detail on mitigation measures it is not possible to make an informed decision regarding the proposed development.	As part of the approach to developing a DCO Application a PEIR is developed to enable consultees to understand the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed scheme. The Stage 2 Statutory Consultation actively sought consultees comments on the information provided in the PEIR. Comments



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS70	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	The documents do not put forward alternatives to incineration or landfill.	<p>provided by consultees were used to inform the preparation of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>The ES, submitted as part of the DCO application, includes details of the environmental mitigation proposed to avoid or reduce the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The schedule of mitigation and monitoring can be found in ES Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation and Monitoring (Volume 6.2).</p>
CS71	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern that alternatives to landfill and the proposed development have not been considered in the consultation.	<p>The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) submitted as part of the DCO application identifies the availability of residual waste i.e. that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill. The Proposed Development is being promoted to deal with this residual waste ensuring that it is treated as a resource in the UK, rather than being sent to landfill or exported for energy recovery.</p>
CS72	Local Community	Concern that the consultation materials have made reference to businesses benefiting from the energy produced from the incinerator without their permission or agreement.	<p>The EFW CHP facility is designed to deliver renewable energy in the form of electricity and/or useable heat to local businesses. This was made clear in the consultation materials published as part of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation. Any specific businesses named in previous consultation materials were purely for illustrative purposes.</p> <p>The Applicant intends to secure consent for a CHP Connection to allow it to provide steam to local businesses should they require it. The Applicant accepts that agreements are not yet in place but is confident that the financial and environmental pressures facing businesses will make alternative sources of heat and power attractive.</p> <p>One of the Applicant's essential criteria for selecting the location for the Proposed Development was its close proximity to industrial users who have a heat/steam demand. To provide reassurance, the Applicant's Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) has investigated the potential heat</p>
CS73	Historic England	Support for the statement in Paragraph 10.12 from Chapter 10 of the PEIR which states that the information and responses from the consultation will be used to augment the final assessment.	<p>The EFW CHP facility is designed to deliver renewable energy in the form of electricity and/or useable heat to local businesses. This was made clear in the consultation materials published as part of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation. Any specific businesses named in previous consultation materials were purely for illustrative purposes.</p> <p>The Applicant intends to secure consent for a CHP Connection to allow it to provide steam to local businesses should they require it. The Applicant accepts that agreements are not yet in place but is confident that the financial and environmental pressures facing businesses will make alternative sources of heat and power attractive.</p> <p>One of the Applicant's essential criteria for selecting the location for the Proposed Development was its close proximity to industrial users who have a heat/steam demand. To provide reassurance, the Applicant's Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) has investigated the potential heat</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			demands and concludes that there is sufficient potential demand to justify the supply of heat/steam in the location chosen to site the EfW CHP Facility.
CS74	Royal Mail	Request for Royal Mail to be added to the advanced consultation for the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	The Applicant notes and welcomes the support for the approach to the final assessment.
CS75	Royal Mail	Request for Medworth CHP Ltd to liaise with Royal Mail at least one month in advance of road closures/diversions to identify and make available alternative highway routes for operational use, where possible.	The request for further engagement with Royal Mail has been noted and included within the CTMP.
CS76	Norfolk County Council Highways	Complaint that the PEIR stated that no response was received to the original scoping request, despite a meeting between MVV and Norfolk County Council, held on January 21st 2021 in which comments were provided prior to the cut-off point of January 22nd.	
CS77	Norfolk County Council	Complaint that the details of consultation between MVV and Norfolk LLFA conveyed in the PEIR do not reflect Norfolk LLFA's records.	The Applicant has reviewed its records and can confirm that this comment in the PEIR was incorrectly made and that Norfolk County Council did provide a response to the scoping request dated 23 December 2019.
CS78	Norfolk County Council	Request for MVV to provide clarification to Norfolk County Council on where the information on the consultation between MVV and Norfolk LLFA came from.	Consultation with Norfolk LLFA at PEIR stage consisted of general advice on flood risk and SuDS provided by email (dated 11/01/21) as detailed in Table 12.3 in ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix 12B: Stakeholder Engagement (Volume 6.2) . A pre-application advice meeting has since been held with Norfolk LLFA on 03/03/22 (details provided in Table 12B.4 in ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix 12B: Stakeholder Engagement (Volume 6.2)). The Norfolk LLFA's advice on flood risk and surface water drainage has been included in the assessment of flood risk (ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix 12A: Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 6.2)) and proposed outline drainage strategy (ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			12F: Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.2)) for the Proposed Development.
CS79	Fenland District Council	Concern that the proposed layout plan in the consultation leaflet includes land in the ownership of Fenland District Council within the scheme, despite there not being an agreement with the Council to include this land.	Consultation with Norfolk LLFA at PEIR stage consisted of general advice on flood risk and SuDS provided by email (dated 11/01/21) as detailed in Table 12B.3 in ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix 12B: Stakeholder Engagement (Volume 6.2) . A pre-application advice meeting has since been held with Norfolk LLFA on 03/03/22 (details provided in Table 12B.4 in ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix 12B: Stakeholder Engagement (Volume 6.2)). The Norfolk LLFA's advice on flood risk and surface water drainage has been included in the assessment of flood risk (ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix 12A: Flood Risk Assessment) and proposed outline drainage strategy (ES Chapter 12: Hydrology, Appendix 12F: Outline Drainage Strategy) for the Proposed Development.
CS80	Wisbech Council	Town The Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR does not provide basic information such as a location plan, so it cannot be relied upon to provide the reader with sufficient information about the proposal and its effects and allow consultees to provide informed responses.	The Applicant acknowledges that land within the DCO Order Limits does include land owned by FDC. The Applicant has worked since the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation to refine the design such that the area of FDC land required is minimised. The Applicant has tried to engage with FDC in relation to the temporary use of this land for the TCC but unfortunately FDC refuse to engage with the Applicant. The Applicant is therefore seeking temporary use powers in the DCO in respect of this land. The Applicant remains willing to enter into a voluntary agreement with FDC.
CS81	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the consultation is contrary to sections 47(7) and 50(3) of the 2008 Planning Act, as the consultation does not provide sufficient information to allow consultees to understand the likely effects and provide adequate responses, does not provide accurate information, is not sufficiently developed, is not engaging or accessible in style, and is likely not inclusive as it took place over July and August when many people would likely be on holiday.	The Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR includes a series of maps showing the location of all components of the Proposed Development. Figure 2.3 Project Components identifies the individual components which together form the main Facility site.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS82	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the timing of the consultation period during a holiday period.	As demonstrated in the Consultation Report, all consultation has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and associated regulations and guidance. The Applicant has sought to provide all consultation documents and materials of a high quality whether in digital or print format at all stages of the pre application process. In line with the requirements of Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008 and DCLG Guidance on Pre-application Consultation the Applicant engaged with the Host Local Authorities on the draft SoCC. Feedback was sought on the proposed approach, the timing and duration of the consultations. Comments from the Host Local Authorities on the draft SoCC were taken into account in the preparation of the final SoCC as published.
CS83	Steve MP	Concern that the consultation process has been flawed due to it being premature and not of appropriate quality for an NSIP.	The Stage 2 Statutory Consultation took place in accordance with the SoCC and evidence of this compliance is presented in Chapter 5 of the Consultation Report.
CS84	Steve MP	Concern that the consultation has been premature and inadequate due to it failing to meet key requirements of the DCO regime.	The Applicant exceeded the commitments laid out in the SoCC as evidenced by:
CS85	Steve MP	Concern as the consultation has not followed the DCO pre-application process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> notification to consultees, which went above and beyond the legal requirements for a DCO, and stringent monitoring against the commitments made in the SoCC.
CS86	Steve MP	Concern that MVV has not met its commitments for consultation made in the Statement of Community Consultation.	<p>The Applicant also complied with the notification and publicity requirements of s.42 and s.48 of the Planning Act 2008, associated regulations and guidance.</p> <p>All consultation information was prepared by competent expert advisors, including the PEIR.</p>
CS87	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that the NTS fails to include key information and provides conclusions that cannot be relied upon, given the lack of baseline data and surveys.	<p>The Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the PEIR presents a preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, based on the environmental information collected at that stage of the project.</p> <p>The ES (Volume 6.2) and its accompanying NTS (Volume 6.1), which are submitted as part of the DCO application, provide fully justified and evidenced</p>
CS88	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that MVV offered to meet with Clenchwarton Parish Council during a period where the Council do not meet.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			assessment conclusions based on surveys undertaken since the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation.
CS89	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that statements made at consultation events and meetings that MVV are certain of obtaining a contract with Norfolk County Council are untrue and that the Council Leader has denied this is the case.	The Applicant prepared and offered a bespoke presentation to King's Lynn Borough Council, which includes the Parish of Clenchwarton; however they did not take up this offer.
CS90	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that statements made to residents that only steam comes out of the top of the stack is untrue as it is known that incinerators emit carcinogenic dioxins, furans, cadmium, lead and arsenic.	So far as the Applicant is aware, no such statement was made.
CS91	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that there is a lack of detail on the proposed highway improvements.	The Applicant provided detailed information to consultees on flue gas treatment processes through a variety of channels, including PEIR documentation, website information, banners at exhibitions and verbally at exhibition events. The Proposed Development will be regulated by the Environment Agency and operated in accordance with the requirements of an Environmental Permit which will include adherence to strict emissions limits.
CS92	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that highway improvements required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development have not been sufficiently detailed in the consultation documents.	As part of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation information was provided which set out the potential for highways improvements along new Bridge Lane. However, until traffic surveys were undertaken it was not possible for these designs to be finalised. Following the relaxation of Covid-19 restrictions surveys were undertaken with the agreement of the highway authorities in October 2021. Further design work was then undertaken and the proposed improvements provided to Cambridgeshire County Council as the relevant highways authority for their comment and observation.
CS93	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that there is a lack of information on the alternative sites considered.	
CS94	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the consultation documents have not addressed site selection and	Chapter 2: Alternatives of the PEIR presented a summary of the alternatives considered by the Applicant. Section 2.3 describes the site selection process



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		alternatives, despite consultees' requests and Scoping Opinion requirements.	
CS95	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on how MVV intends to consult on information regarding alternative sites considered.	for the Facility and the alternatives which were considered. The Applicant established criteria to determine the suitability of a site for the EFW CHP Facility. The criteria included essential and preferable siting criteria. Options were evaluated against this criteria. The results were presented in Chapter 2: Alternatives of the PEIR.
CS96	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that there is a lack of information on the residential amenity assessment.	The assessment of alternatives has been updated in the Environmental Statement (Volume 6.2), to reflect any further alternatives considered and provide a justification for the preferred options selected.
CS97	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the results from the Residential Amenity Assessment has not been provided for the consultation stage.	ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) of the PEIR includes a residential visual amenity assessment, undertaken in accordance with "The Landscape Institute's Technical Information Note - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment." The assessment included all residential properties within 500m of the boundary of the main Facility.
CS98	Steve MP Barclay	Request for information on when MVV intends to consult with residents on local impacts, given that a Residential Amenity Assessment was not provided.	ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) submitted in support of the DCO application presents the final assessment.
CS99	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that there is a lack of information on air quality modelling.	
CS100	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the consultation is premature due to the lack of location specific weather data and modelling of abnormal operations.	Details of the air quality modelling were included in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) of the PEIR.
CS101	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that CCS facilities required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development has not been sufficiently detailed in the consultation documents.	ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) submitted in support of the DCO application presents the air quality modelling in greater detail.
CS102	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on how MVV will consult on carbon capture and storage elements of the proposed development.	Carbon capture and storage does not currently form part of the Proposed Development as it is not a legal or policy requirement for projects of this size. However, the Applicant is aware that legislation is evolving and as such has



ID	Respondent		Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS103	Steve MP	Barclay	Suggestion that a further round of consultation is required due to the lack of information on the carbon capture and storage elements of the project.	ensured that the Proposed Development will be 'carbon capture ready'. This readiness includes setting aside land within the EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate carbon capture equipment. The installation and operation of carbon capture technology will require the submission of a separate planning application and therefore will not be consulted on at this time.
CS104	Steve MP	Barclay	Concern that the requirements of the PINS Advice Note 7 have not been met.	
CS105	Steve MP	Barclay	Concern that the transport of hazardous waste is not discussed in the consultation material.	<p>The Planning Inspectorates Advice Note Seven relates to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). In accordance with the EIA Regulations, the Applicant formally notified the Secretary of State in writing on the 3 December 2019 of its intention to provide an ES in respect of the Proposed Development. In accordance with good practice, a Scoping Report was prepared to identify the potential likely significant environmental effects.</p> <p>An EIA, which covers the construction and operation of the Proposed Development has been undertaken is reported in the ES (Volume 6.2) that accompanies the DCO application.</p>
CS106	Steve MP	Barclay	Suggestion that a further round of consultation take place once issues with the draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment have been addressed.	The Applicant can confirm that that no hazardous waste will be treated at the EfW CHP Facility. However, treatment of flue gases, for example, will require chemicals to be delivered and APC residues to be removed. The Applicant will enter into contracts for the supply and removal of these products with fully licenced suppliers who will transport them in fully sealed tankers.
CS107	Steve MP	Barclay	Suggestion that a further stage of statutory consultation take place when missing information, such as traffic surveys, further assessments, and design arrangements for the A1101 Elm High Road and A47 Broadend Crossings, are available.	The draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) was published for comment as part of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation. Feedback received from consultees has been considered and has informed the preparation of the final WFAA (Volume 7.3) which is included within the suite of documents submitted with the DCO application.
CS108	Steve MP	Barclay	Suggestion that a further round of consultation take place when schemes of mitigation are more clearly understood.	The DCO application includes an ES (Volume 6.2) which builds on the information presented in the PEIR and includes updated information based on detailed surveys undertaken since the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS109	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that a further round of consultation be undertaken, including full Preliminary Environmental Information, and additional information on the project description, grid connection proposals, highways improvements, residential amenity impacts, ash waste, air quality, traffic and GHG emissions.	<p><i>Traffic – Surveys</i></p> <p>Following the relaxation of Covid-19 restrictions traffic surveys were undertaken with the agreement of the highway authorities in October 2021. The results informed the development of the final DCO application and is covered in the ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2).</p> <p><i>Mitigation measures</i></p> <p>The ES includes detailed information covering mitigation measures (Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation and Monitoring (Volume 6.2)).</p> <p><i>Other</i></p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation the Applicant's technical advisors undertook further surveys and information gathering in order to refine the final DCO application. These surveys and investigations cover all of the topics listed in CS105.</p> <p>Consequently, no further rounds of consultation are currently required for the Proposed Development. There is however further opportunity to comment on the Proposed Development during the Examination of the application by the Examining Authority. Once the application has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, consultees should register through the PINS website if they wish to make representations to the Examining Authority as an Interested Party.</p>
CS110	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on when MVV will consult on accurate and realistic GHG emission estimates for the proposed development.	<p>The DCO submission includes detailed information on GHG emissions (Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2)). This includes the results of scenario modelling.</p> <p>Consequently, no further rounds of consultation are currently required for the Proposed Development. There is however further opportunity to comment on the Proposed Development during the Examination of the application by the Examining Authority. Once the application has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, consultees should register through the PINS website if they wish to make representations to the Examining Authority as an Interested Party.</p>
CS111	Steve MP Barclay	Request for information on when all details of associated development, including substation design and construction, and highways improvements, will be made available for public consultation.	<p>The DCO submission includes detailed information on GHG emissions (Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2)). This includes the results of scenario modelling.</p> <p>Consequently, no further rounds of consultation are currently required for the Proposed Development. There is however further opportunity to comment on the Proposed Development during the Examination of the application by the Examining Authority. Once the application has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, consultees should register through the PINS website if they wish to make representations to the Examining Authority as an Interested Party.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
CS112	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied that the PEIR is in accordance with the EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 7, meaning the PEIR presents a level of preliminary assessment appropriate to enable consultees to develop an informed view of the likely environmental effects of the Proposed Development and help inform their consultation responses.	<p>As part of the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation the Applicant consulted on the options that were under consideration for associated development. Following this proposals for the associated development were refined and are now presented in the ES Chapter 3: Description of Development (Volume 6.2)</p> <p>Consequently, no further rounds of consultation are currently required for the Proposed Development. There is however further opportunity to comment on the Proposed Development during the Examination of the application by the Examining Authority. Once the application has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, consultees should register through the PINS website if they wish to make representations to the Examining Authority as an Interested Party.</p>
CS113	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied that the approach to the EIA has encompassed public, stakeholder and consultee engagement and has been adapted during the recent Covid-19 pandemic to ensure maximum engagement with the process.	The Applicant notes the support for the PEIR.
CS114	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Environmental Statement provide details on the remit and responsibility of the Local Liaison Committee, including commitments to running the committee regularly during early operation, post-completion, and long term.	<p>The Applicant notes the support for the approach to EIA.</p> <p>The Applicant has included an Outline Community Benefits Plan (Volume 7.14) within the DCO application. This reiterates the Applicant's commitment to the provision of a Local Liaison Committee (LLC), how it will be convened and how it will operate. During the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation the Applicant received a number of requests to join the LLC and will contact those who expressed an interest. The Applicant intends to convene the first meeting of the LLC once the DCO application has been accepted for Examination to enable local residents to engage closely with all stages of the Proposed</p>

JJ107

Consultation Report



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			Development from planning, through construction, commissioning, and the operational period.



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding DCO, Design and Planning

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 5.1 Issues raised regarding DCO, Design and Planning** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 5.5 Issues raised regarding DCO, Design and Planning

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP01	Local Community	Suggestion that the energy-from-waste facility should not be developed in Wisbech and should be located elsewhere instead.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP02	<p>BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk</p> <p>South Wooton Parish Council</p> <p>Local Community</p>	Suggestion that other methods of waste disposal and energy generation are more suitable, effective, or environmentally efficient.	<p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP03	Local Community	Concern that the proposals contradict national and pending environmental legislation.	<p>the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP04	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Emneth Parish Council Wisbech Town Council	Objection to the proposals for an energy-from-waste combined heat and power facility at Wisbech.	<p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p> <p>Comment is noted. National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Commercial Safety Systems Ltd		the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) .
	Kirk Coachworks		
	English Brothers Ltd		
	The Sportsman Pub		
	William H Brown/ Sequence (UK) Ltd		
	MJ Acoustics		
	Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd		
	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School		
	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council		
	Liz Truss MP		



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Nordelph Parish Council South Wooton Parish Council Local Community PIL		
DP05	Local Community	Concern that the proposals contradict national and WHO guidelines regarding the siting of energy-from-waste facilities.	<p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP06	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Local Community	Concern that proposed facility undermines current efforts to encourage recycling and reduce the use of non-recyclable materials.	<p>national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p> <p>It is the Applicant's understanding that the "WHO guidelines" referred to relate to a report titled Findings on an Assessment of Small-scale Incinerators for Health-care Waste, S Batterman (2004). This report provides an analysis of low-cost small-scale incinerators used to dispose of healthcare waste in developing countries. Research papers can be unintentionally misrepresented by objectors to energy from waste proposals and the Applicant believes this might be the case here.</p> <p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), including sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP07	Emneth Parish Council WEP Fabrications Ltd Liz Truss MP Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Nordelph Parish Council Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed location of the energy-from-waste facility is inappropriate due to proximity to schools, residential areas, businesses and agricultural land.	<p>arisings may change with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility is located within an industrial estate which is allocated for future development and primarily on land currently operating as a waste transfer station (WTS). Where relevant, for example, to assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on air quality at sensitive receptors, such as, schools homes, businesses and agricultural land, these have been assessed and are reported in the ES. Further details of how these assessments have been undertaken, what mitigation is proposed (where necessary) and the overall conclusion of the assessment of effects are reported in full in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where the emission limits are being exceeded, the power to require an operator to cease operations either temporarily or permanently.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11); • Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4); • Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10); • Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9);



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Travel Plan (Volume 6.4); and • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7).
DP08	Local Community	Support for the proposals for an energy-from-waste combined heat and power facility at Wisbech.	Comment is noted.
DP09	Icon Engineering Ltd The Sportsman Pub Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed energy-from-waste facility should be sited closer to transport links including motorways and dual carriageways.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet.</p> <p>Good access to the strategic road network is one of the Applicant's criteria and the EfW CHP Facility Site's close proximity to the A47, part of the national road network was met.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the highway capacity, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B: Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments consider the A47 and conclude that it would not be significantly affected.</p> <p>The assessment also examined the local road network to access the EfW CHP Facility Site, including HGV access off the A47 onto Cromwell Road and then New Bridge Lane. By implementing the proposed Access Improvements along New Bridge Lane, which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing point, the assessment concludes that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p>
DP10	South Wooton Parish Council	Suggestion that greater efforts be made instead into reducing the use of non-	The Applicant is supportive of programmes to support waste education and awareness. For the Proposed Development, the Applicant has prepared an



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Local Community	recyclable materials and encouraging recycling and the use of recyclable materials.	<p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14). This strategy includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
DP11	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed energy-from-waste facility should be sited closer to the grid connection or power stations to reduce the impacts of developing the connection.	<p>Locating the EfW CHP Facility closer to the grid connection point at Walsoken substation would not satisfy the Applicant's site selection criteria; principally being near existing businesses that have a large heat and/or power demand. See ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) for further information.</p> <p>During the pre-application process, the Applicant investigated several connection routes to connect the EfW CHP facility to the national grid. Following consultation with National Grid, UKPN and National Highways, rather than a combination of overhead and underground cables on public highway and private land to connect to the Walpole substation some 10 km north of the EfW CHP Facility, the Applicant proposes a shorter route. This shorter route connects to Walsoken substation, approximately 4km north and is solely underground and within highway land. Further information of the section process for the Grid Connection is provided in ES Appendix 2A: Grid Connections Options Report (Volume 6.4).</p>
DP12	English Brothers Ltd Local Community	Concern that the decision to site the facility at Wisbech was because the town is deprived and perceived to have low levels of education.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations. <p>Deprivation indexes of Wisbech was not a criteria of the Applicant's site selection process.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including socio-economic factors, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2). The assessment concludes there will be no adverse significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including education; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
DP13	Fascinating Fens MJ Acoustics WEP Fabrications Ltd Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed location of the energy-from-waste facility is inappropriate due to Wisbech being a small town.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP14	Local Community	Request for information on the cost of developing and operating an energy-from-waste facility against other alternatives such as wind and solar.	<p>The Applicant estimates the total investment for the Proposed Development to be in the region of £350m, see Funding Statement (Volume 4.2).</p> <p>Wind and solar are alternative forms of energy generation only, and do not process residual waste, therefore costs are not considered comparable.</p>
DP15	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed energy-from-waste facility should be sited in a rural location in order to reduce impacts on towns and residential areas.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP16	Local Community	Objection to the principle of the energy-from-waste incineration process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations. <p>Comment is noted. The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the Proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP17	Local Community	Concern that the energy output of the proposals has been maximised in order to achieve DCO consent and avoid the local planning process.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>The amount of residual waste to be processed at the EfW CHP will generate in excess of 50 megawatts of electricity. Therefore, the Proposed Development</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under Part 3 Section 14 of the Planning Act 2008 (2008 Act) by virtue of the fact that the generating station is located in England and has a generating capacity of over 50 megawatts (section 15(2) of the 2008 Act). It, therefore, requires an application for a DCO to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) under the 2008 Act.
DP18	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed facility is not needed due to high recycling rates in Cambridgeshire.	The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) , to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including Cambridgeshire. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.
DP19	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed facility is not needed to treat local waste and generate local energy.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including Cambridgeshire and Norfolk. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development. One of the Applicant's essential criteria for selecting the location for the Proposed Development was its close proximity to businesses which have a heat/steam demand. To provide reassurance, the Applicant's Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) has investigated the potential heat demands and concludes that the supply of heat/steam in the location chosen to site the EfW CHP Facility is viable.</p>
DP20	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed energy-from-waste facility should be sited in an urban city location in order to handle the waste at source.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP21	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed energy-from-waste facility should be sited closer to the centre of the proposed catchment area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP21	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed energy-from-waste facility should be sited closer to the centre of the proposed catchment area.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including Cambridgeshire and Norfolk. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste within the region.</p> <p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP22	Local Community	Support for the principle of the energy-from-waste incineration process.	Comment is noted.
DP23	Local Community	Concern that the decision to site the facility at Wisbech was because plans for an energy-from-waste facility were rejected at nearby Kings Lynn.	<p>The choice of location was not influenced by the Kings Lynn decision.</p> <p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential'</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP24	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed facility is not needed because there is a current overcapacity of incinerators.	<p>and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP25	Local Community	Concern that the proposed facility will further exacerbate the housing crisis in Wisbech.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including socioeconomic impacts to the housing market have been assessed and reported in Chapter 15: Socio-economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2). The assessment concludes there will be no significant effects to the housing market.</p>
DP26	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed energy-from-waste facility should be sited in a coastal location in order to reduce air quality impacts.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP27	Liz Truss MP Local Community	Concern that the proposed facility has been sited on land at risk of flooding.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with flood risk have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2). Due to their low laying nature, many areas within the Fens are at risk from flooding, but benefit from defences managed by the Environment Agency. However, the Applicant has assessed extreme events, including changes due to climate change, where these defences fail. The assessment concludes that with embedded mitigation, there are no significant impacts related to the risk of flooding. The embedded mitigation that will be secured by either a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The finished floor level (FFL) of the EfW CHP Facility to be 3m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD); • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a ranges of mitigation measures to control e.g., flooding); • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9); and • Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4).
DP28	Local Community	Request for clarification on the site selection process and what alternative locations and options were considered.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP29	Local Community	Request for clarification on whether any businesses in Algores Way will be issued compulsory purchase orders.	<p>The Applicant is only seeking compulsorily acquisition powers over the land shown coloured pink and blue on the Land Plans (Volume 2.2). In addition, street works and highways powers are being sought in respect of Algores Way.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP30	Local Community	Concern that the proposals contradict local authority waste policies and the NPPF.	<p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the Proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP31	Local Community	Satisfied that the proposed location of the energy-from-waste facility on an industrial estate is appropriate.	Comment is noted.
DP32	Local Community	Request for clarification as to who designated the proposed site for waste management use.	<p>The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2036¹ (adopted July 2021) is the current adopted development plan relevant to this area. Policy 10 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan designates Waste Management Areas (WMAs). WMAs identify existing or committed waste management facilities that make a significant contribution to managing any waste stream; within a WMA, non-waste management proposals are (subject to some exceptions) not permitted. The majority of the EfW CHP Facility Site is designated as a WMA.</p>
DP33	Local Community	Request for clarification on whether budget provision has been made for the decommissioning of the facility and who would undertake this work if MVV liquidated.	The decommissioning of the EfW CHP Facility will be undertaken by the Applicant.

¹ Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council (2021). Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2036.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP34	Local Community	Concern that the proposed energy-from-waste facility will rely on imported waste in order to justify its operation.	<p>The Applicant's intention is that the EfW CHP Facility will intercept UK waste which is currently exported. It is not proposed to import waste from abroad.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level including residual waste currently being exported abroad for treatment in EfW facilities. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p>
DP35	Local Community	Concern that the particulate emissions created by the Proposed Development will not be considered by the Planning Inspectorate.	<p>The Planning Inspectorate will consider the application consistent with the relevant national policy statements.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with particulates have been assessed and reported ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2). This assessment includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation, with regards to particulate pollution. In addition, it should be noted that the EfW CHP Facility is unlikely to emit ultrafine particles considering the fabric filter system, and the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) used to define emissions or particles was based on total particulate matter.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. Continuous emissions monitoring includes particulate matter (total dust including PM_{2.5}).</p>
DP36	Local Community	Concern that the proposals contradict national and local waste strategies.	<p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the Proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy.</p> <p>The planning assessment also concludes the Proposed Development would not result in unacceptable adverse environmental impacts and is not judged to be in conflict with the local planning policies relevant to the DCO application. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP37	PIL	Suggestion that the Proposed Development conflicts with the consented Lapwing Fen II development and that areas of Model Farm need to be removed from the project red line boundary.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to connect to Walsoken substation. Consequently, the Order limits has been redrawn and no longer includes land adjacent to the Lapwing Fen II development or areas of Model Farm.</p>
DP38	Floorspan Contracts Ltd	Suggestion that the vacant adjacent Fenland District Council land be used as it would mean that existing local businesses would not need to relocate. The representation considered this to be obvious in terms of a decision regarding any compulsory land purchase.	<p>The Applicant is proposing to use some of the vacant adjacent FDC land. The Applicant's preference is to acquire the land rights it requires for the Proposed Development via voluntary agreement. Nevertheless, it is essential to ensure the timely delivery of the Proposed Development and the Applicant is therefore seeking compulsory powers to deliver the Proposed Development, should voluntary agreement not be reached or ultimately not be effective. Further details on the justification for compulsory acquisition powers is set out in the Statement of Reasons. Whether acquisition is voluntary or undertaken using compulsory acquisition, no local businesses will be required to relocate.</p>
DP39	PIL	Suggestion that MVV contact other utility providers to gather the extent of services within the area.	<p>Utility providers have been contacted and consultation undertaken to understand how the Proposed Development would interact with their assets.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP40	PIL	Request for clarification on how the Proposed Development would impact on CBRE's client's property.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to connect to Walsoken substation. Consequently, the Order limits have been redrawn and no longer includes land adjacent to the St Pauls Road Services service station off the A47.</p>
DP41	Local Community	Concern that the street scene within the town is part of a conservation area, something which will be degraded beyond recognition with the built proposal and contravening the Neighbourhood Plan of the area	<p>The Landscape and Visual Assessment and the Historic Environment Assessment are both reported in ES Chapters 9: Landscape and Visual and 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) respectively. They assess the potential for significant effects upon receptors including the town centre of Wisbech and its conservation area and conclude that these would not be significant.</p>
DP42	Nordelph Parish Council	Concern that the siting of the Proposed Development is in close proximity to the main drain serving the local area.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with surface water drainage have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2). To inform the assessment and discuss embedded mitigation to address concerns, consultation with key Stakeholders including the Internal Drainage Boards', Environment Agency and Local Lead Flood Authorities has taken place. ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to connect to Walsoken substation. Consequently, the Order limits have been redrawn and excludes several drains that would have been affected had the Grid Connection been to Walpole substation.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that with embedded mitigation, there are no significant impacts related surface water drainage. The embedded mitigation that will be secured by either a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The finished floor level (FFL) of the EfW CHP Facility to be 3m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD); • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a ranges of mitigation measures to control e.g., surface water drainage); • Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9); and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4).
DP43	CPRE	<p>Concern that the Proposed Development contradicts national and local waste policy to cease transshipping of waste between local authorities.</p>	<p>There is no extant waste planning policy which seeks the restriction of waste movement between Local Authority boundaries. Indeed, due to the number and type of specialist waste facilities required across England, movement of waste across arbitrary administrative boundaries is commonplace - it would be impractical for every Local Planning Authority to provide for the full range of waste facilities that their communities require, and to become totally self-sufficient in waste management terms. What extant legislation and waste management policy does require is adherence to the proximity principle i.e., that waste is treated in the nearest available, appropriate facility. Adherence to this principle is fully reflected in both the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) and the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3).</p>
DP44	CPRE	<p>Suggestion that alternative treatments higher in the waste hierarchy, such as anaerobic digestion and plastic re-use and re-processing, are more suitable and environmentally friendly for the handling of combustible organic materials.</p>	<p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP45	CPRE	Suggestion that the Proposed Development contradicts Policy 1 of the adopted Minerals and Waste Plan that proposals should demonstrate how they will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), including sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that in comparison to other renewable energy technologies, the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, comparing the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario where waste is sent to landfill, the GHG assessment indicates an overall net reduction in emissions. Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures to further reduce GHG emissions associated with the Proposed Development have also been considered in the assessment.</p>
DP46	CPRE	Suggestion that the Proposed Development contradicts Policy 1 of the adopted Minerals and Waste Plan that proposals should demonstrate how they make use of renewable energy, as the Proposed Development does not provide renewable energy.	<p>EfW is classified as renewable energy as defined by national policy within NPS EN-1. The Proposed Development also includes for CHP to supply heat and power to local businesses. This would displace their use of natural gas in heating or cooling processes.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies relevant to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP47	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development contradicts Policy 3 of the adopted Minerals and Waste Plan due to its intention to import waste from other local authorities.	Policy 3 of the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2021) states that the Waste Planning Authorities will seek to achieve 'net self-sufficiency' in relation to the management of waste arising from the plan area. This policy does not preclude the importation of waste from other Local Authorities or place a ceiling on capacity to be provided - rather, it simply states that the plan will make positive provision for the equivalent of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's own waste arisings. Compliance with the extant Development Plan is discussed in detail in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) .
DP48	CPRE	Concern that there is no evidence that the local authorities listed in the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment have committed to using the Proposed Development if consented.	Waste management contracts are commercially sensitive and the subject of ongoing change. As such, until such time as there is some certainty around the proposed EfW CHP Facility's development, it is unlikely that there would be any commercial commitments expressed to use the EfW CHP Facility. Notwithstanding this, the WFAA (Volume 7.3) has concluded that there is sufficient residual waste generated both 'locally' and nationally and insufficient, corresponding waste management capacity to manage this waste i.e., there is a clear need for the EfW CHP Facility.
DP49	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development contradicts Fenland Local Plan Policies LP2 and LP3.	The policy titles are Policy LP2 Facilitating the health and wellbeing of local residents and LP3 Spatial Strategy, settlement hierarchy and the countryside. Policy LP2 is addressed in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) with reference to the ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) whilst LP3 states that the focus of major growth is around the four market towns. The siting of the Proposed Development in Wisbech would appear to be consistent with this strategy given that Wisbech is one of the market towns referenced.
DP50	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development does not meet much of the selection criteria laid out for employment proposals under Fenland Local Plan Policy LP6.	LP6 states that the majority of new employment land should be in Wisbech and March. In terms of criteria the proposal is consistent with the policy requirement to be consistent with the spatial strategy and broad locations for growth, it is accessible by public transport (Cromwell Road) and the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) demonstrates that the site can be developed without increasing flood risk. The ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) demonstrates that the effects upon the natural and heritage assets would not be significant and it has assessed the level of effects



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			upon the historic character of the area. The proposed infrastructure improvements are considered by the Applicant to be appropriate, and the majority of the EfW CHP Facility Site is identified as a waste management area in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
DP51	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development contravenes the objectives for development in Wisbech laid out in Fenland Local Plan Policy LP8 due to the impact on local character and increased HGV movements on the A47.	The Applicant has undertaken regular engagement with National Highways, the organisation responsible for the A47. It has scoped and agreed the Transport Assessment (TA) (Appendix 6B, Volume 6.4) with National Highways. The conclusions of the TA are that there would not be significant effects upon the A47.
DP52	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development does not meet the criteria laid out in Fenland Local Plan Policy LP13 due to placing extra burden on the local road network.	The Applicant has scoped the TA (Appendix 6B, Volume 6.4) with Cambridgeshire County Council as local highways authority. The conclusions of the TA are that the local highway network would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development with the exception of New Bridge Lane. However, the percentage increase in HGV traffic on this road is a result of the fact that it is presently closed at the point at which it crosses the disused March to Wisbech Railway.
DP53	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development does not meet the criteria laid out in Fenland Local Plan Policy LP16.	LP16 Delivering and Protecting high quality environments across the district establishes a number of policy criteria (A-O). Whilst local plan policy is not the prime policy consideration in the context of an NSIP the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) does assess the performance of the Proposed Development against the environmental issues covered by this policy and concludes on the appropriateness of the Proposed Development within the planning balance.
DP54	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development contradicts Fenland Local Plan Policy LP18 due to adverse impacts on Conservation Areas and heritage assets.	The Environment Statement includes for the consideration of effects upon the historic environment. Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) concludes that there would be no significant effects upon the historic environment.
DP55	CPRE	Objection to the proposals for an energy-from-waste combined heat and power facility at Wisbech.	Comment is noted.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP56	National Grid	Suggestion that a Deed of Consent is required for any crossing of the National Grid gas pipeline easement.	Changes made to the Proposed Development since statutory consultation mean that it will not cross any gas pipelines owned by National Grid. The Applicant is in discussions with all statutory undertakers affected by the Proposed Development.
DP57	Environment Agency	Suggestion that the Environmental Permit and Development Consent Order applications be tracked in parallel to enable the Environment Agency to identify key issues and resolve them efficiently for both processes.	Once the DCO application has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate for examination, the Applicant intends to submit an application for an Environmental Permit to the Environment Agency.
DP58	Environment Agency	Suggestion that the Environmental Permit and Development Consent Order applications be tracked in parallel to reduce the uncertainty of whether activity is likely to be permitted.	Once the DCO application has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate for examination, the Applicant intends to submit an application for an Environmental Permit to the Environment Agency.
DP59	Environment Agency	Suggestion that MVA arrange a pre-application meeting with the National Permitting Service and Area Compliance Officers to ensure design requirements are known at the earliest for key permitting areas.	The Applicant welcomes your suggestion. The request for engagement is noted and the Applicant has subsequently engaged with the Environment Agency to discuss a forthcoming Environmental Permit application.
DP60	Bedford Borough Council and Central Bedfordshire Council	Suggestion that it is unlikely that the Bedfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan area will have the shortfall of waste treatment options anticipated in the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Report due to the Rookery South ERF serving the Bedford Borough and Central Bedfordshire Councils.	The point made by the representation is accepted and the WFAA (Volume 7.3) has been amended accordingly.
DP61	Natural England	Satisfied that an appropriate process for site selection, grid connection route options, and solutions has been applied in PEIR Chapter 2.	Comment is noted.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP62	Highways England	Satisfied with the construction and operational phases study areas as seen in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 in Chapter 6 of the PEIR.	Comment is noted.
DP63	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Opposition to incineration as it is destroying valuable materials that could otherwise be recycled. If recycled the demand for virgin materials would be lower.	<p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP64	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern that the Proposed Development will disincentivise waste reduction efforts.	<p>The Applicant does not believe that EfW leads to a disincentive to recycle. In addition to this, the focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP65	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Objection to the Proposed Development due to it being an inefficient method of energy generation.	The Proposed Development would burn waste that would otherwise go to landfill. By burning the waste electricity and steam is generated which can be exported to the national grid and/or used by local businesses. National Policy (EN-1) is clear that EfW also provides an important means of balancing the national grid.
DP66	Wisbech March TUC	Objection to the proposal of developing an EfW plant in Wisbech.	Comment is noted.
DP67	Fenland District Council	Concern that waste supplying the Proposed Development will come from far away and place Wisbech at risk of becoming a 'dumping ground' for waste materials.	The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) , to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.
DP68	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that the proposed location of the facility is inappropriate due to proximity to schools, residential areas and businesses, and distance from the grid connection.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility is located within an industrial estate which is allocated for future development and primarily on land currently operating as a waste transfer station (WTS). Where relevant, for example, to assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on air quality at sensitive receptors, such as, schools, homes and businesses, these have been assessed and are reported in the ES. Further details of how these assessments have been undertaken, what mitigation is proposed (where necessary) and the overall conclusion of the assessment of effects are reported in full in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where the emission limits are being exceeded, the power to require an operator to cease operations either temporarily or permanently.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11); • Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4); • Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10); • Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9); • Outline Travel Plan (Volume 6.4); and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7). <p>Locating the EfW CHP Facility closer to the grid connection point at Walsoken substation would not satisfy the Applicant's site selection criteria; principally being near existing businesses that have a large heat and/or power demand. See ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) for further information.</p> <p>During the pre-application process, the Applicant investigated several connection routes to connect the EfW CHP facility to the national grid. Following consultation with National Grid, UKPN and National Highways, rather than a combination of overhead and underground cables on public highway and private land to connect to the Walpole substation some 10km north of the EfW CHP Facility, the Applicant proposes a shorter route. This shorter route connects to Walsoken substation, approximately 4km north and is solely underground and within highway land. Further information of the section process for the Grid Connection is provided in Appendix 2A: Grid Connections Options Report (Volume 6.4).</p>
DP69	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that there is no requirement for a facility capable of treating an additional 0.6256mtpa in this location, as this is above the surplus for waste management capacity is 0.495mtpa for 2036, meaning waste would	The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has assessed both the regional and national requirement for the EfW CHP Facility. This has concluded that there is insufficient residual waste management capacity available to ensure that our non-recyclable waste can be managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible (i.e., diverted from landfill) and in a manner which complies with the proximity principle (i.e., treating waste as close as possible to its point of



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		have to be transported large distances to the facility.	arising). This latter point is especially relevant for the significant quantities of residual waste that are presently exported from England for management via EfW in mainland Europe.
DP70	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that data relied upon in the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment is dated, such as the capacity gap identified for Norfolk County Council from 2013.	The DWFAA was based upon the latest published evidence bases which underpinned the Waste Local Plans of those Waste Planning Authorities in the assessment's Study Area. However, it is acknowledged that some of this data was out of date. A such, in the submission version of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) , an updated position in terms of newly consented capacity (as well as capacity which may have been lost) has been presented.
DP71	Wisbech Council	Town That the shortfall of non-landfill HIC residual waste management capacity quoted in the PEIR does not take into account the surplus capacity identified in a number of authorities within the catchment area, or the assumptions around the need to increase recycling rates.	The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has considered future residual waste management needs both locally and nationally and has concluded that there is a need for additional residual waste management capacity - and especially capacity that offers an alternative to landfill (which is at the very bottom of the waste management hierarchy). Additionally, (and importantly), the WFAA (Volume 7.3) only considers the need for the proposed EfW CHP Facility in the context of how much residual waste will require management in the future. In other words, the achievement of national targets for the recycling and reuse of waste have already been taken into account when considering how much residual waste is likely to require management in the future.
DP72	Wisbech Council	Town That as Hertfordshire's new Draft Local Plan includes a commitment to net self-sufficiency by 2036 and a move towards zero avoidable waste, less waste will be exported from Hertfordshire, therefore negating the need for this waste facility.	The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.
DP73	Wisbech Council	Town That there is no identified need for the proposal, as the information provided is outdated, and fails to take into account the predicted waste performance of neighbouring authorities it claims it will use waste from.	The DWFAA was based upon the latest published evidence bases which underpinned the Waste Local Plans of those Waste Planning Authorities in the assessment's study area. However, it is acknowledged that some of this data was out of date. A such, in the submission version of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) , an updated position in terms of newly consented capacity (as well as capacity



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			which may have been lost) has been presented. In addition to this, the focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.
DP74	Wisbech Council	Town	Concern that as there is no justification for the need of the proposal, the development has the potential to prejudice local waste management targets which would be contrary to the National Policy Statement EN-3.
DP75	Wisbech Council	Town	Suggestion to consider alternative locations, as made clear by paragraph 2.2.10 of the Scoping Report, and to include reasoning for the chosen location including a comparison between environmental effects.
			The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has considered future residual waste management needs both locally and nationally and has concluded that there is a need for additional residual waste management capacity - and especially capacity that offers an alternative to landfill (which is at the very bottom of the waste management hierarchy).
			The Scoping opinion provided by PINs states that the ES should include for the consideration of alternative sites where these have been considered. The Applicant did not consider alternative sites. However, ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP76	Wisbech Council	Town	Complaint that MVV did not consider proximity to waste fuel as one of the essential siting criteria, as if it had, it would suggest that it is not proposed in an appropriate location.
			The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (Volume 7.3) which accompanies the application demonstrates that there is a need for a facility such as the EfW CHP Facility. Government policy encourages EfW Facilities to include CHP or be CHP ready. Section 2.3 to ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.3) sets out the site selection process undertaken to identify a suitable location for an EfW facility with a potential CHP market.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP77	Wisbech Town Council	Concern that the selection criteria skewed in favour of this specific site and does not represent a fair and reasonable selection process.	<p>The process involved the use of 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably met. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP78	Wisbech Town Council	That the pre-application provided a lack of data and failed to prove there would be no adverse impacts on the local highway network, the visual amenities of the historic backdrop of Wisbech, health and well-being resulting from air quality issues, local biodiversity and flood risk, and the believe the proposal would exacerbate these issues.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations.
DP79	Wisbech Town Council	That there has been no genuine search for alternative sites and that the data fails to	The EIA regulations require that alternatives considered by the applicant are reported in the ES and the reasons for selection provided.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>demonstrate the need for the facility within its proposed location, meaning the waste hierarchy would not be followed, making the development unsustainable.</p>	<p>The Scoping opinion provided by PINs states that the ES should include for the consideration of alternative sites where these have been considered. ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and, • A site free of environmental designations. <p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), including sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates the need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p>
DP80	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Opposed to the plans of the incinerator as the County Council will find it hard to conform the Waste Hierarchy.	<p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP81	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Suggestion that the priority should be on developing infrastructure promoting re-use and recycling.	<p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including waste awareness and education; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; and• Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/placements. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establishment of a local liaison committee;• Employment of a Community Liaison Manager;• Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
DP82	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that Nickel-Cadmium batteries, an outlet of cadmium contamination, will be included in the waste stream.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions of metal and related compounds have been assessed in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2). This assessment includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The assessment has considered potential emissions of cadmium and nickel from the EFW CHP Facility chimney, including metal deposition on land. The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>
DP83	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Suggestion that the reduction, re-use and recycling of municipal waste be employed instead of incineration.	<p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
<p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p> <p>To support waste education and awareness, as part of the Proposed Development, Applicant is committed to providing the following strategies.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support;• Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements;• Local employment during construction and operation; and• Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establishment of a local liaison committee;• Employment of a Community Liaison Manager;• Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building;• Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and• Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>			



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP84	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Opposition to the facility as Nriagu considers Waste incineration to be one of the most important anthropogenic sources of heavy metals.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including production and dispersal of anthropogenic compounds have been assessed and reported. ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease. In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation, for example dioxins in the food chain. The air quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11); • Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4); • Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10); • Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9); • Outline Travel Plan (Volume 6.4); and • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7). <p>All EfW facilities in England require an EP from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where the emission limits are being</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP85	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Opposition to the facility as Gibb et al. lists incineration as one of the main sources of trace elements to the atmosphere.	<p>exceeded, the power to require an operator to cease operations either temporarily or permanently.</p> <p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that: <i>"...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed published research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/municipal-waste-incinerators-emissions-impact-on-health). PHE's risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small..."</i></p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including production and dispersal of anthropogenic compounds have been assessed and reported. ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease. In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation, for example dioxins in the food chain. The air quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11); • Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4); • Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10); • Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9); • Outline Travel Plan (Volume 6.4); and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7). <p>All EfW facilities in England require an EP from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where the emission limits are being exceeded, the power to require an operator to cease operations either temporarily or permanently.</p> <p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that:</p> <p><i>“...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed published research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health. PHE’s risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small...”</i></p>
DP86	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that there is no need for the Proposed Development or any new incinerator in the UK.	The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) , to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP87	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the Proposed Development is incompatible with the national waste strategy due to the potential for incineration overcapacity.	<p>waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates there is not over capacity and there is a need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
			<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates there is not over capacity and there is a need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met and the Proposed Development is compatible with the National Planning Policy Statement for Waste.</p> <p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1);• National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and• National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the proposed Development does is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP88	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the siting of the Proposed Development in a deprived ward.	<p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including socio-economic factors, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2). The assessment concludes, there will be not significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including education; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP89	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that there should be a public inquiry on the Proposed Development.	<p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
DP90	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the Proposed Development is not compliant with the National Policy Statements for Energy, the NPPF and the UK's Sixth Carbon Budget recommendations.	<p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1)</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
DP91	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the benefits of the project does not outweigh the adverse effects.	The decision on whether consent will be granted rests with the Secretary of State. The Applicant has set out within the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) its consideration of how the application performs against relevant policy and why consent should be granted.
DP92	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that there is a lack of detail on the proposed grid connection and substations.	During the pre-application process, the Applicant investigated several connection routes to connect the EfW CHP facility to the national grid. Following consultation with National Grid, UKPN and National Highways, rather than a combination of overhead and underground cables on public highway and private land to connect to the Walpole substation some 10km north of the EfW CHP Facility, the Applicant proposes a shorter route. This shorter route connects to Walsoken substation, approximately 4km north and is solely underground and within highway land. Further information of the section process for the Grid Connection is provided in Appendix 2A: Grid Connections Options Report (Volume 6.4) and ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) provides further details of the proposed Grid Connection route and substation.
DP93	Steve MP Barclay	Objection that National policy regarding 'good design' seems to have been disregarded.	NPS EN-1 defines what government considers to be good design in the context of energy infrastructure. It recognises that in addition to aesthetic considerations, that good design includes sustainability and efficiency, and that the nature of energy infrastructure is that it can be limited in the extent to which



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP94	Steve Barclay MP	Objection to the proposal as the Secretary of State has determined that there is no longer a national need for large new incinerators.	<p>it can contribute to the appearance of an area. The Applicant has explained how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved including the alternatives considered within the ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2). It has also produced a Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) and has committed to achieving BREEAM Good and Excellent for the EfW CHP Facility and Administration building respectively.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates there is not over capacity and there is a need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met.</p> <p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1);



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP95	Steve MP	Barclay	<p>Objection that the formal consultation does not meet the legislative requirements and best practice for NSIPs.</p> <p>The Applicant provided the necessary information in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and associated regulations (including the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>The approach to statutory consultation was defined within the Statement of Community Consultation (Appendix J, Volume 5.1) which was issued to and agreed with the host authorities.</p>
DP96	Steve MP	Barclay	<p>Suggestion that another round of formal consultation be held to ensure that all stakeholders are fully informed and that information requested by them are responded to.</p> <p>No further rounds of consultation are currently required for the Proposed Development. There is however further opportunity to comment on the Proposed Development during the Examination of the application by the Examining Authority. Once the application has been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, consultees should register through the PINS website if they wish to make representations to the Examining Authority as an Interested Party.</p>
DP97	Steve MP	Barclay	<p>Concern that the project does not comply with key elements of policies such as the National Policy Statements for Energy, the National</p> <p>National policy relevant to the determination of the DCO for the Proposed Development is stated in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1);



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>Planning Policy Framework for waste and the 6th Carbon Budget recommendations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and • National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5). <p>The Applicant is aware that these National Policy Statements are under review and consequently, as part of the planning policy assessment that accompanies the DCO application, the Applicant has reviewed these emerging policy documents to check compliance. The Applicant's planning assessment concludes, the proposed Development is supported by adopted and emerging national policy. Further details of the policy assessment are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1)</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>



ID	Respondent		Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP98	Steve MP	Barclay	Suggestion that the Proposed Development is unlikely to be receive consent due to non-compliance with planning and climate change policies, and limited project benefits.	The decision on whether consent will be granted rests with the Secretary of State. The Applicant has set out within the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) its consideration of how the application performs against relevant policy and why consent should be granted.
DP99	Steve MP	Barclay	Suggestion that the Proposed Development is unlikely to receive consent due to the recent refusal of consent for the Kemsley North EfW project.	
DP100	Steve MP	Barclay	Concern that the Proposed Development is contrary to the National Policy Statements and national policy framework for waste.	
DP101	Steve MP	Barclay	Suggestion that the Proposed Development is unlikely to receive consent as the limited benefits do not outweigh the adverse impacts.	
DP102	Steve MP	Barclay	Concern that the project description, particularly of associated developments, is incomplete in the PEIR, contrary to the requirements of the EIA Regulations.	The PEIR Chapter 3 described the Proposed Development as it was understood at PEIR. The design has evolved since PEIR in response to further baseline survey and Stakeholder engagement. The final description of development can be found within ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) which has consequently been updated from the PEIR.
DP103	Steve MP	Barclay	Concern that the developer has not provided any alternative sites for the development which is required in Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations.	<p>The EIA regulations require that alternatives considered by the applicant are reported in the ES and the reasons for selection provided.</p> <p>The Scoping opinion provided by PINs states that the ES should include for the consideration of alternative sites where these have been considered. ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP104	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the Proposed Development is incompatible with UK emissions targets without adopting carbon capture and storage as an integral part of the project, rather than peripheral.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and • A site free of environmental designations. <p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) explains the situation of carbon capture and how this relates to the Proposed development. It states; there is currently no legal or policy requirement for the EfW CHP Facility to include Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) apparatus or to be Carbon-Capture Ready (CCR). The Proposed Development does not therefore include the construction and operation of any carbon capture technology.</p> <p>As set out in the 2020 Energy White Paper, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) issued a call for evidence on an expansion to the 2009 CCR requirements to generation facilities under 300MW in July 2021. The consultation closed in September 2021, but the outcome of this consultation has not yet been published by BEIS. As the outcome of the consultation is unknown, the layout of the EfW CHP Facility Site has been designed to allow sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed so as to be ready for installation of controlled low pressure steam extraction; space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11/15kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switchgear building to the future CCS facility. The area proposed for the laydown maintenance area (ID31) as part of the Proposed Development in the south-east portion of the EfW CHP Facility Site could accommodate a future CCS facility.</p>
DP105	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that description of the carbon capture and storage elements of the Proposed	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) explains the situation of carbon capture and how this relates to the Proposed



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>Development and their operation have not been included in the PEIR.</p>	<p>Development. It states; there is currently no legal or policy requirement for the EfW CHP Facility to include Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) apparatus or to be Carbon-Capture Ready (CCR). The Proposed Development does not therefore include the construction and operation of any carbon capture technology.</p> <p>As set out in the 2020 Energy White Paper, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) issued a call for evidence on an expansion to the 2009 CCR requirements to generation facilities under 300MW in July 2021. The consultation closed in September 2021, but the outcome of this consultation has not yet been published by BEIS. As the outcome of the consultation is unknown, the layout of the EfW CHP Facility Site has been designed to allow sufficient space for the plant and equipment for a CCS facility if required in the future (including plant and equipment to capture carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the flue gas emissions of the EfW CHP Facility and transport this to a storage facility). Furthermore, the steam turbine will be designed so as to be ready for installation of controlled low pressure steam extraction; space will be available for condensate return to the main condensate system, diversion of flue gas through the CCS facility and installation of an additional 11/15kV circuit breaker, plus a pre-installed duct from the switchgear building to the future CCS facility. The area proposed for the laydown maintenance area (ID31) as part of the Proposed Development in the south-east portion of the EfW CHP Facility Site could accommodate a future CCS facility.</p>
DP106	Steve MP Barclay	<p>Concern that the draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment is incomplete and flawed due to it not addressing the waste hierarchy.</p>	<p>The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has considered future residual waste management needs both locally and nationally and has concluded that there is a need for additional residual waste management capacity - and especially capacity that offers an alternative to landfill (which is at the very bottom of the waste management hierarchy).</p> <p>Additionally, the WFAA (Volume 7.3) only considers the need for the proposed EfW CHP Facility in the context of how much residual waste will require management in the future. In other words, the achievement of national targets for the recycling and reuse of waste have already been taken into account when considering how much residual waste is likely to require management in</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			the future. The point about addressing the waste hierarchy more explicitly in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is noted and the assessment has been amended to include a 'waste hierarchy statement of compliance'.
DP107	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the assumptions about source local authorities does not align with the proximity principle.	As part of the drafting of the submission version of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) , further consideration has been given to the scope of the Study Area for assessment. In line with the existing National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) and the emerging updated version of this, the WFAA now considers the availability of waste in the context of local and national need. In terms of 'local' need, the extent of the study area has been informed by a 2-hour travel time (based on professional judgement as to how far it is economic to transport waste) and is defined as being the former East of England planning region.
DP108	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that the assumptions in the draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment are flawed as much of the waste to supply the Proposed Development could be managed further up the waste hierarchy.	The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed Issues raised regarding DCO, Design and Planning d in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.
DP109	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the Proposed Development is not consistent with the principles of proximity and self-sufficiency as set out in the Waste Regulations 2011.	The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has assessed both the regional requirement for the EfW CHP Facility as well as the national need. This has concluded that there is insufficient residual waste management capacity available to ensure that our non-recyclable waste can be managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible (i.e., diverted from landfill) and in a manner which complies with the proximity principle (i.e., treating waste as close as possible to its point of arising). This latter point is especially relevant for the significant quantities of residual waste that are still exported from England for management via EfW in mainland Europe.
DP110	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the Proposed Development is not consistent with the Waste Hierarchy as set out in the Waste Regulations 2011.	One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP111	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the Proposed Development does not meet the requirements of National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-3 with regards to the principles of good design.	<p>desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met and the Proposed Development is compatible with the National Planning Policy Statement for Waste.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates there is not over capacity and there is a need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p>
			<p>NPS EN-1 defines what government considers to be good design in the context of energy infrastructure. It recognises that in addition to aesthetic considerations, that good design includes sustainability and efficiency, and that the nature of energy infrastructure is that it can be limited in the extent to which it can contribute to the appearance of an area. The Applicant has explained how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved including the alternatives considered within the ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2). It has also produced a Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) and has committed to achieving BREEAM Good and Excellent for the EfW CHP Facility and Administration building respectively.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP112	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the Proposed Development is not consistent with the Waste Hierarchy as recommended by paragraph 2.5.2 of National Policy Statement EN-3.	<p>Paragraph 2.5.2 of NPS EN-3 states that the recovery of energy from the combustion of waste, where in accordance with the waste hierarchy will play an increasingly important role in meeting the UK's energy needs.</p> <p>One of the guiding principles, that underpins national and local waste management policy of sustainable waste management is the concept of a hierarchy of waste management options (waste hierarchy), where the most desirable option is not to produce the waste in the first place (waste prevention) and the least desirable option is to dispose of the waste with no recovery of either materials and/or energy i.e., landfill. Between these two extremes there are a wide variety of waste treatment options that may be used as part of a waste management strategy to recover materials.</p> <p>Residual waste, which the Proposed Development proposes to process, is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled and is either destined for landfill, the least sustainable form of waste management or could be incinerated (under strict controlled conditions) to recover valuable energy in the form of electricity and/or heat, via a process commonly known as Energy from Waste (EfW). By diverting residual waste away from landfill to EfW, the principles established by the waste hierarchy are met and the Proposed Development is compatible with the National Planning Policy Statement for Waste.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development is consistent with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Further details of the national and local planning policies that support the principle of sustainable waste management, including the waste hierarchy and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
DP113	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the Proposed Development does not comply with provisions of National Policy Statement EN-1 regarding Combined Heat and Power, due to the proposed CHP	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development. One of the Applicant's essential criteria for selecting the location for the Proposed Development was its close proximity to industrial users who have a heat/steam demand. To provide</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>pipeline being situated in land controlled by Network Rail, a statutory undertaker.</p>	<p>reassurance, the Applicant's Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) has investigated the potential heat demands and concludes that there is sufficient potential demand to justify the supply of heat/steam in the location chosen to site the EfW CHP Facility.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms the CHP Connection and the plant and equipment required for its implementation, forms part of the Proposed Development for which the Applicant seeks to secure a DCO</p> <p>The Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can co-exist.</p> <p>In summary, the Proposed Development is consistent with NPS EN-1. Further details of the national and local planning policies relevant to CHP and how these are applied to the Proposed Development are reported in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1).</p>
<p>DP114</p>	<p>Steve MP Barclay</p>	<p>Concern that no evidence has been provided of the demand for excess heat or the likelihood of entering commercial contracts for the heat.</p>	<p>Government (BEIS) produces a UK CHP Development Map. This shows that Wisbech has one of the largest concentrations of large heat users in the region. This mapping has been confirmed by the Applicant's own research and estimation of local business demands More information is provided within the Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6).</p>
<p>DP115</p>	<p>Steve MP Barclay</p>	<p>Concern that the Proposed Development does not satisfy paragraphs 4.6.6 to 4.6.8 of the National Policy Statement EN-1 due to the CHP being undeliverable on current evidence.</p>	<p>NPS EN-1 gives substantial positive weight to any thermal power station consent application which includes CHP. ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms the Proposed Development includes provision of a CHP Connection to supply local businesses, therefore complaint EN-1.</p>
<p>DP116</p>	<p>Steve MP Barclay</p>	<p>Concern that the project proposals are not currently sufficiently advanced to be suitable for public consultation.</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken at an early stage in the project development process, to provide consultees with an opportunity to influence the proposals whilst options were still being considered. There have been multiple rounds of consultation (2 non-statutory and one statutory). At each stage, updates were provided as the design of the proposal progressed.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP117	Steve MP Barclay	Concern that the Proposed Development is incompatible with the assumptions set out in the 6th Carbon Budget regarding Energy from Waste and future management of waste.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including climate change impacts, have been assessed and reported in the Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2). Chapter 14 includes a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by 2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
DP118	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that the Proposed Development's business case would need to acknowledge a far lower proportion of available waste fuel in order to be compatible with the assumptions set out in the 6th Carbon Budget.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA (Volume 7.3)), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates there is not over capacity and there is a need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that as a standalone entity the Proposed Development results in net carbon emissions from the EfW combustion processes. However, the GHG assessment indicates a net reduction in emissions in the 'with Proposed Development' scenario compared to a 'without Proposed Development' scenario. The assessment is based on assessing whether the Proposed Development would impede the UK in being carbon net zero by</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP119	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that without the adoption of carbon capture and storage technology, there are more efficient and carbon friendly recovery technologies than energy-from-waste.	<p>2050, this being the UK position in terms of meeting international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. The assessment includes evaluation of emissions with respect to UK Government 5-year carbon budgets, indicating a minor reduction in emissions ranging from between 0.004% to 0.03% for the 4th, 5th and 6th carbon budgets.</p> <p>Therefore, GHG impacts of the Proposed Development will have a beneficial significant effect. The Proposed Development has net GHG emissions below zero, causing an indirect reduction in atmospheric GHG emissions which has a positive impact on the UK Government meeting its carbon budgets/targets.</p>
DP120	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that the Proposed Development is unlikely to obtain consent due to the presence of alternative sites and project configurations and the existence of preferred technical solutions, such as increased plastic recycling, to manage waste.	The decision on whether consent will be granted rests with the Secretary of State. The Applicant has set out within the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) its consideration of how the application performs against relevant policy and why consent should be granted. .
DP121	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that the Secretary of State's decision to decline consent to the Kemsley North energy-from-waste facility demonstrates there is no national need for large new incinerators.	The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has demonstrated that there is a requirement for the Proposed Development.
DP122	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that a business case be developed which accords with the proximity principle and provides evidence that the	The WFAA (Volume 7.3) demonstrates that there is a requirement for the EfW CHP Facility due to the amount of residual waste which will continue to be generated in the local and national economy. Without the Proposed



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		project is aligned with the waste hierarchy and does not divert waste from recycling or other recovery methods.	Development waste will continue to be landfilled inconsistent with the waste hierarchy. The assessment also demonstrate conformance with the proximity principle.
DP123	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that information be provided on the design of the plant and site selection in the context of the Good Design requirements of the National Policy Statements.	The evolution of the design is set out within the ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) and the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) .
DP124	Steve MP Barclay	Request for information on how the requirements for good design set out in the National Policy Statements have been considered in the site selection for the Proposed Development.	The approach to site selection is set out within ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) . The Applicant has also prepared a Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) .
DP125	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on the status of potential contracts for the sale of excess heat from the project.	No contracts have been signed. More information is provided within the Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) .
DP126	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on the site selection process and how it fulfilled the criteria for good design as set out in National Policy Statement EN-1.	<p>ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied to the Proposed Development and suitably meet. In summary these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for additional residual waste treatment within the area; • In close proximity to existing business that have a large heat and/or power demand; • A site of a suitable size to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility; • Good access to the strategic road network; • A brownfield site allocated for waste management; and A site free of environmental designations. <p>NPS EN-1 defines what government considers to be good design in the context of energy infrastructure. It recognises that in addition to aesthetic considerations, that good design includes sustainability and efficiency, and that the nature of energy infrastructure is that it can be limited in the extent to which</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>it can contribute to the appearance of an area. The Applicant has explained how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved including the alternatives considered within the ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2). It has also produced a Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) and has committed to achieving BREEAM Good and Excellent for the EFW CHP Facility and Administration building respectively.</p>
DP127	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on how MVV will demonstrate a need case for the project given the draft Waste Fuel Assessment has not evidenced compliance with the waste hierarchy and proximity principle.	<p>The WFAA (Volume 7.3) demonstrates that there is a requirement for the EFW CHP Facility due to the amount of residual waste which will continue to be generated in the local and national economy. Without the Proposed Development waste will continue to be landfilled inconsistent with the waste hierarchy. The assessment also demonstrate conformance with the proximity principle.</p>
DP128	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on how MVV intends to sustain a compulsory purchase case if no need case has been demonstrated and no alternatives considered.	<p>The DCO application demonstrates that there is a need for the Proposed Development and, since PEIR, the Applicant has substantially reduced the amount of land which may require compulsory acquisition. It has set out within Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) the other areas of land which it has considered which surround the site and the reasons for selecting the land identified (and which may require compulsory acquisition).</p> <p>The Applicant's preference is to acquire the land rights it requires for the Proposed Development via voluntary agreement. Nevertheless, it is essential to ensure the timely delivery of the Proposed Development and the Applicant is therefore seeking compulsory powers to deliver the Proposed Development, should voluntary agreement not be reached or ultimately not be effective. Further details on the justification for compulsory acquisition powers is set out in the Statement of Reasons.</p>
DP129	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied that the description of the development set out in Chapter 3 of the PEIR complies with the requirements of Schedule 4 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, Paragraph 1.	<p>Comment is noted.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP130	Cambridgeshire County Council, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk and Peterborough City Council	MVV should consider local planning policy including the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.	The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) considers relevant national and local policy and the performance of the Proposed Development against such policy and finds it policy compliant when read as a whole.
DP131	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for MVV to note the adoption of the MWLP in July 2021 which supersedes the SSP and MWCS documents and to update their policy considerations accordingly.	Comment is noted. The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) refers to the current policy documents.
DP132	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the study area in the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (dWFAA) and the policy considerations in Chapter 5 of the PEIR so not match, as the dWFAA considers policy from a much wider area.	Noted. The WFAA (Volume 7.3) identification of policy is undertaken in order to inform the Study Area for the potential importation of waste it therefore differs from ES Chapter 5: Legislation and Policy (Volume 6.2) which considers policy relevant to the consideration of the Proposed Development i.e., National Policy and the planning policy of the host local planning authorities.
DP133	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request for the policy considerations in Chapter 5 of the PEIR to consider policy for a much wider area, in order to match the study area of the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment.	Noted. The WFAA (Volume 7.3) identification of policy is undertaken in order to inform the Study Area for the potential importation of waste it is therefore differs from ES Chapter 5: Legislation and Policy (Volume 6.2) which considers policy relevant to the consideration of the Proposed Development i.e., National Policy and the planning policy of the host local planning authorities.
DP134	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment does not identify other existing or proposed recovery facilities.	The Draft WFAA was based upon the latest published evidence bases which underpinned the Waste Local Plans of those Waste Planning Authorities in the assessment's study area. However, it is acknowledged that some of this data was out of date. As such, in the submission version of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) , an updated position in terms of newly consented capacity (as well as capacity which may have been lost) has been presented.
DP135	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request that information on the location of existing and proposed recovery facilities is included with the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment, and for the information to be	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		extended to show if there is any surplus or deficit of capacity beyond the study area.	
DP136	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment to either make it clear that the double-counting of transfer movements within the WDI has been included and provide an indication of the level of error this introduces, or make an allowance for it.	It is considered that there is not the potential for significant levels of double counting in the WDI data presented in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) . The WDI data presented relates to 'in scope' HIC waste that has been received at specific final disposal permitted waste management facilities within the spatial scope of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) . This point has been clarified in Tables 3.2 and 4.2 of the WFAA, where it is noted that quantities of 'in scope' waste managed at 'treatment facilities' and ultimately disposed of via landfill, incineration or recovery have been removed from totals.
DP137	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment does not provide an analysis of the composition of the potential feedstock and if being used as feedstock is the most sustainable use for this form of material.	Noted. Whilst the focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste only i.e., that after recycling has taken place, it is acknowledged that specific recycling/recovery initiatives may change the composition of the residual waste stream. An obvious example of this is the removal of food waste for recycling. In this regard, the issue of changing composition has been considered in the updated WFAA (Volume 7.3) .
DP138	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request that consideration is given to likely future alterations in waste composition Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment.	Noted. Whilst the focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste only i.e., that after recycling has taken place, it is acknowledged that specific recycling/recovery initiatives may change the composition of the residual waste stream. An obvious example of this is the removal of food waste for recycling. In this regard, the issue of changing composition has been considered in the updated WFAA (Volume 7.3) .
DP139	Cambridgeshire County Council Peterborough City Council	Request for the proposal to take into account the aims and objectives of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2036, such that the strategic objectives are met.	The Minerals and Waste Local Plan is considered within the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) .
DP140	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment assumes that all HIC	The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has considered only those fractions of the waste stream that would be suitable for incineration and are presently being landfilled.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		waste currently landfilled will be suitable for incineration.	
DP141	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment does not account for changes in the quantity and composition of HIC arising from policy drivers that are likely to occur during the development's operational phase.	The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.
DP142	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that 1 million tonnes of the 3.5 million tonnes of HIC waste identified in the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment will be recycled rather than incinerated as the 2035 target for recycling is 65%, a 20% increase in current municipal solid waste recycling.	The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.
DP143	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment does not consider the utilisation of existing incineration capacity with the study area, as there is already 287,00 tonnes of unutilized incinerator capacity available.	Noted. The Draft WFAA was based upon the latest published evidence bases which underpinned the Waste Local Plans of those Waste Planning Authorities in the assessment's study area. However, it is acknowledged that some of this data was out of date. A such, in the submission version of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) , an updated position in terms of newly consented capacity (as well as capacity which may have been lost) has been presented.
DP144	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment only addressed proximity in relation to the export of Refuse Derived Fuel.	The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has assessed both the regional requirement for the EfW CHP Facility as well as the national need. This has concluded that there is insufficient residual waste management capacity available to ensure that our non-recyclable waste can be managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible (i.e., diverted from landfill) and in a manner which complies with the proximity principle (i.e., treating waste as close as possible to its point of arising). Whilst this latter point is especially relevant for the significant quantities of residual waste that are presently exported from England for management via EfW in mainland Europe, it is also relevant in terms of the waste that is presently exported from the East of England region for final disposal.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP145	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that an active heat network is not an integral part of the Proposed Development, therefore meaning it cannot be classified as a recovery operation, so if the recovery facilities that Refuse Derived Fuel is currently exported to they may remain the nearest appropriate installation until this development has an associated active heat network.	<p>NPS EN-1 gives substantial positive weight to any thermal power station consent application which includes CHP. ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms the Proposed Development includes provision of a CHP Connection to supply local businesses, therefore complaint EN-1.</p> <p>The Applicant is fully committed to developing a local heat and power network and the application includes for the consent to construct and operate a CHP system. The Applicant has prepared a Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6). The document demonstrates the viability of the EfW CHP Facility to provide heat and power to local businesses.</p>
DP146	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that there is sufficient existing incineration capacity within the study area, so the Proposed Development may not provide a more proximate facility for Refuse Derived Fuel to be exported to.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a WFAA (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates there is not over capacity and there is a need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p>
DP147	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the Proposed Development does not contribute to the proximity considerations of the Waste Planning Authority due to there likely being other closer appropriate installations along the route the waste would travel.	<p>The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has assessed both the regional requirement for the EfW CHP Facility as well as the national need. This has concluded that there is insufficient residual waste management capacity available to ensure that our non-recyclable waste can be managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible (i.e., diverted from landfill) and in a manner which complies with the proximity principle (i.e., treating waste as close as possible to its point of arising). Whilst this latter point is especially relevant for the significant quantities of residual waste that are presently exported from England for management via EfW in mainland Europe, it is also relevant in terms of the waste that is presently exported from the East of England region for final disposal.</p>
DP148	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the final Waste Fuel Availability Assessment set out how the Proposed Development contributes to the	<p>The WFAA (Volume 7.3) has assessed both the local/ regional requirement for the EfW CHP Facility as well as the national need. This has concluded that there is insufficient residual waste management capacity available to ensure</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>Waste Planning Authority's proximity considerations regarding HIC residual waste given this source will form the majority of fuel supply.</p>	<p>that our non-recyclable waste can be managed as far up the waste hierarchy as possible (i.e., diverted from landfill) and in a manner which complies with the proximity principle (i.e., treating waste as close as possible to its point of arising). Whilst this latter point is especially relevant for the significant quantities of residual waste that are presently exported from England for management via EfW in mainland Europe, it is also relevant in terms of the waste that is presently exported from the East of England region for final disposal.</p>
DP149	Cambridgeshire County Council	<p>Concern that the development is not going to receive the expected fuel as the legislation progresses towards 'increased recycling, reuse and circular economy principles' meaning that over the next 40 years the waste sent to landfill will not continue in the same rate.</p>	<p>The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.</p>
DP150	Cambridgeshire County Council	<p>Concern that the draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment does not consider existing targets and reductions relating to waste reduction, reuse and recycling as it assumes the maintaining of current levels of residual waste landfilling in the 'without Proposed Development' scenario.</p>	<p>The Applicant has prepared a WFAA (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates there is not over capacity and there is a need for the Proposed Development to treat residual waste.</p>
DP151	Cambridgeshire County Council	<p>Suggestion that the final Waste Fuel Availability Assessment sets out how existing targets and reductions relating to waste reduction, reuse and recycling have been considered.</p>	<p>The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.</p>
DP152	Cambridgeshire County Council	<p>Suggestion that a HIA Methodology be used in the production of the EIA Health chapter to comply with the Fenland District Council Local</p>	<p>The methodology for the consideration of health has been informed by and agreed via consultation with CCC, KLWN, NCC and the former Public Health</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		Plan requirement for Health Impact Assessments.	England. Details of the methodology are reported in ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) .
DP153	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that MVV will need to demonstrate that the requirements of Policy 18 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Local Plan which requires developments to be integrated with neighbouring development and must not result in adverse impacts on amenity of existing occupiers will be met.	Information in the form of the environmental assessments necessary to understand amenity considerations is reported within the ES. The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) sets out how the Proposed Development performs against planning policy which considers amenity amongst other criteria.
DP154	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Environmental Statement account for the newly adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Local Plan, particularly Policy 18 which requires developments to be integrated with neighbouring development and must not result in adverse impacts on amenity of existing occupiers.	Information in the form of the environmental assessments necessary to understand amenity considerations is reported within the ES. The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) sets out how the Proposed Development performs against this amenity where this is identified in relevant policy. ES Chapter 15: Socio economic, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) considers the potential for effects upon nearby land uses and concludes that there would be no potentially significant effect. Other ES Chapters such as Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual and Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (both Volume 6.2) consider other aspects of amenity. Chapter 9 concludes that there would be significant visual amenity effects upon a small number of residential properties whilst Chapter 7 identifies additional mitigation measures to ensure that residual effects arising from noise would not be significant.
DP155	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment does not provide details of sorting methods and destinations, as requested by King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council during engagement.	The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.
DP156	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the final Waste Fuel Availability Assessment addresses the	The focus of the WFAA (Volume 7.3) is on the availability of residual waste i.e., that part of the waste stream that is left over after reuse, recycling and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		comments of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council during engagement regarding information on waste sorting and destination.	other forms of recovery have taken place. It is therefore implicit in the WFAA (Volume 7.3) that the fraction of the household and commercial waste stream that is 'residual' is not able to be managed in any other way apart from incineration (with or without energy recovery) or landfill.
DP157	Network Rail	Objection to the Proposed Development due to concerns that it would conflict the potential future use of the adjacent Wisbech to March rail line.	The proposed CHP Connection has been designed to provide sufficient space to allow for the reopening of the disused March to Wisbech Railway.
DP158	Network Rail	Concern that there had been a lack of formal engagement with Network Rail and insufficient assurances had been provided that the Proposed Development would not inhibit future use of the Wisbech to March rail line.	The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech Railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can co-exist. For example, the siting of the access road to the EfW CHP Facility Site from New Bridge Lane and adjacent landscaping area has been designed to accommodate a road bridge embankment, should the reopening of the March to Wisbech Railway require a vehicle crossing in the form of a bridge as opposed to an at-grade crossing. To date the Business Clearance with Network Rail has been approved and the Applicant is currently in discussions about Technical Clearance process. ES Chapter 2: Alternatives and ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) provide further details.
DP159	Local Community	Concern about the need for multiple chimneys.	The Applicant has prepared a WFAA (Volume 7.3) , to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates a need for an EfW CHP Facility of the proposed capacity; 625,600 tonnes per annum. At this capacity, the EfW CHP Facility requires two operational lines and consequently two chimneys.
DP160	Local Community	Concern around the proposed height of the chimney.	The Environment Agency sets strict emission limits for the chimneys, and in part, this dictates the minimum height required to secure an Environmental



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP161	Local Community	Concern that the proposed facility is not aesthetically pleasing.	<p>Permit. ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and the accompanying Air Quality Technical Report (Appendix 8B, Volume 6.4) assessed the height and concluded it must be no lower than 84m above finished floor level (FFL). As part of their assessment of the Applicant's Environmental Permit application, the Environment Agency will review the air quality assessments and then confirm the chimneys' height. Should the Environmental Agency require an increase in height to secure the Environmental Permit, ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) allows for a final chimney height of 84m to 90m above FFL.</p>
			<p>NPS EN-1 defines what government considers to be good design in the context of energy infrastructure. It recognises that in addition to aesthetic considerations, that good design includes sustainability and efficiency, and that the nature of energy infrastructure is that it can be limited in the extent to which it can contribute to the appearance of an area. The Applicant has explained how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved including the alternatives considered within the ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2). It has also produced a Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) and has committed to achieving BREEAM Good and Excellent for the EfW CHP Facility and Administration building respectively.</p> <p>The visual effects of the EfW CHP Facility have been assessed with the results presented within the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). The conclusion is that whilst there will be some significant effects arising from the EfW CHP Facility as a whole these would be restricted to some individual properties, and localised parts of several recreational routes and highways. .</p>
DP162	Local Community	Concern that the size of the proposed facility is disproportionate compared to the size of the town.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a WFAA (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates a need for an EfW CHP Facility of the proposed capacity; 625,600 tonnes per annum. To deliver a processing capacity of the size</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP163	Local Community	Concern that the size of the proposed facility is too big for the area.	<p>required or indeed other EfWs, the building to house the plant and equipment is large.</p> <p>The visual effects of the EfW CHP Facility have been assessed with the results presented within the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). The conclusion is that whilst there will be some significant effects arising from the EfW CHP Facility as a whole these would not extend to the town of Wisbech itself but to some individual properties, footpaths and community receptors.</p>
DP164	Local Community	Suggestion that consideration is made to increasing the proposed height of the chimney to improve dispersion of emissions.	<p>The Applicant has prepared a WFAA (Volume 7.3), to assess the amount of residual waste available at a national and local level, including existing and anticipated EfW capacity within the Study Area. The assessment includes sensitivity analysis to understand how residual waste arisings may change over time with increased recycling. The conclusion of the assessment demonstrates a need for an EfW CHP Facility of the proposed capacity; 625,600 tonnes per annum. To deliver a processing capacity of the size required or indeed other EfWs, the building to house the plant and equipment is large.</p> <p>The visual effects of the EfW CHP Facility have been assessed with the results presented within the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). The conclusion is that whilst there will be some significant effects arising from the EfW CHP Facility as a whole these would be restricted to some individual properties, and localised parts of several recreational routes and highways. .</p> <p>The Environment Agency sets strict emission limits for the chimneys, and in part, this dictates the minimum height required to secure an Environmental Permit. ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and the accompanying Air Quality Technical Report (Appendix 8B, Volume 6.4) assessed the height and concluded it must be no lower than 84m above finished floor level (FFL). As part of their assessment of the Applicant's Environmental Permit application, the Environment Agency will review the air quality assessments and then confirm the chimneys' height. Should the Environmental Agency require an increase in height to secure the Environmental Permit, ES Chapter</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) allows for a final chimney height of 84m to 90m above FFL.
DP165	Local Community	Concern about light pollution from aviation lights on the stack.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, a static infra-red light would be fitted at the highest practical point of each chimney to satisfy the MoD's request for aviation warning lighting.
DP166	Local Community	Concern that the benefit of the chimney has not been established.	The Environment Agency sets strict emission limits for the chimneys, and in part, this dictates the minimum height required to secure an Environmental Permit. ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and the accompanying Air Quality Technical Report (Appendix 8B, Volume 6.4) assessed the height and concluded it must be no lower than 84m above finished floor level (FFL). As part of their assessment of the Applicant's Environmental Permit application, the Environment Agency will review the air quality assessments and then confirm the chimneys' height. Should the Environment Agency require an increase in height to secure the Environmental Permit, ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) allows for a final chimney height of 84m to 90m above FFL.
DP167	Local Community	Suggestion that a small-scale model be built and tested before the project goes ahead.	Based on MVV's experience of operating similar facilities in the UK and Europe, the proposed technology is considered to have a proven and safe track record. The Applicant does not propose to build a small-scale model.
DP168	Fenland District Council	Concern that the massing of the Proposed Development is incongruous with the surrounding landscape and built environment.	The Applicant considered a number of different roof designs for the Proposed Development with the aim of reducing the scale of the development as far as it would be practicable. The alternatives considered are summarised within ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) and within the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) . The Proposed Development is considered to be consistent in its design with the surrounding industrial context, most notably, the existing Cold Store. The Landscape effects arising from the Proposed development have been assessed and are reported within ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) . The assessment concludes that there would be very localised significant landscape effects.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP169	Steve MP Barclay	Suggestion that MVV take account of National Infrastructure Commission guidance regarding good design and show how the project design has evolved.	The visual effects of the EfW CHP Facility have been assessed with the results presented within the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) . The conclusion is that whilst there will be some significant visual effects arising from the EfW CHP Facility be restricted to some individual properties, and localised parts of several recreational routes and highways. .
DP170	Steve MP Barclay	Request for information on how the requirements for good design set out in the National Policy Statements have been considered in the appearance and layout design of the Proposed Development.	NPS EN-1 defines what government considers to be good design in the context of energy infrastructure. It recognises that in addition to aesthetic considerations, that good design includes sustainability and efficiency, and that the nature of energy infrastructure is that it can be limited in the extent to which it can contribute to the appearance of an area. The Applicant has explained how the design of the Proposed Development has evolved including the alternatives considered within the ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) . It has also produced a Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) and has committed to achieving BREEAM Good and Excellent for the EfW CHP Facility and Administration building respectively.
DP171	Steve MP Barclay	Request for clarification on whether independent advice has been sought or a design review undertaken, as recommended by paragraph 4.5.5 of National Policy Statement EN-1.	NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.5.5 states that applicants and the IPC (now PINs) should consider taking independent professional advice on the design aspects of a proposal. The design process for the Proposed Development has been informed by the technology type, by comments received at non-statutory and statutory consultation and through the appointment of professional designers (architects) and landscape architects. Whilst the Applicant did not seek an external design review outside of the consultation process it has evidenced



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
DP172	Steve Barclay MP	Request for clarification on whether the National Infrastructure Commission's Design Guidance, and principles of climate, people, places and value, will be taken into account.	and explained the design for the EfW CHP Facility within the accompanying Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) .
DP173	Norfolk County Council	Advised that the area of land contained within the proposed development redline boundary in Norfolk is not within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area. The area of land contained within the proposed development redline boundary in Norfolk is also not within the safeguarding area or consultation area for a safeguarded waste management facility, safeguarded water recycling centre, safeguarding mineral extraction site or safeguarded mineral infrastructure	The Applicant thank and acknowledge the information provided.
DP174	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Provided a review of the status of relevant local plans commenting that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021 forms the principal source of local policy. Specific reference is made to Policy 4 and notes that the key element in regard to the proposal is its location in Wisbech.	The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) submitted with the DCO application sets how the Proposed Development sits in the context of the current and emerging Local Plans for all the Host Authorities. This includes the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted July 2021) which does not apply to the Borough Council area.



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding Environment

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 6.1 Issues raised regarding Environment** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 6.6 Issues raised regarding Environment

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV01	Local Community	The environmental mitigation measures appear to have been fully considered and will be implemented.	Noted.
EV02	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Shampers Dog Grooming Local Community	Concern about the effects of the proposed development on protected species and domestic animals in the local area.	The effect of the Proposed Development on species which are legally protected or otherwise conservation notable was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed in the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . No potential negative significant effects have been identified.
EV03	Local Community	Concern that the environmental mitigation measures identified within the documentation will not be effective.	Many of the mitigation measures identified are industry standard and the Applicant is confident that they can be deployed successfully.
EV04	Local Community	Concerned about the potential environmental effects of the proposed development on Walsoken.	The ES considers a wide range of environmental topics and identifies the extent to which significant effects may occur at Walsoken. No significant negative effects at Walsoken are identified.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV05	Local Community	Concern about the effects of the proposed development on the historic environment within Wisbech.	Assessment of effects, including on the setting of Wisbech Conservation Area is included in ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes they will not be significant.
EV06	Emneth Parish Council Forestry Commission Kirk Coachworks Liz Truss MP Local Community Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School Nordelph Parish Council PIL	Concern about the impacts of the proposed development on the natural environment within the local area.	ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) considers a wide range of ecological Receptors which together make up the natural environment and it identifies the extent to which significant effects may occur. No significant effects on the ecological Receptors identified.
EV07	Local Community	Concern that the proposed mitigation measures within the CEMP in relation to invasive species are not sufficiently detailed.	The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) submitted with the DCO application provides more detail on the proposed embedded measures. The Outline CEMP is secured via a DCO requirement.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV08	Local Community	Concern that the proposed mitigation measures within the CEMP in relation to water courses are not sufficiently detailed.	The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) submitted with the DCO application provides more detail on the proposed embedded measures. The Outline CEMP is secured via a DCO requirement.
EV09	Local Community	Concern that the biodiversity and ecological enhancements that have been proposed are insufficient given the scale of negative environmental effects that the proposed development will cause.	The Applicant has given more consideration to how it can improve the ecology of the site and these measures are set out in the DCO application. Notably in Appendix 11M BNG (Volume 6.3) to ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) and in the approach it has taken to the landscaping of the EfW CHP Facility Site (Figure 3.14 Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy, Volume 6.3).
EV10	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Local Community Nordelph Parish Council	Concern about the effects of the proposed development on the local waterways from pollution discharges.	The proposed drainage system includes SuDS features which will lower flow rates, increase water storage capacity and reduce the transport of pollution to the water environment. The proposed number and types of SuDS components have been determined in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753. Further information is given in ES Chapter 13: Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land (Volume 6.2) .
EV11	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Local Community Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the effects of noise, light, and environmental pollution.	Potential noise and air quality effects due to the construction and operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed and the results are set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) , and Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) . Where any potentially significant effects are identified, appropriate control measures will be implemented. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Lighting Strategy (Appendix 3B, Volume 6.4) . The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV12	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development will generate significant noise pollution during its operation.	Potential noise effects during operation have been assessed in accordance with the relevant British Standards. Potential noise effects due to the operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed and the results are set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) . Where any potentially significant effects are identified, appropriate control and mitigation measures will be implemented, to avoid or reduce any significant effects.
EV13	Local Community Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concerns about the effects of odour on the local environment.	The potential for effects arising from odour have been identified and assessed within ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) . An Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) has also been developed and submitted as part of the DCO application.
EV14	Local Community	Concern about the effects of the proposed development on migrating birds to feeding grounds in Welney.	The effect of the Proposed Development on bird species which are legally protected or otherwise conservation notable was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . No potential negative significant effects have been identified.
EV15	Local Community	Concerns about the effects of the incinerator on the soil at the proposed site as this is not considered within the environmental documentation.	The potential effects of the Proposed Development on soil within the DCO Order limits are assessed within ES Chapter 13: Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land (Volume 6.2) which concludes that they would not be significant.
EV16	Local Community	Concerns about the proposed development and its effects on ground water.	ES Chapter 13: Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land (Volume 6.2) considers the potential for effects upon hydrogeology and concludes that they would not be significant.
EV17	Fascinating Fens Liz Truss MP	Concern about the effect of particulate emissions created by the proposed development on local agricultural land and crops.	The assessment considered impacts on nitrogen and acid deposition (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)) on sensitive ecological Receptors and concluded that the effects are not significant. Impacts from heavy metal deposition on land, were assessed (Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2)), concluding that potential effects are not significant.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Local Community Nordelph Parish Council WEP Fabrications Ltd		In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain. The assessment concluded that potential effects are not significant.
EV18	Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd Fascinating Fens Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Icon Engineering Ltd Local Community MJ Acoustics	Concern that the proposed development is sited on land at risk of flooding.	The Applicant has undertaken consultation with the Environment Agency and the relevant Internal Drainage Boards. A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) has been carried out. The flood risk assessment identifies the need for a drainage strategy for the development. An Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) is included in the DCO application.
EV19	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Local Community	Concern that the environmental monitoring measures will not be effective.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV20	Local Community	Concern that there is insufficient information to make informed comments regarding mitigation.	<p>As part of the approach to developing a DCO Application a PEIR is developed to enable consultees to understand the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed scheme. The Stage 2 Statutory Consultation actively sought consultees comments on the information provided in the PEIR. Comments provided by consultees were used to inform the preparation of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Volume 6.2). Until the preparation of the detailed ES was complete, (post PEIR) it was not possible to detail specific mitigation measures.</p> <p>The ES, submitted as part of the DCO application, includes details of the environmental mitigation proposed to avoid or reduce the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The schedule of mitigation and monitoring can be found in ES Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation and Monitoring (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV21	Local Community	Concern about the impact of the proposed improvements to New Bridge Lane on the local natural environment.	<p>The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development were initially assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2). No potentially negative significant effects upon the natural environment (the reference to which is assumed to relate to ecological Receptors) have been identified.</p>
EV22	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development is sited close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest on the River Ouse.	<p>The Applicant has experience of locating and operating another site adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The effect of the Proposed Development on SSSIs within its Zone of Influence was assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2). No potentially negative significant effects on biodiversity have been identified including in relation to the SSSI.</p>
EV23	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed facility should be developed on the basis of net zero environmental impact.	<p>All development may give rise to environmental effects which may be both positive and negative. The appropriate balance to be struck is a decision taken by the Secretary of State in the case of this application. However, the Applicant has considered the planning balance within the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) and found the planning balance weighs in favour of DCO consent being granted.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV24	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Local Community	Concern that the environmental surveys and assessments have been insufficient.	The scope of environmental surveys were initially agreed with the Host Authorities and PINS at scoping stage of the Proposed Development. The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development were initially assessed in the PEIR and the assessments have been completed are reported within the ES Chapters 6 to 18 (Volume 6.2) .
EV25	Fascinating Fens Local Community	Concern that the proposed development is sited close to The Wash Site of Special Scientific Interest.	The Proposed Development is over 15km from the Wash SSSI which is outside of the Study Area for national biodiversity sites. Effects on The Wash Ramsar/SPA (international sites) have been considered in the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) and were scoped out of the assessment due to being outside of the Zone of Influence of the Proposed Development.
EV26	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development contradicts national environmental legislation and policies.	The Proposed Development is consistent with all relevant policy and guidance. A full policy assessment is contained within the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) .
EV27	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development is sited close to the WWT Welney Wetland Centre nature reserve.	The Proposed Development is over 15km from the WWT Welney Wetland Centre, which is outside of the Study Area for non-statutory biodiversity sites. The Ouse Washes Ramsar/SPA/SAC is contiguous with the WWT Welney Wetland Centre supporting similar habitat and species assemblage. The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development on the Ouse Washes Ramsar/SPA/SAC were initially assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within the ES (Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2)). and no potentially negative significant effects have been identified.
EV28	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Local Community	Suggestion for surveys and monitoring of current and potential future soil contamination.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits. The Permit will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted. Prior to operation the operator of a EfW CHP Facility has to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application that they are using best available



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV29	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development will require the supply of large quantities of water.	<p>techniques for pollution prevention. Other embedded measures are likely to include a requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a Permit condition.</p> <p>The stated water demand of the EfW CHP Facility is based on a worst case scenario with full steam off-take and zero condensate return. In reality the water demand is significantly lower as commercial agreements for the use of steam will include requirements for the return of condensate. In the event that there are no steam offtake customers the water steam cycle will be a closed loop system with all condensate being returned to the boiler.</p>
EV30	Local Community	Concern that a Biodiversity Action Plan for the Wash has not been developed.	<p>The Wash Biodiversity Action Plan boundary is greater than 10km from the Proposed Development at the nearest point, which is outside of the Zone of Influence where effects on biodiversity could potentially occur. Habitats and species are considered 'conservation notable' through inclusion in Biodiversity Action Plans, and these were assessed in the PEIR to a distance of 1km for habitats and 2km for species from the Proposed Development boundary; reflecting the level of sensitivity of these Receptors, and the mobile nature of certain species.</p> <p>The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development on the Wash Ramsar and SPA were initially assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within the ES (Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2)), and no potentially negative significant effects have been identified.</p>
EV31	Local Community	Concern that a baseline assessment for soil acidity has not been undertaken.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits. The Permit will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted.</p> <p>Prior to operation the operator of a EfW CHP Facility has to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application that they are using best available techniques for pollution prevention. Other embedded measures are likely to include a requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a Permit condition.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV32	Local Community	Concern about the noise pollution created from soil piling works.	Noise effects resulting from construction activities have been assessed in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) and an Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Volume 7.12, Appendix F) is included in the DCO application. Where any potentially significant effects are identified, appropriate control and mitigation measures will be implemented, to avoid or reduce any significant effects.
EV33	Local Community	Concern about the impact of the proposed development on the acidification of limestone structures and buildings in the local area.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits. The Permit will require emissions to air to be limited.</p> <p>Prior to operation the operator of a EfW CHP Facility has to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application that they are using best available techniques for pollution prevention.</p>
EV34	Local Community	Concern about the impact of the proposed development on the River Nar Site of Special Scientific Interest.	<p>The effect of the Proposed Development on SSSIs within its Zone of Influence (5km) was assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2). No potentially negative significant effects on biodiversity have been identified, including in relation to the SSSI.</p> <p>The River Nar Site of Special Scientific Interest is located greater than 10km from the Proposed Development boundary, therefore is outside of its potential Zone of Influence.</p>
EV35	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Local Community	Suggestion for regular monitoring of dioxins in livestock and local residents.	The potential effects of emissions to air on the natural environment are considered in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) . A Human Health Risk Assessment (Appendix 8B, Annex G, Volume 6.4) has also been undertaken. The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.
EV36	PIL	Suggestion that further environmental studies should be undertaken on the impact of the emissions from the proposed development.	The scope of environmental surveys were initially agreed with the Host Local Authorities and PINS at the scoping stage of the Proposed Development. The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development were initially



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>assessed in the PEIR, and the assessments have been completed and are reported in ES Chapters 6 to 18 (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>The potential effects of emissions to air on the natural environment are considered in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken (Appendix 8B, Volume 6.4). A Human Health Risk Assessment (Appendix 8B, Annex G, Volume 6.4) has also been undertaken and concludes that effects would be negligible.</p>
EV37	PIL	Suggestion that MVV should be responsible for funding mitigation measures put in place by businesses and local residents due to impacts of the proposed development.	The ES, submitted as part of the DCO application, includes details of mitigation measures proposed to avoid or reduce the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The schedule of mitigation and monitoring can be found in ES Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation and Monitoring (Volume 6.2) .
EV38	Marine Coastguard Agency	& Request for clarification on whether any works are expected to take place below the Mean High Water Level.	No works will be undertaken below Mean High Water Level.
EV39	CPRE	Concern about the proximity of the proposed development to the Wisbech Conservation Area.	The effects of the Proposed Development on the Wisbech Conservation area are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that the Proposed Development would not have a significant effect upon this historic area.
EV40	CPRE	Suggestion that the assessment of the effects of the proposed development on the Wisbech and Elm Conservation Areas as 'not significant' is untrue due to the lack of assessment of visual impacts from first or second storeys.	The effects of the Proposed Development on the Wisbech and the Elm Conservation Areas are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that the effects of the Proposed Development would not be significant on either Conservation Area during both the construction and operational phases.
EV41	CPRE	Concern about the visual impact of the proposed development on the Wisbech and Elm Conservation Areas and the local character of Wisbech.	The effects of the Proposed Development on the Wisbech and the Elm Conservation Areas are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that the effects of the Proposed Development



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			would not be significant on either Conservation Area during both the construction and operational phases.
EV42	CPRE	Concern that the visual impact of the proposed development on local property puts the Wisbech Conservation Area at risk.	The effects of the Proposed Development on the Wisbech Conservation area are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that the Proposed Development would not have a significant effect upon this historic area.
EV43	CPRE	Concern that the PEIR does not individually consider the effect of the proposed development on historic buildings and assets in Wisbech.	<p>The PEIR presented a preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, based on information collected at that stage of the project.</p> <p>The ES (Volume 6.2) and its accompanying Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1), which are submitted as part of the DCO application, provide fully justified and evidenced assessment conclusions based on surveys undertaken since the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>The effects of the Proposed Development on historic buildings and assets in Wisbech are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV44	CPRE	Concern that the proposed development is located on a low-lying site with drainage issues and potential conflicts with drainage infrastructure and systems.	<p>An Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) is included in the DCO application.</p> <p>An Outline Water Management Plan is also included in the DCO application as part of the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12).</p>
EV45	CPRE	Concern that the proposed development is sited on land at risk of flooding.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken consultation with the Environment Agency and the relevant Internal Drainage Boards. A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) has been carried out. The flood risk assessment identifies the need for a drainage strategy for the development.</p> <p>An Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) is included in the DCO application.</p>
EV46	CPRE	Concern that the proposed development could alter the local hydrological pressures and	An Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) is included in the DCO application.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		cause additional drainage issues for neighbouring residential and agricultural properties.	An Outline Water Management Plan is also included in the DCO application as part of the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) .
EV47	CPRE	Concern that the proposed development will place the planned Fens Biosphere's UNESCO biosphere designation at risk.	The effect of the Proposed Development on biodiversity was assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . The assessment includes consideration of statutory designated sites up to 20km from the Proposed Development, including the Nene Washes and Ouse Washes Ramsar/SPA/SAC sites which are part of the Core Area of the planned Fens Biosphere Reserve. No potentially negative significant effects on these sites or other biodiversity Receptors have been identified.
EV48	CPRE	Concern that light emitting from the buildings and car parks of the proposed development will result in light pollution in a rural area.	The Applicant has prepared an Outline Lighting Strategy (Appendix 3B, Volume 6.4) . This sets limits for light levels and other measures to control lighting.
EV49	CPRE	Concern about the impact of light pollution from the proposed development on the Wisbech Conservation Area and residential areas.	The Applicant has prepared an Outline Lighting Strategy (Appendix 3B, Volume 6.4) . This sets limits for light levels and other measures to control lighting.
EV50	CPRE	Concern about the light pollution impacts of aircraft warning lights required on the proposed facility and smokestack.	To minimise visual impacts, rather than a flashing light, the Applicant proposes to fit an equivalent infra-red light at the highest practical point of the structure. Details are secured by a suitably worded DCO requirement. The MoD confirmed their agreement to this approach via email on 5 May 2021.
EV51	National Grid	Suggestion that slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted as part of any landscaping scheme near the existing overhead line to reduce risk of compromising statutory safety clearances.	Trees would not be planted close to existing overhead lines, noting the overhead line proposed as part of the PEIR is now to be undergrounded. Figure 3.14 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy illustrates the locations of the proposed native planting that will be provided within the operational EfW CHP Facility Site. This landscape planting will include native shrub mix; native hedgerow with trees; native wet woodland, native species rich grassland, brown roof, and green walls. The full details of



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			the final scheme will be based on the Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy which is secured via a DCO requirement.
EV52	Environment Agency	Satisfied with the approach to flood risk set out in the PEIR.	Noted.
EV53	Environment Agency	Concern that table 1.6 of the Flood Risk Assessment states the finished floor levels will be set above the 0.1% AEP but does not provide details on the areas of the site not classed as essential infrastructure.	Since the PEIR, an updated Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) has been produced and is submitted with the DCO application. This document identifies the essential and non-essential infrastructure. Finished floor levels for the different elements of the EfW CHP Facility were set out using the Environment Agency Product 4 information. The proposals were agreed with the Environment Agency on a consultation call on 19/10/21.
EV54	Environment Agency	Suggestion that MVV confirm that the division of the site into different flood risk vulnerability classifications (essential infrastructure, less vulnerable etc) is acceptable.	The flood risk vulnerability of the different elements of the EfW CHP Facility was identified using the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance. The proposals were agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority) on a consultation call on 26/10/21.
EV55	Environment Agency	Suggestion that the finished floor levels will be required for areas of the site not classed as essential infrastructure, or that the whole site could be set at the same finished floor level.	The finished floor levels on the EfW CHP Facility Site north of the HWIDB drain will be 3m AOD. South of it they will be 2.6m AOD to 3m AOD except for the southern edge of this area where ground levels will slope down to the elevation of New Bridge Lane at about 2 to 2.2m AOD. This information is set out in the FRA (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) .
EV56	Environment Agency	Suggestion that the EPR application would require a more detailed assessment of operation than provided in the DCO application.	The Applicant has been liaising closely with the relevant national and local EA officers and will be submitting an application for an Environmental Permit in parallel with the DCO application. This will provide all of the information required by the EA to enable it to make a determination and will include full details of operations.
EV57	Natural England	Satisfied that the HRA screening has concluded that there is no potential for likely significant effects to occur in relation to potential effects associated with collision, disturbance, and displacement on any of the	Noted.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		qualifying features of the Nene Washes, Ouse Washes and The Wash SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites.	
EV58	Natural England	Satisfied that the Wash Ramsar and SPA and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC will not be impacted from hydrology due to the distance and robust surface water drainage and pollution prevention measures.	Noted.
EV59	Natural England	Support for the measures outlined in table 12.9 of PEIR Chapter 12.	Noted.
EV60	Natural England	Satisfied that as the Nene Washes Ramsar, SAC and SPA and Ouse Washes SPA are upstream of the development, they are therefore not considered an issue.	Noted.
EV61	Natural England	Support for embedded environmental measures such as: Minimising land take and micro-site, Sensitive vegetation removal, Maintaining habitat connectivity, Protection of retained habitats, Habitat reinstatement, and sensitive access and enabling works.	Noted.
EV62	Natural England	Suggestion that survey effort, assessment and mitigation relating to protected species should accord with NE's standing advice document, and that any departures from this advice, along with any likely consequences should be provided in the ES.	The methodologies for ecological surveys undertaken to inform the baseline for assessment accord with ecological best practice and Natural England standing advice and are outlined in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .
EV63	Natural England	Suggestion that, to resolve any outstanding issues early in the process, MVA should seek advice on protected species survey,	Comment is noted. The Applicant set out how it proposed to undertake protected species surveys through the process of EIA Scoping, and detailed survey and assessment methodologies and draft mitigation proposals were



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		assessment, and draft mitigation proposals through NE's Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) and Pre-submission Screening Service (PSS).	subsequently presented in the PEIR. The Stage 2 Statutory Consultation sought Natural England comments on the information provided in the PEIR. There has been no confirmed need for protected species licencing identified during the baseline surveys in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) Section 11.4 and 11.5 of the assessment in Section 11.9 .
EV64	Natural England	Satisfied that there may be a loss of semi-natural woodland, deciduous and veteran trees, and hedgerows, and that all areas of hedgerow cross will be replaced and that compensation for habitat loss will be identified within the ES.	Noted. Figure 3.14: Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy (Volume 6.3) illustrates the locations of the proposed native planting that will be provided within the operational EfW CHP Facility Site. This landscape planting will include native shrub mix; native hedgerow with trees; native wet woodland, native species rich grassland, brown roof, and green walls. The full details of the final scheme will be based on the Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy and is secured via DCO requirement.
EV65	Natural England	Support for the provision and implementation of an Ecological Mitigation Strategy, Habitat Management Plan, Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, and Construction Environmental Management Plan.	Noted. Outline documents will be submitted with the DCO application and if the application is approved these will be developed into detailed documents for implementation via the discharge of DCO requirements.
EV66	Natural England	Suggestion to take into account the new amendment to the Environmental Bill for 'Biodiversity Net Gain' for NSIPs and to provided additional habitat beyond the existing baseline.	The Applicant has had regard to the Environment Act 2021 which in the future will require a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for NSIPs. Accordingly, the Applicant has set out the options it will consider to deliver BNG within Appendix 11M (Volume 6.4) .
EV67	Natural England	Suggestion that the Environmental Statement should demonstrate the proposed development's contribution to nature recovery and delivery of Natural Cambridgeshire's 'doubling nature' targets.	The targets have been considered in the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) and measures to improve the Proposed Development's contribution to nature recovery have been included in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Volume 7.7) and Outline Ecological Mitigation Strategy which forms an appendix to the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) .
EV68	Natural England	Suggestion that details of ecological mitigation measures for species and habitats be	Area A has been taken forward and ecological mitigation measures are set out within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		provided in the ES if the Area A extension is pursued.	
EV69	Natural England	Support for the approach taken in assessing the combined and cumulative impacts of the proposed scheme set out in PEIR Chapter 18.	Noted.
EV70	Historic England	Suggestion to consider the impacts on the historic environment through the EIA and the development of an Environmental Statement, as the effects of the proposal on the historic environment will likely be significant.	The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant .
EV71	Historic England	Satisfied with the PEIR and its multi-discipline approach to heritage assessment.	Noted.
EV72	Historic England	Suggestion that the final report submitted with the DCO clearly demonstrates that the historic environment and landscape and visual study areas are appropriate and are informed by a detailed analysis of ZTV exercises and guided by the County archaeological adviser.	<p>The results of a ground investigation previously completed within the EfW CHP Facility were shared with Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) archaeological officer and have been incorporated into ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>The view of CCC's Senior Archaeologist was that borehole records from within the site of the EfW CHP Facility, did not show a requirement for further archaeological work within the area.</p> <p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p>
EV73	Historic England	Suggestion to use and reference the guidance given by Historic England in GPA2; Managing Significance in Decision-taking in the historic Environment and GPA 3; The Setting of Heritage Assets within the full ES.	These guidance notes were used and are referenced in Table 10.7 in ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV74	Historic England	Satisfied that various heritage assets have been scoped into the ES for further assessment.	Noted.
EV75	Historic England	Suggestion that the final assessment of heritage assets examines all potential impacts more thoroughly, including the visibility of the development from local conservation areas and listed buildings.	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development on historic assets has been undertaken and the results presented in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). The assessment has concluded that there are no likely significant effects on the landscape and townscape Receptors.</p>
EV76	Historic England	Suggestion to include appropriate photomontages/wire frame and rendered images that relate specifically to heritage asset viewpoints and specific impact upon setting, in order to substantiate the claims of the impact assessment.	<p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and the results presented in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>Agreement on the viewpoints for the production of photomontages and photowires was reached with Cambridgeshire County Council's appointed landscape architects, Liz Lake Associates. Details of the agreed locations for photomontages and photowires are presented in Table 9.1 in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV77	Historic England	Suggestion to consider environmental impacts, other than visual impacts, such as noise, smell, vibrations etc. on heritage assets and to include detail on how the negative effects would be managed and mitigated.	Construction noise has been predicted and assessed at the nearest heritage assets to determine the potential for likely significant effects at these locations. The settings assessment also takes account of the potential for other, non-visual effects as advised in Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3.
EV78	Historic England	Suggestion to provide a method statement detailing construction operations and methods, and mitigation strategies, to	The Applicant has prepared an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) which sets out the responsibilities and environmental standards that the Applicant will comply with and will



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>minimise impacts on the archaeological potential of the site and grid connection.</p>	<p>contractually require its Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) contractor(s) to comply with during the construction of the Proposed Development. The CEMP includes mitigation requirements identified within the following, relevant, Environmental Statement (ES) chapters for archaeology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration; • Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual; • Chapter 10 Historic Environment; <p>Proposals for the provision of archaeological recording are outlined as part of the embedded environmental measures in ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV79	Historic England	<p>Suggestion to seek the specialist advice of the County archaeological team for guidance on the requisite evaluation and survey work and other technical aspects of the work that is required for the ES.</p>	<p>The Applicant sought the views of Cambridgeshire County Council's Senior Archaeologist to inform the development of ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) and their comments have been considered in completing the archaeological assessment.</p>
EV80	Historic England	<p>Suggestion that the ES include further viewpoints and photomontages and rendered images to support LVIA analysis to make it acceptable in historic environment terms.</p>	<p>Agreement on the viewpoints for the production of photomontages and photowires was reached with Cambridgeshire County Council's appointed landscape architects, Liz Lake Associates. Details of the agreed locations for photomontages and photowires are presented in Table 9.1 in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV81	Historic England	<p>Suggestion that the ES include more detailed archaeological data, including geo-archaeological works to make it acceptable in historic environment terms.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) includes an appropriate and proportionate level of archaeological data, reflecting the nature of the Proposed Development and the extent of previous disturbance within the site. The scope has been subject to consultation with relevant consultees.</p> <p>A summary of known and potential archaeological assets within the Proposed Development is presented in Table 10.10 in ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV82	Historic England	Suggestion that archaeological survey and evaluation fieldwork be completed and reporting on in the ES to make it acceptable in historic environment terms.	The scheme design has developed since the PEIR was produced. Specifically, the undergrounding of the entire Grid Connection means that works within land not previously developed is very limited. Given this, it has not been appropriate or proportionate to undertake evaluation fieldwork as part of the ES. Notwithstanding this, proposals for the provision of archaeological recording are outlined as part of the embedded environmental measures in ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) .
EV83	Historic England	Suggestion to continue identifying heritage assets' significance at an early stage, as required in NPPF paras. 194, 189 and 199, to evolve baseline assessment, heritage and Environmental Statements and management plans, due to potential impacts on assets of national importance.	There will be no direct impact (i.e. direct disturbance) on any asset of national importance, ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) includes an assessment of effects on the settings of designated assets, including those of national importance.
EV84	Historic England	Suggestion to continue setting, landscape and archaeological-focused approaches to analysis, and that the Scheme responds to historic environment concerns in line with the objective outlined paragraph 206 of the NPPF.	<p>ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) includes an appropriate and proportionate level of archaeological data, reflecting the nature of the Proposed Development, the extent of previous disturbance within the site, and an assessment of effects on heritage assets, completed in accordance with relevant guidance. The scope has been subject to consultation with relevant consultees.</p> <p>A summary of known and potential archaeological assets within the Proposed Development is presented in Table 10.10 in ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV85	Historic England	Suggestion to adequately identify the impacts on the historic environment and to avoid or minimise the harm to the heritage assets, including providing justification for any harm, in line with NPPF paras. 190 and 200.	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development on historic assets has been undertaken and the results presented in ES Chapter 9:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). The assessment has concluded that there are no likely significant effects on the landscape and townscape Receptors.</p>
EV86	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Concern that the area has previously faced flooding which affected property and infrastructure, and that options are being investigated to alleviate flows entering the drainage system.	Water discharges from the EfW CHP Facility into the Hundred of Wisbech IDB drains will be limited to greenfield runoff rates using SuDS as agreed with Hundred of Wisbech IDB on consultation calls on 14/12/21. This will ensure that runoff will not increase due to the Proposed Development.
EV87	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board Waldersey Internal Drainage Board	Suggestion that the proposed development could aid in reducing flows that discharge into the drainage system.	Water discharges from the EfW CHP Facility into the Hundred of Wisbech IDB drains will be limited to greenfield runoff rates using SuDS. The flow rates have been agreed with Hundred of Wisbech IDB on consultation calls on 14/12/21. This will ensure that runoff will not increase due to the Proposed Development.
EV88	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Concern that the lack of action by Highway England to ensure the capacity and structural integrity of culverts under the A47 will result in greater flood risks.	The Applicant is unable to comment on the extent to which National Highways (previously Highways England) maintains existing culverts.
EV89	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Concern that the proposed development is vulnerable to water shortage and resulting water stress, as well as severe weather events.	<p>The stated water demand of the EfW CHP Facility is based on a worst case scenario with full steam off-take and zero condensate return. In reality the water demand is significantly lower as commercial agreements for the use of steam will include requirements for the return of condensate. In the event that there are no steam offtake customers the water steam cycle will be a closed loop system with all condensate being returned to the boiler.</p> <p>There will be a variety of structures which together form the Proposed Development. The most significant is the EfW CHP Facility Site which includes a main building for the EfW process and chimneys of up to 90m in height. The design of the Proposed Development will be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced personnel including civil and structural engineers. The design</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			and design loads will take into account the ground conditions, the effect of extreme weather, and climate change.
EV90	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Request for clarification on whether use of potable water could be reduced by using other sources of water supply.	The Applicant is proposing to recycle grey water for use within the Administration building to minimise the use of potable water within the building.
EV91	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Request for clarification on whether a 'closed loop' system to capture and treat the water for use could be utilised at the proposed facility.	The stated water demand of the EfW CHP Facility is based on a worst case scenario with full steam off-take and zero condensate return. In reality the water demand is significantly lower as commercial agreements for the use of steam will include requirements for the return of condensate. In the event that there are no steam offtake customers the water steam cycle will be a closed loop system with all condensate being returned to the boiler.
EV92	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board Waldersey Internal Drainage Board	Concern about the potential impacts on water pollution and the effects on local agricultural land, urban development, and aquatic environment.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency. The Environmental Permit will require all operational areas to be provided with a sealed drainage system. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) which has been submitted with the DCO application.
EV93	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Suggestion that systems, such as pollution retention devices, be installed to ensure that no materials, debris, or polluting matter are discharged into open watercourses.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) which has been submitted with the DCO application.
EV94	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Suggestion that any excavated, imported or exported soils and materials are tested regularly to assure compliance with standards.	Phase 2 geo-environmental ground investigation has been completed for the EfW CHP Facility Site and all other areas of the Proposed Development have been subject to Phase 1 geo-environmental desk study, which has identified potential sources of contamination that need further investigation. Embedded measures include a further Phase 2 investigation.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV95	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Suggestion that no soils or materials, particularly those potentially contaminated, be placed within 20m of an open watercourse during construction and decommissioning.	<p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) which includes an Outline Soil Management Plan (Appendix C). This will ensure the protection, conservation and reinstatement of soil material, its physical and chemical properties, and functional capacity for agricultural use.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) which includes an Outline Soil Management Plan (Appendix C).</p> <p>The Outline Soil Management Plan accords with the principles of environmental protection set out in the Environmental Statement (ES), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All soil handling, placing, compaction and management shall be undertaken in accordance with best practice (DEFRA, 2009); • Soils suitable for reuse as part of wider mitigation (e.g. planting areas) to be reused in a broadly similar location to their origin, and stored for the shortest amount of time permissible; and • Any surplus soils will be disposed of in an appropriate manner off-site.
EV96	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Suggestion that water discharged into open watercourses during construction and decommissioning be regularly tested to assure compliance with standards.	<p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) which includes a Outline Water Management Plan (Appendix B). This outlines the best practice working methods to protect surface water and groundwater from pollution and other adverse impacts including change to flow and water levels during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. This includes a description of the proposed management of surface water and groundwater and required consents/permits, pollution prevention measures and flood emergency management measures. Similar documents will be produced for the decommissioning phase.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV97	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Suggestion that water discharged into open watercourses during operation be regularly tested to assure compliance with standards.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency. The Environmental Permit will require all operational areas to be provided with a sealed drainage system.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>The Outline Drainage Strategy will utilise SuDS principles for attenuation storage and treatment to reduce the discharge to greenfield runoff rates and prevent pollution of the water environment.</p>
EV98	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board Waldersey Internal Drainage Board	Concern about the detrimental impact of the proposals on the deterioration of the ecosystem of the River Nene and the smaller habitats and species in the rural and urban environment.	<p>The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development were initially assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2). In response to this suggestion, the River Nene County Wildlife Site has now been included within the scope of cumulative assessment within ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2). The assessment includes all ecological features relevant to the Proposed Development that are of sufficient importance for likely effects to be significant, and this includes the River Nene County Wildlife Site. No potentially negative significant effects have been identified.</p> <p>The Applicant has given more consideration to how it can improve the ecology of the site and these measures are set out within the DCO application. Notably in the appendices to ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV99	Waldersey Internal Drainage Board	Concern that the area has previously experienced flooding and measures to alleviate the flows entering its system is currently being investigated.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken consultation with the Environment Agency and the relevant Internal Drainage Boards. A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) has been carried out. The flood risk assessment identifies the need for a drainage strategy for the development.</p> <p>An Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) is included in the DCO application.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV100	Norfolk County Council	Support of paragraph 11.9.1 from Chapter 11 of the PEIR, that without further field survey information or final design of the proposed development, it is not possible to conclusively determine the importance of some ecological features, or the extent of environmental change on certain features.	The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development were initially assessed in the PEIR. Field surveys were completed post-PEIR and are reported in the ES with the ecological assessment completed and reported within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .
EV101	Norfolk County Council	Suggestion that all ecological field survey work should accord with the best practice guidelines.	The methodologies for ecological surveys undertaken to inform the baseline for assessment accord with ecological best practice and Natural England standing advice and are outlined in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .
EV102	Norfolk County Council	Suggestion that further field survey information is required to determine the preferred Grid Connection route from an ecological perspective.	Overhead line poles will no longer be required as the whole of the Grid Connection will now be underground. An environmental assessment on the route of the revised Grid Connection (underground cable) has been undertaken and the conclusions are presented in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .
EV103	Norfolk County Council	Suggestion that if new poles are required, the potential for impact on protected species and priority habitats should be assessed and mitigation hierarchy should be followed.	Overhead line poles will no longer be required as the whole of the Grid Connection will now be underground.
EV104	Norfolk County Council	Complaint that the locations of the poles, construction compounds and access routes were not included in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Plans in the Biodiversity Chapter of the PEIR.	Overhead line poles will no longer be required as the whole of the Grid Connection will now be underground. An environmental assessment on the route of the revised Grid Connection (underground cable) has now been undertaken and the conclusions are presented in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .
EV105	Norfolk County Council	Suggestion to update the Habitats Regulations Assessment after the completion of air quality dispersion modelling.	As part of the approach to developing a DCO Application a PEIR is developed to enable consultees to understand the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed scheme. Air dispersion modelling has now been undertaken to



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			inform the preparation of ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) . The results of this modelling have been used to inform the Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (HRA NSER) (Volume 5.3) which accompanies the DCO application.
EV106	Norfolk Council	County Suggestion to update the HRA screening report to reflect the developments in project design and the introduction of Grid Connection Option 2.	Air dispersion modelling has now been undertaken to inform the preparation of ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and this reflects the updated design. The results of this modelling have been used to inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment NSER (HRA NSER) (Volume 5.3) which accompanies the DCO application. Screening matrices are presented as an appendix to the HRA NSER at Appendix E .
EV107	Norfolk Council	County Complaint that the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, as well as the Norfolk PFRA and Lead Flood Risk Management Strategies appear to have not been reported on in the Flood Risk Assessment.	The SFRA for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, the Norfolk PFRA and the Local Flood Risk Management Strategies have now been included in the ES as Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) .
EV108	Norfolk Council	County Concern that there is no mention of an Emergency Flood Plan for the temporary construction works outside of the main site, despite the work occurring in an area at risk to multiple sources of flooding.	The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes measures to be taken with respect to flooding during construction. These are detailed in Appendix B to the Outline CEMP.
EV109	Norfolk Council	County Suggestion to make all Emergency Flood Plans are consistent with the requirements of ADEPT Guidance.	An Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) has been submitted with the DCO application.
EV110	Norfolk Council	County Suggestion to provide further information on how water ingress and dewatering of the groundwater is planned to occur and where any water will be discharged to.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency. The Environmental Permit will require all operational areas to be provided with a sealed drainage system.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV111	Norfolk County Council	Suggestion that a Surface Water Management Plan and Drainage Strategy is required and will need to include a plan for temporary dewatering discharges should any groundworks become flooded and will need to be agree with the appropriate regulators.	<p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken consultation with the Environment Agency and the relevant Internal Drainage Boards. A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) has been carried out. The flood risk assessment identifies the need for a drainage strategy for the development.</p> <p>An Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4 Appendix 12F) is included in the DCO application.</p> <p>An Outline Water Management Plan is also included in the DCO application as part of the Outline CEMP (Appendix B to Outline CEMP, Volume 7.12).</p>
EV112	Norfolk County Council	Suggestion that the Construction Environmental Management Plan should consider the management of surface water quality management.	<p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) which includes an Outline Water Management Plan (Appendix B). This outlines the best practice working methods to protect surface water and groundwater from pollution and other adverse impacts including change to flow and water levels during the construction phase of the Proposed Development. This includes a description of the proposed management of surface water and groundwater and required consents/permits, pollution prevention measures and flood emergency management measures. Similar documents will be produced for the decommissioning phase.</p>
EV113	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern that the project may endanger the land and waterways of the area due to its siting on Zone 3 flood plain.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken consultation with the Environment Agency and the relevant Internal Drainage Boards. A Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) has been carried out. The flood risk assessment identifies the need for a drainage strategy for the development.</p> <p>An Outline Drainage Strategy is included in the DCO application (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F).</p> <p>A final Drainage Strategy will be prepared and implemented for the operational EfW CHP Facility. This will include the provision of oil interceptors and trapped</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV114	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern about the facility leading to potential pollution of the Fenland farms from toxic emissions.	<p>gullies, appropriate storage of chemicals, fuel and oil and an accident response protocol. The Drainage Strategy will utilise SuDS principles for attenuation storage and treatment to reduce the discharge to greenfield runoff rates and prevent pollution of the water environment.</p> <p>The potential effects of emissions to air on the natural environment are considered in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2). A Human Health Risk Assessment (Volume, Appendix 8B Annex F, Volume 6.4) has also been undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of metals in the food chain. The assessment addresses potential impacts of particulates and nitrogen deposition on the local area, including farmland.</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
EV115	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern that full environmental and biological surveys for the area have not been conducted.	The methodologies for ecological surveys undertaken to inform the baseline for assessment accord with ecological best practice and Natural England standing advice and are outlined in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .
EV116	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern for the habitat of endangered species such as newts and natterjacks due to their known existence on pylon sites and local waterways.	No suitable aquatic breeding habitat for these amphibian species would be affected by the Proposed Development. The ecological desk study and baseline surveys identified no evidence of these species occurring within the terrestrial habitat inside the Zone of Influence of the Proposed Development. Nevertheless, as a precaution, the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) and an accompanying Outline Ecological Mitigation Strategy (Appendix D) includes sensitive working methods that would minimise the risk of harm to amphibian species such as these, and other species such as common toad, in the unlikely event that they are present.
EV117	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that assessment of noise impacts at nearby industrial and commercial receptors employ a hybrid approach using BS 4142 and	Agreed to refer to BS 8233:2014 criteria when assessing impacts at nearby industrial/ commercial Receptors. The criteria for determining noise impact magnitudes at non-residential Receptors is set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		the relevant limits prescribed by the WHO and/or BS 8233.	
EV118	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that BS 8233:2014 be added to the list of technical guidance in Table 7.7 of PEIR Chapter 7.	Agreed. Table 7.9 in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) contains reference to BS 8233:2014 and other technical guidance used in the assessment.
EV119	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that table 7.9 in PEIR Chapter 7 confirm that approach is consistent with the joint ANC-loA guidance regarding COVID-19 .	Agreed. Table 7.2 in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) refers to the joint ANC-loA guidance regarding COVID-19 and confirms that the approach to the baseline surveys accords with the guidance provided therein.
EV120	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that paragraphs 7.5.7 to 7.5.9 of PEIR Chapter 7 be reworded to clarify that a formal desk-based review was undertaken, but rather there was a consideration of relevant data available.	Agreed to amend for clarity where the term 'desk-based review/ desktop study' is used. Wording in Paragraph 7.4.12 and Section 7.5 in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) has been amended on this basis.
EV121	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that the phrase "where possible" in Table 7.18 in PEIR Chapter 7 be reworded to provide greater clarity.	Once explained, agreed original wording was acceptable. However wording in Table 7.18 of ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) has been reworded for clarity and consistency.
EV122	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that the CoNAW Regulations are not relevant to the assessment of noise impacts from an external source at industrial and commercial receptors, as the Regulations intend to ensure workers' hearing is protected from noisy activities at their place of work.	Agreed, reference to CoNAW removed. The criteria for determining noise impact magnitudes at non-residential Receptors is set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) based on guidance from relevant British Standards.
EV123	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that all alternative noise monitoring locations be identified to ensure potential delays with consent are avoided.	(Suggestion relates to Survey and Monitoring Plan (SMP) in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed. All alternative/ backup monitoring locations were agreed in advance with the host Local Authorities through submission and review of a SMP. The agreed SMP is provided in Appendix 7A, Annex B (Volume 6.4) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV124	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that the level of detail provided for the location descriptions of the ST6 and ST8 survey locations be expanded to provide greater clarity.	(Suggestion relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed. Explanation of survey locations ST6 and ST8 were expanded as provided in the SMP in Appendix 7A, Annex B (Volume 6.4) .
EV125	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 7 insert wording to reference that noise measurements will be undertaken by personnel who hold the IoA Certificate of Competence in Environmental Noise Monitoring.	(Suggestion relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed with Fenland District Council that an alternative demonstration of competency would be acceptable. It was agreed that all monitoring would be undertaken by personnel who, as a minimum, are Associate Members of the Institute of Acoustics (AMIOA) and all analysis and reporting would be overseen by personnel who, as a minimum, are full corporate Members of the IOA (MIOA). The statements of competencies provided in the baseline monitoring report (Appendix 7A, Annex A, Volume 6.4) confirms that the personnel undertaking the monitoring and overseeing the data processing and analysis were appropriately qualified and competent.
EV126	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 7 paras. 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 be changed to reflect that noise measurements be undertaken in accordance with the relevant British Standards.	(Comment relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed, paragraphs 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 of the SMP (provided in Appendix 7A, Annex B, Volume 6.4) are amended accordingly.
EV127	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 7 paras. 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 be changed to reflect that meteorological logging stations will be installed at locations of long-term monitoring sites to ensure that only noise data collected under appropriate and representative weather conditions is assessed.	(Comment relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed, paragraphs 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 of the SMP (provided in Appendix 7A, Annex B, Volume 6.4) have been amended, and confirmation of the approach to the installation of data logging meteorological stations is provided in paragraph 2.2.4.
EV128	Fenland Council	District Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 7 paragraph 2.2.5 be reworded to ensure that the locations of long-term unattended baseline monitoring are agreed in writing with host Local Authorities in advance.	(Comment relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed, paragraph 2.2.5 of the SMP (provided in Appendix 7A, Annex B, Volume 6.4) has been amended to state that all long-term monitoring locations would be agreed in advance in writing with the host Local Authorities.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV129	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 7 paragraph 2.3.1 be reworded to clarify that reporting of all data is undertaken in accordance with relevant technical guidance.	(Comment relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed, paragraph 2.3.1 of the SMP (provided in Appendix 7A, Annex B, Volume 6.4) has been reworded to clarify that reporting of all data is undertaken in accordance with the relevant technical guidance.
EV130	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 7 paragraph 2.4.2 be reworded to ensure that assumed baseline sound levels are agreed in writing with host Local Authorities in advance.	<p>(Comment relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed, paragraph 2.4.2 of the SMP (provided in Appendix 7A, Annex B, Volume 6.4) has been reworded to ensure that any assumed baseline sound levels would be agreed in writing with host Local Authorities in advance.</p> <p>The allowance for assuming baseline sound levels was never required. This was because the baseline monitoring was undertaken when any influence on local activity due to the influence of Covid-19 was negligible, as evidenced by the validation of the measured baseline sound level data provided in Section 4 of the Baseline Noise Monitoring Report in Volume 6.4, Appendix 7A.</p>
EV131	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that clarification be provided on the infrastructure provided at the termination of the CHP connection, which will be closer to affected heritage assets than the main plant site.	A description of the CHP Connection, including the connection terminating at the existing Nestlé Purina site, is included within the ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) .
EV132	Fenland District Council	Concern that PEIR Chapter 10 does not consider the impacts of odour, noise, or pollution on the settings of heritage assets.	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within the ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2). The assessment concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>Construction noise has been predicted and assessed at the nearest heritage assets to determine the potential for likely significant effects at these locations. The settings assessment also takes account of the potential for other, non-visual effects as advised in GPA 3.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			Noise effects resulting from construction activities have been assessed in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) and an Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan is included in the DCO application in Appendix F to the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) .
EV133	Fenland Council	District	Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 10 should provide a summary of the odour, noise, and pollution impacts on the setting of heritage assets.
			The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) , which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant .
EV134	Wisbech Council	Town	Complaint that there is a lack of traffic data within the PEIR which will affect the noise assessment, therefore the conclusions on any noise related effects cannot be relied upon.
			The PEIR presents a preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, based on information collected at that stage of the project. Since the PEIR, additional baseline traffic data has been collected at all road links requested by National Highways and CCC, and this data has been used to inform the assessment presented in ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) .
EV135	Wisbech Council	Town	Complaint that the NTS does not provide information that allows readers to understand the likely impact of the proposal on noise considering the existing baseline levels.
			Limited baseline data was available at PEIR. ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) presents full details of the baseline monitoring undertaken in accordance with the agreed methodology, and the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) provided for the ES addresses potential impacts in the context of the baseline conditions.
EV136	Wisbech Council	Town	Complaint that there is no baseline noise information for receptors potentially affected by the combined heat and power connection or grid connection within the NTS.
			The PEIR presents a preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, based on information collected at that stage of the project. Limited baseline data was available at PEIR. ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) presents full details of the potential impacts due to the construction and operation of the CHP Connection and Grid Connection and includes baseline conditions.
EV137	Wisbech Council	Town	Concern about the potential significant noise effects from the horizontal drilling for the grid connection.
			Noise effects resulting from construction activities have been assessed and the results are set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2)



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			and a Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan is included in the DCO application in Appendix F of the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) .
EV138	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the impact of the tipping bunker and main waste bunker on archaeological remains up to 15m below finished floor level, has not be considered in the PEIR.	The results of a ground investigation previously completed within the EfW CHP Facility were shared with Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) archaeological officer and have been incorporated into ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) . The view of CCC's Senior Archaeologist was that borehole records from within the site of the EfW CHP Facility, did not show a requirement for further archaeological work within the area.
EV139	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the policy tests on the consideration of potential impacts set out in Paragraphs 199-203 of the 2021 NPPF are not referred to enough in the PEIR.	Paragraphs 199 onwards consider the assessment of effects upon the historic environment. Additional reference has been made within the ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) . The Applicant's consideration of Legislation and Policy is presented in ES Chapter 5: Legislation and Policy (Volume 6.2) .
EV140	Wisbech Council	Town Suggestion to reference the balancing exercise required between harm and public benefit when undertaking the assessment of potential impacts mentioned in paragraphs 199-203 of the NPPF.	Paragraphs 199 onwards consider the assessment of effects upon the historic environment. Additional reference has been made within the ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) . The Applicant's consideration of Legislation and Policy is presented in ES Chapter 5: Legislation and Policy (Volume 6.2) .
EV141	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that reference to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is underplayed within the PEIR in regard to development affecting listed buildings or their settings.	The Applicant's consideration of Legislation and Policy is presented in ES Chapter 5: Legislation and Policy (Volume 6.2) and this includes the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Consideration of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 have been given in Table 10.3 in ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) .
EV142	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that there is not an appropriate heritage impact assessment within the PEIR, so it is not possible to draw reasonable conclusions related to planning balance or conclude that there would not be significant harm to heritage assets.	The PEIR presents a preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, based on information collected at that stage of the project. The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have now been assessed fully and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant .
EV143	Wisbech Town Council	Suggestion that as baseline assessment is incomplete, as surveys of the habitats on the site and surrounding area have not yet been undertaken, conclusions that there are no likely significant effects cannot yet be made.	The PEIR included a preliminary assessment of effects on Biodiversity. The assessment within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) is based on completed baseline surveys.
EV144	Wisbech Town Council	Suggestion that conformation is needed for whether the finished floor levels relied upon to mitigate any impact from flooding are the same as those assessed in the landscape and visual assessment.	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2)) modelling reflects the proposed Finished Floor Levels (FFLs). The parameters used for the ZTV include the furthest extents of the roofline of the Boiler house building at 52m above FFL which represents the worst-case scenario under the LoD adopted.
EV145	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that the NTS is unclear on how much the development will need to be raised to mitigate flood risk.	Finished floor levels for the different elements of the EfW CHP Facility were set out using the Environment Agency Product 4 information. The proposals were agreed with the Environment Agency on a consultation call on 19/10/21.
EV146	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that no information on an appropriate Drainage Management Plan is provided within the PEIR, so it is not possible for the reader to provide any meaningful comment on the strategy.	The Applicant has prepared an Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F, Volume 6.4) which will be submitted with the DCO application.
EV147	Wisbech Town Council	Suggestion to provide clarification on the impact on flood risk of the construction of the 15m waste bunker, in order to be able to fully consider the flood risk impacts of the development on the surrounding area.	As stated in the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) the proposed waste bunker (maximum depth of 15m below FFL) could be liable to groundwater flooding if not sealed appropriately or be at risk of groundwater uplift (floating) if not adequately engineered to avoid this. This will be a matter for design post DCO submission. Groundwater dewatered from excavations of the waste bunker is to be discharged to HWIDB drains and will be subject to a Land Drainage Consent from the HWIDB. Discharges would be temporarily halted if a flood alert or flood warning is in place downstream (and the on-site



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV148	Wisbech Council	Town Concern about the lack of information on how the waste bunker impacts flood risk, given Wisbech is in an area at high risk of flooding.	<p>discharges could feasibly contribute to the flood event). Furthermore, it was agreed with the EA that there is no potential loss of floodplain storage due to the EfW site because the site is not predicted to flood both in the 0.5% AEP (design flood event under PPG) and 0.1% AEP overtopping events (plus climate change).</p> <p>As stated in the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A, Volume 6.4) the proposed waste bunker (maximum depth of 15m below FFL) could be liable to groundwater flooding if not sealed appropriately, or be at risk of groundwater uplift (floating) if not adequately engineered to avoid this. This will be a matter for design post-PEIR. Groundwater dewatered from excavations of the waste bunker is to be discharged to HWIDB drains and will be subject to a Land Drainage Consent from the HWIDB. Discharges would be temporarily halted if a flood alert or flood warning is in place downstream (and the on-site discharges could feasibly contribute to the flood event). Furthermore, it was agreed with the EA that there is no potential loss of floodplain storage due to the EfW site because the site is not predicted to flood both in the 0.5% AEP (design flood event under PPG) and 0.1% AEP overtopping events (plus climate change).</p>
EV149	Wisbech Council	Town The PEIR is not clear about whether the geology, hydrogeology and contaminated land study area concerns represent the entire application site or just the main development site.	<p>The ES covers the entire application site. The Study Area in ES Chapter 13: Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land (Volume 6.2) covers the entire application boundary, in the text it is subdivided into the EfW CHP Facility, the CHP Connection Corridor, Access Improvements and Temporary Construction Compound and the Grid Connection. In general the Grid Connection is discussed separately from the other areas due to its rural setting, whereas the other areas are in an urban setting.</p>
EV150	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern about the potential for the proposed development to result in acid rain, impacting on respiratory health.	<p>The potential effects of emissions to air on the natural environment are considered in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken. Acid deposition on biodiversity sites has been considered as part of the air quality assessment. With respect to the impacts of acid rain on respiratory health, a reduction in the use of coal and other fossil fuel has resulted in a significant reduction in acidifying pollution in the last 40 years.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV151	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that local wildlife will be adversely impacted by operations, particularly those relying on smell and darkness, and the use of calls to communicate.	The effect of the Proposed Development on species which are legally protected or otherwise conservation notable was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . No potential negative significant effects have been identified, although the ES includes for embedded mitigation measures.
EV152	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that despite reassurance from the incinerator operators the residents will experience unexpected levels of noise, odour, and light both during construction and operation.	The ES, submitted as part of the DCO application, includes details of mitigation measures proposed to avoid or reduce the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The schedule of mitigation and monitoring can be found in ES Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation and Monitoring (Volume 6.2) .
EV153	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Suggestion that the local area, including farm animals, vegetation, and residents, be regularly monitored for dioxins and pollutants.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits for dioxins and furans, and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.
EV154	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern about the potential emissions of Heavy metal and Dioxins.	<p>Assessment of impact from emissions of metals and dioxins has been considered within ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits for dioxins and furans, and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
EV155	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that environmental priorities should be focused on Heavy metals due to anthropogenic activity and health risk they pose.	Detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken of emissions from the stack. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Emissions are based on Emission Limit Values (ELVs) included in the Environmental Permitting regulations and includes metals. Results demonstrate acceptable levels of impacts. The permitting regulations also specify that the facility would need to monitor these emissions to ensure compliance with the ELVs set in the Environmental Permit. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV156	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern for the vegetation in the area as Cadmium is toxic to them.	Detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken of emissions from the stack. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality Objectives set for the protection of human health. Emissions are based on Emission Limit Values (ELVs) included in the Environmental Permitting regulations and includes metals. Results demonstrate acceptable levels of impacts. Results demonstrate acceptable levels of impacts. The permitting regulations also specify that the facility would need to monitor these emissions to ensure compliance with the ELVs set in the Environmental Permit. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.
EV157	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the soil organisms and microbial processes will be affected by an increased level of Cadmium in the soil.	<p>The ES addresses increased emissions to air against health-based standard. As part of the scope (Chapter 8: Air Quality, Volume 6.2) an assessment of deposition on land from emissions to air from metals is included and concluded that impacts were not significant.</p> <p>The ES also details embedded measures to prevent pollution during the operational phase i.e., that the site will operate under an Environmental Permit which will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted.</p> <p>Air emissions will need to comply with mandatory Emission Limit Values (ELVs). The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application that they are using Best Available Techniques (BAT) for pollution prevention – including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air. Other embedded measures include the likely requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a permit condition.</p> <p>Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
EV158		Concern as Cadmium is highly labile in soils it is therefore essential that soils with high	The ES addresses increased emissions to air against health-based standard. As part of the scope (Chapter 8: Air Quality, Volume 6.2) an assessment of deposition on land from emissions to air from metals is included as well as a



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>concentrations are managed appropriate to avoid transfer into the human food chain.</p>	<p>HHRA (Appendix 8B, Annex G, Volume 6.4) to address potential bioaccumulation of dioxins and furans in food. Both studies concluded that impacts were not significant.</p> <p>Assessment in the ES (Volume 6.2) sets out the embedded measures to prevent pollution during the operational phase i.e., that the site will operate under an Environmental Permit which will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted. Air emissions will need to comply with mandatory Emission Limit Values (ELV). The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application for the EfW CHP that they are using Best Available Techniques (BAT) for pollution prevention – including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air.</p> <p>Other embedded measures include the likely requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a permit condition. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
EV159	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	<p>Concern that due to the boiling point of Cadmium it will be emitted from the waste incinerator's stacks as a vapour rather than adsorbed onto particulates and become captured in the filters.</p>	<p>A detailed assessment of chimney emissions is presented in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and the accompanying Technical Report (Appendix 8B, Volume 6.4).</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits for Group 1 metals, and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application for the EfW CHP that they are using Best Available Techniques (BAT) for pollution prevention – including use of appropriate filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV160	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the target values for some of the chemicals may be exceeded.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits for chemicals, and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency. Emissions from the EfW CHP Facility will be continuously monitored using a certified Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) and reported to the Environment Agency.
EV161	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that there will be emitted metals and chemicals so it will exceed their target values.	The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits for metals, and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency. Emissions from the EfW CHP Facility will be continuously monitored using a certified Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS) and reported to the Environment Agency.
EV162	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the soil in the surrounding area and particularly down wind of the incinerator will have the potential to accumulate Cadmium and other metals.	<p>Assessment in the ES (Chapter 8: Air Quality, Volume 6.2) details embedded measures to prevent pollution during the operational phase i.e., that the site will operate under an Environmental Permit which will require emissions to air to be limited; and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted. Air emissions will need to comply with mandatory Emission Limit Values (ELV). The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency, in the permit application, that they are using Best Available Techniques (BAT) for pollution prevention – including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air. Other embedded measures include the likely requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a permit condition.</p> <p>Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
EV163	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the estimated concentrations of cadmium being emitted is underestimated, as it assumes optimum sorting of the waste prior	Emissions from EfW CHP Facility were based on mandatory Emission Limit Values (ELV) stipulated by Environmental Permit regulation. The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency, in



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		to incineration and removal of all potential sources of Cadmium.	<p>the permit application, that they are using Best Available Techniques (BAT) for pollution prevention – including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air.</p> <p>In additions the assessment has applied the regulators guidance in the assessment of metals, designed to ensure a level of conservatism. It is worth noting the ELVs have been derived after a review of emissions from EfW plants across Europe, through the BREF documents and therefore do not reflect emissions only from plants with optimum sorting.</p>
EV164	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the absorbed metal ions will deposit in fog droplets to the ground.	<p>The ES addresses increased emissions to air against health-based standard. As part of the scope (Chapter 8: Air Quality, Volume 6.2) an assessment of deposition on land from metal emissions is included as well as a HHRA to address potential bioaccumulation of dioxins and furans in food. Both studies concluded that impacts were not significant</p>
EV165	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the soil condition will accumulate heavy metals and in case the soil properties change the heavy metals may transfer to other environmental systems.	<p>The ES addresses increased emissions to air against health-based standard. As part of the scope (Chapter 8: Air Quality, Volume 6.2) an assessment of deposition on land from metal emissions is included as well as a HHRA (Appendix 8B, Annex G, Volume 6.4) to address potential bioaccumulation of dioxins and furans in food. Both studies concluded that impacts were not significant.</p> <p>Assessment in the ES details embedded measures to prevent pollution during the operational phase i.e., that the site will operate under an Environmental Permit which will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted. Air emissions will need to comply with mandatory emission limit values (ELV).</p> <p>The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application for the EfW CHP that they are using best available techniques for pollution prevention – including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air. Other embedded measures include the likely requirement</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV166	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that heavy metals will be up taken in the root system and thereby enter the food chain.	<p>for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a permit condition.</p> <p>The ES addresses increased emissions to air against health-based standard. As part of the scope (Chapter 8: Air Quality, Volume 6.2) an assessment of deposition on land from metal emissions is included as well as a HHRA to address potential bioaccumulation of dioxins and furans in food. Both studies concluded that impacts were not significant.</p> <p>Assessment in the ES sets out the embedded measures to prevent pollution during the operational phase i.e., that the site will operate under an Environmental Permit which will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted. Air emissions will need to comply with mandatory emission limit values (ELV).</p> <p>The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application for the EfW CHP that they are using best available techniques for pollution prevention – including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air. Other embedded measures include the likely requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a permit condition.</p>
EV167	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the potential harmful concentrations of Cadmium and other metals will accumulate in the environment during the lifespan of the incinerator.	<p>The ES addresses increased emissions to air against health-based standard. As part of the scope (Chapter 8: Air Quality, Volume 6.2) an assessment of deposition on land from metal emissions is included as well as a HHRA to address potential bioaccumulation of dioxins and furans in food. Both studies concluded that impacts were not significant.</p> <p>Assessment in the ES sets out the embedded measures to prevent pollution during the operational phase i.e., that the site will operate under an Environmental Permit which will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted. Air emissions will need to comply with mandatory emission limit values (ELV). The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>in the permit application for the EfW CHP that they are using best available techniques for pollution prevention – including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air. Other embedded measures include the likely requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP Facility as a permit condition.</p>
EV168	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the noise impacts of the grid connection installation, including night-time noise from pumps where Horizontal Directional Drilling takes place.	Noise effects resulting from construction activities have been assessed and the results are set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) and a Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan is included in the DCO application in Appendix F of the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) .
EV169	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk's comments on the Scoping Report were not reported in the Summary of EIA Scoping Opinion responses in PEIR Chapter 13.	The Applicant notes that KLWN submitted a late scoping response and accepts that this was not referred to in PEIR Chapter 13. KLWN response is now captured in Table 13.1 to Chapter 13: Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land (Volume 6.2) .
EV170	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that there has been no assessment of stack emissions during abnormal operations, and that this will need to be completed and considered in the application.	A detailed assessment of chimney emissions is presented in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and the accompanying Technical Report (Volume 6.2, Appendix 8B). This includes assessment of emissions during abnormal operations at Section 4.2 .
EV171	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Support for the approach to subsequent environmental surveys and monitoring and informal consultation following the publication of the PEIR.	This support has been noted.
EV172	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that PEIR Chapter 10 only considers certain buildings and structures.	The effects of the Proposed Development on historic buildings and assets are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) . The scope of the assessment reflects the nature of the Proposed Development and of the surrounding historic environment, and the heritage assets within the Study Area. It is not necessary or proportionate to assess effects on all heritage assets and so the focus of the assessment is on those assets which could be



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV173	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that PEIR Chapter 10 should have itemised the designated heritage assets and provided an analysis for each one.	subject to potentially significant effects. The selection of relevant historic assets has been done in consultation with relevant consultees such as the Planning Inspectorate, Fenland District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Norfolk County Council.
EV174	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the analysis of listed buildings' settings in PEIR Chapter 10 is inconsistent due to settings that have not been analysed being closer to the boundary than others which have been analysed.	The potential likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on historic buildings and assets are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) . The scope of the assessment reflects the nature of the Proposed Development and of the surrounding historic environment, and the heritage assets within the Study Area. It is not necessary or proportionate to assess effects on all heritage assets and so the focus of the assessment is on those assets which could be subject to potentially significant effects. The selection of relevant historic assets has been done in consultation with relevant consultees such as the Planning Inspectorate, Fenland District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Norfolk County Council.
EV175	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the analysis of listed buildings' settings in PEIR Chapter 10 should have considered all designated heritage assets within the 2km boundary.	The scope of the assessment reflects the nature of the Proposed Development and of the surrounding historic environment, and the heritage assets within the Study Area. Distance is a factor in determining whether an asset may be subject to a change in setting, but it is not the only factor, and this can also be affected by the nature and sensitivity of the asset, the nature of the Proposed Development and the presence of any intervening structures or vegetation. The selection of relevant historic assets has been done in consultation with relevant consultees such as the Planning Inspectorate, Fenland District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Norfolk County Council.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV176	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the analysis of non-designated heritage assets' settings could have considered all non-designated heritage assets within the 2km boundary.	The scope of the assessment reflects the nature of the Proposed Development and of the surrounding historic environment, and the heritage assets within the Study Area. It is not necessary or proportionate to assess effects on all heritage assets and so the focus of the assessment is on those assets which could be subject to potentially significant effects. The selection of relevant historic assets has been done in consultation with relevant consultees such as the Planning Inspectorate, Fenland District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Norfolk County Council.
EV177	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that PEIR Chapter 10 is inconsistent in its emphasis on the setting of listed buildings in Kings' Lynn and West Norfolk.	The scheme design has developed such that the Grid Connection will now comprise entirely of an underground cable from the EfW CHP Facility to the Walsoken DNO Substation. This will negate any potential for effects on the settings of any heritage assets within Kings' Lynn and West Norfolk.
EV178	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that analysis of the impact of the grid connection on listed buildings at Oxburgh Hall has not been provided.	An assessment of the effects on Oxburgh Hall listed building is included within Section 10.9 although the Grid Connection is now proposed to be underground thus negating any potential effects on Oxburgh Hall.
EV179	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Request for clarification on whether access to water in the event of an emergency situation has been fully considered.	Access to water in the event of an emergency has been considered by the Applicant in the design of the EfW CHP Facility. Section 17.4 in ES Chapter 17: Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2) describes the design standards proposed and includes the requirement for a suitable volume of firewater to be stored (based on a risk assessment of the final design). The good practice design standards such as NFPA 850 include a minimum refill rate water supply volume. The EfW CHP Facility will be operated under a Fire Prevention Plan which will be submitted to the Environment Agency for approval.
EV180	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the proposed development will not be adequately monitored by the Environment Agency due to the infrequency of site visits, and that operators are informed of upcoming visits.	The Environment Agency (EA) are an independent regulatory body tasked with licensing and monitoring waste facilities against the conditions of the Environmental Permit for the facility. In the Applicant's experience, gained at their other facilities, the EA is more than willing to enact their regulatory powers where an issue is identified.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV181	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the proposed mitigation measures are generic and do not include key mitigating measures required, such as highways improvements, CHP connections and CCS facilities.	<p>As part of the approach to developing a DCO Application a PEIR is developed to enable consultees to understand the likely significant environmental effects of a proposed scheme. The Stage 2 Statutory Consultation actively sought consultees comments on the information provided in the PEIR. Comments provided by consultees were used to inform the preparation of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Volume 6.2). until the preparation of the detailed ES is complete, it is not possible to detail specific mitigation measures.</p> <p>The ES, submitted as part of the DCO application, now includes details of the mitigations proposed to avoid or reduce the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The schedule of mitigation and monitoring can be found in ES Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation and Monitoring (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>Current policy requires power generation facilities over 300Mwe to install CCS. The Proposed Development will generate 50Mwe. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has reserved space for CCS equipment and is actively investigating emerging CCS technologies.</p>
EV182	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the references to the Control of Noise at Work Regulations 2005 (CoNAW) used in Table 7.3 and Section 7.8 in Chapter 7 of the PEIR are not relevant as CoNAW relate to the hearing protection of workers, rather than assessing potential noise impacts from external noise sources at industrial/commercial receptors.	Agreed, reference to CoNAW removed. The criteria for determining noise impact magnitudes at non-residential Receptors is set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) based on guidance from relevant British Standards.
EV183	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that if noise impacts are to be based at nearby industrial/commercial receptors, a hybrid approach such as using BS4142 and the application of relevant limits as prescribed by the World Health Organisation – and/or BS 8233, would be appropriate.	Agreed to refer to BS 8233:2014 criteria when assessing impacts at nearby industrial/ commercial Receptors. The criteria for determining noise impact magnitudes at non-residential Receptors is set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV184	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to add Technical Guidance for noise and vibration BS 8233:2014 to the list of BS standards in table 7.7.	Agreed. Table 7.9 in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) contains reference to BS 8233:2014 and other technical guidance used in the assessment.
EV185	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied with the use of DMRB LA 111 in paragraph 7.4.3 in Chapter 7 of the PEIR.	Noted that use of the DMRB guidance on Study Areas for construction noise is agreed. This guidance was referred to when determining appropriate Study Areas for the assessment of construction noise. Study areas for construction noise are discussed in Section 4 of ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) .
EV186	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide confirmation in Table 7.8 that the author has reviewed the joint ANC/loA Guidance note re Covid-19 and that the approach is consistent with the content of the guidance note.	Agreed. Table 7.2 in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) refers to the joint ANC-loA guidance regarding COVID-19 and confirms that the approach to the baseline surveys accords with the guidance provided therein.
EV187	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to improve the wording in the paragraphs from 7.5.7 to 7.5.9 to make it clear that the 'desk-based review' that is referred to this was a consideration of the relevant data available rather than a formal review.	Agreed to amend for clarity where the term 'desk-based review/ desktop study' is used. Wording in Paragraph 7.4.12 and Section 7.5 in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) has been amended on this basis.
EV188	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to reword the information in Table 7.18 in Chapter 7 of the PEIR, in order to provide greater clarity.	Once explained, agreed original wording (about any construction activities being undertaken outside normal construction hours) was acceptable. However, wording in Table 7.18 of ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) has been reworded for clarity and consistency.
EV189	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that if noise impacts are to be based at nearby industrial/commercial receptors, a hybrid approach such as using BS4142 and the application of relevant limits as prescribed by the World Health Organisation – and/or BS 8233, would be appropriate.	Agreed to refer to BS 8233:2014 criteria when assessing impacts at nearby industrial/ commercial Receptors. The criteria for determining noise impact magnitudes at non-residential Receptors. Is set out in ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV190	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide alternatives for all of the monitoring locations set out in the paragraphs 2.1.13-2.1.14 to ensure potential delays associated with granting planning permission are avoided during future development of the project.	(Suggestion relates to Survey and Monitoring Plan (SMP) in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed. All alternative/ backup monitoring locations were agreed in advance with the host Local Authorities through submission and review of a SMP. The agreed SMP is provided in Appendix 7A, Annex B (Volume 6.4) .
EV191	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide more detail for ST6 and ST8 location descriptions in order to provide greater clarity, as the level of detail with other monitoring locations is not consistent.	(Suggestion relates to SMP in PEIR Chapter 7 Appendix 7A) Agreed. Explanation of survey locations ST6 and ST8 were expanded as provided in the SMP in Appendix 7A, Annex B (Volume 6.4) .
EV192	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to consider the emissions of HCl in relation to acid deposition to designated ecological sites.	The assessment has considered emissions of HCL in the calculation of acid deposition. in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) .
EV193	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to consider the impacts on internationally designated biodiversity sites in isolation and in-combination with other relevant plans and projects before the criteria stated in the PEIR is applied, as stated by High Court judgements.	The effect of the Proposed Development on designated biodiversity sites was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) .
EV194	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that realistic assessments of vehicle movements, travel distances and GHG emissions are undertaken prior to carrying out the Cumulative Effects Assessment.	<p>The PEIR presents a preliminary assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development, based on information collected at that stage of the project. Following the relaxation of Covid-19 restrictions detailed traffic surveys were undertaken with the agreement of the Highways Authority in October 2021 and this data has been used to inform the assessment presented in ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>The traffic and transport assessment has also been reflected within ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV195	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the conclusions made for the Cambridgeshire section within Chapter 10 of the PEIR.	Noted.
EV196	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for conclusion that surface impact on the historic environment will be minimal.	
EV197	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied with the history of the historic environment covered within the chapter.	
EV198	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the submission of PEIR Chapter 10 unchanged.	
EV199	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to restore more recent 19 th century land use types with regard to off-set biodiversity gain.	<p>The Applicant has had regard to the Environment Act 2021 which in the future will require a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for NSIPs. Accordingly, the Applicant has set out the options it will consider to deliver BNG within Appendix 11M (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>The Applicant has also prepared an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7) and this is secured via DCO requirement.</p>
EV200	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the screening in of construction and operational impacts on Nene Washes SPA/and Ouse Washes SPA/Ramsar.	Noted.
EV201	Cambridgeshire County Council	Objection to the assessment of 'no' likely significant effects shown in Table 8.26 within Chapter 8 of the PEIR, given that the scheme will result in increase in daily Nox on international designation receptors at this stage.	The assessment of significant was based on published guidance and therefore the descriptors applied to the assessment are appropriate.
EV202	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to update the PEIR to include the results of the Air Quality Report.	Noted. The ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4) now includes this.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV203	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Cumulative Effects Assessment includes potential impacts of the proposed development on the River Nene County Wildlife Site.	In response to this suggestion, the River Nene County Wildlife Site has now been included within the scope of cumulative assessment within ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) .
EV204	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Cumulative Effects Assessment includes all proposed housing and development proposals within the identified zones of influence.	All significant current developments (proposed and in-train) within a 15km radius of the Proposed Development have been identified and considered as set out in Appendix 18A: Long List and Short List of Other Developments (Volume 6.4) . The long list was issued to CCC on 14 February 2022. The Applicant was advised by CCC of one additional development which has been incorporated into the long list.
EV205	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the proposed approach to the Cumulative Effects Assessment.	Noted.
EV206	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Environmental Statement adequately demonstrate there will be no significant effects from major accidents and disasters on the environment, human health and safety, land uses and amenity of surrounding uses within Cambridgeshire.	<p>The Applicant has considered the potential effects arising from major accidents and disasters and the results are presented in ES Chapter 17: Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>The Environment Agency will be responsible for monitoring significant effects on the environment, human health, land uses and amenity of surrounding uses within Cambridgeshire. Under the application for an Environmental Permit the Applicant will submit an Accident Prevention and Management Plan.</p> <p>In combination the following regulatory authorities will monitor adherence to statutory requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Health and Safety Executive; • The Environment Agency; and • Environmental Health.
EV207	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied with scope of the biodiversity survey work.	Noted.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV208	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the surveying of the River Nene County Wildlife Site and out-of-date surveys.	The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development were initially assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has been completed within ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . The assessment includes all ecological features relevant to the Proposed Development that are of sufficient importance for likely effects to be significant, and this includes the River Nene County Wildlife Site. No potentially negative significant effects have been identified.
EV209	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the Biodiversity Assessment for ES to provide a comprehensive, up-to-date assessment of the impact of the final version of the scheme, including the completion of the outstanding surveys listed in Table 11.6 of the PEIR.	A complete baseline and assessment has been provided in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) for relevant biodiversity features, including completion of any outstanding baseline surveys noted within Table 11.6 of the PEIR.
EV210	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the features scoped in for further assessment listed in Table 11.10 of the PEIR.	Noted.
EV211	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to include more detailed assessment of ecological features for the Ecological Impact Assessment, including detailed air quality assessment and completion of the baseline ecological survey work, in order to determine the impact of some of the features.	A complete baseline and assessment has been provided in ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) for relevant biodiversity features, including completion of any outstanding baseline surveys noted within the PEIR. The assessment adheres to CIEEM guidance (2018, updated 2019) on Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) which provided the necessary structure to ensure a proportionate assessment as detailed in Section 11.8 . The ES (Volume 6.2, Chapter 8 Section 8.9.34 – Air Quality) includes a detailed air quality assessment with respect to ecological effects.
EV212	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the evidence for the habitats scoped out in Table 11.11 in Chapter 11 of the PEIR to be supplied to qualify whether the land take is minimal utilizing a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.	The Applicant has had regard to the Environment Act 2021 which in the future will require a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for NSIPs. Accordingly, the Applicant has set out the options it will consider to deliver BNG within Appendix 11M (Volume 6.4) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV213	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the scheme has identified potential for negative effects on ecological features, particularly international and local biodiversity sites, habitats (scrub) and species (bats).	The effect of the Proposed Development on biodiversity features was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed within the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . The assessment in the ES has been informed by a complete baseline, including completion of any outstanding baseline surveys noted within the PEIR and air quality modelling. No potentially negative significant effects on ecological features have been identified following the final assessment in the ES.
EV214	Cambridgeshire County Council	Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that any adverse impacts on ecological features would not be significant.	The effect of the Proposed Development on biodiversity features was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed within the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . The assessment in the ES has been informed by a complete baseline, including completion of any outstanding baseline surveys noted within the PEIR and air quality modelling. No potentially negative significant effects on ecological features have been identified following the completion of baseline surveys and the final assessment in the ES.
EV215	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide further information on the potential negative impacts on ecological features, including completed biodiversity survey work, lighting and landscape strategies and finalised outline CEMP, all of which should be supplied as part of the ES.	The effect of the Proposed Development on biodiversity features was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed within the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . The assessment in the ES has been informed by a complete baseline, including completion of any outstanding baseline surveys noted within the PEIR and air quality modelling. No potentially negative significant effects on ecological features have been identified following the completion of baseline surveys and the final assessment in the ES. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Lighting Strategy (Appendix 3B, Volume 6.4) , and an Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) with accompanying Outline Ecological Mitigation Strategy (Appendix D).
EV216	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the scheme may result in negative impacts on Nene Washes Ramsar, Nene Washes SPA, Ouse Washes Ramsar, Ouse Washes SPA, and Ouse Washes SAC as a result of air pollution.	The effect of the Proposed Development on biodiversity sites was preliminarily assessed in the PEIR and assessment has been completed within the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) and Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) . The assessment in the ES has been informed by completed air quality



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV217	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the level of significance of impacts on internationally important sites cannot be ascertained, as the air quality modelling has not been taken into account.	modelling, and no potentially negative significant effects on internationally important biodiversity sites have been identified.
EV218	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to update the report on the impacts on internationally important ecological sites with the results of the air quality modelling.	
EV219	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to update the biodiversity assessment to include the impact on the River Nene County Wildlife Site from air pollution.	The potential environmental effects of the Proposed Development were initially assessed in the PEIR and the assessment has now been updated, and completed in the ES. The assessment in the ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) includes the River Nene County Wildlife Site, and the assessment was informed by additional baseline information and completed air quality modelling. No potentially negative significant effects have been identified.
EV220	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the cumulative impacts of increased elevations of a number of different pollutants and acid deposition on the River Nene, its important flora and fauna, and the complimentary semi-natural habitats adjacent to the river.	The River Nene County Wildlife Site has now been included within the scope of cumulative assessment within ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) , and the air quality assessment within ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) . However, in line with EA Air Emissions Risk Assessment guidance, any effects have been screened out as insignificant as long and short-term PCs are less than 100% of the AQAL.
EV221	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide a more in-depth study into the impacts of the scheme on the River Nene County Wildlife Site, including an assessment of the current condition of the river and its associated semi-natural habitats to identify any potentially sensitive habitats or species that will be adversely impacted by the air quality changes.	
EV222	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment that sets out how the development meets the 10 principles of Biodiversity Net Gain, including the usage of Defra 3.0 BNG metric calculator to quantify	The Applicant has had regard to the Environment Act 2021 which in the future will require a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for NSIPs. Accordingly, the Applicant has set out the options it will consider to deliver BNG within Appendix 11M (Volume 6.4) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		the BNG. This would help demonstrate how the scheme meets the requirements of the National Policy Statement EN-1, paragraph 180d of the NFFP, and policy 22 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan Proposed Submission 2021.	ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) sets out how the Applicant has had regard to the overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), National Planning Policy Framework, and the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2036 (adopted 28 July 2021).
EV223	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the inclusion of River Nene County Wildlife Site, and the Ouse Washes and Nene Washes SAC/Ramsar sites as part of the modelled receptors.	Noted.
EV224	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the air quality modelling is incomplete, and that Cambridgeshire County Council's Air Quality Review identified some errors.	<p>The air quality modelling presented in Chapter 8 of the PEIR at Stage 2 Statutory Consultation listed the relevant technical guidance, sources and Receptors for air dispersion modelling; these were considered for both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development, taking into account EIA Scoping Opinion responses.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation and in light of comments received, the Applicant has refined the air dispersion modelling and this is presented in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV225	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to include the cumulative impact assessment of the impact of air quality on the international and local wildlife receptors and to give clarity to which international sites will be affected.	<p>ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) details how the Applicant has considered cumulative effects on international, national and local biodiversity sites, including the Nene Washes and Ouse Washes Ramsar/SPA/SACs and the River Nene County Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Impacts on air quality at internationally designated biodiversity sites are considered in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and include Nene Washes Ramsar site, SAC and SPA (7.2km south-west) and Ouse Washes Ramsar site, SAC and SPA (12.5km south-east). The non-statutory River Nene CWS (0.2km west) has also been taken into consideration. In line with EA guidance, effects have been screened out as insignificant and do not require further assessment as the long-term PC is less than 1%, or the short-term PC</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV226	Cambridgeshire County Council	Objection to the conclusion that the impact of elevated air pollution will be negligible to international and local wildlife sites.	<p>is less than 10% of the air quality assessment level (AQAL) for internationally designated sites, and long- and short-term PCs are less than 100% of the AQAL for the non-statutory CWS.</p> <p>Conclusions presented in the PEIR chapters at Stage 2 Statutory Consultation were preliminary and the Applicant has considered representations from consultees in developing the ES chapters for the DCO application.</p> <p>International and local wildlife sites have been included in the scope of air quality assessments; in line with EA guidance, effects have been screened out as insignificant and do not require further assessment as the long-term PC is less than 1%, or the short-term PC is less than 10% of the air quality assessment level (AQAL) for internationally designated sites, and long- and short-term PCs are less than 100% of the AQAL for the non-statutory CWS.</p>
EV227	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to undertake the assessment of the impacts of air quality on international and local wildlife sites within the biodiversity assessment, so the individual sensitivity of each site and its habitat and species are duly considered.	The ES chapters cross-reference each other where there is an overlap of information and a number of different potential effects need to be considered at a single site. The potential for air quality impacts on international and local wildlife sites has been assessed in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) .
EV228	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the final outline CEMP to incorporate the embedded environmental measure to protect biodiversity set out in section 11.7 in Chapter 11 of the PEIR.	Embedded environmental measures to protect biodiversity are refined and set out in Section 11.7 of Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) . These measures have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development and Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and an accompanying Outline Ecological Mitigation Strategy (Appendix D to the Outline CEMP) where relevant. This document sets out relevant legislation and measures to protect species and habitats during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
EV229	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the final CEMP to be accompanied with an Ecological Mitigation Strategy and Invasive Species Management Plan.	Noted.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV230	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment that sets out how the development meets the 10 principles of Biodiversity Net Gain, including the usage of Defra 3.0 BNG metric calculator to quantify the BNG. This would help demonstrate how the scheme meets the requirements of the National Policy Statement EN-1, paragraph 180d of the NFFP, and policy 22 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan Proposed Submission 2021.	<p>The Applicant has had regard to the Environment Act 2021 which in the future will require a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for NSIPs. Accordingly, the Applicant has set out the options it will consider to deliver BNG within Appendix 11M (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) sets out how the Applicant has had regard to the overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), National Planning Policy Framework, and the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2036 (adopted 28 July 2021).</p>
EV231	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request for information on whether there are opportunities to enhance or improve the condition of the local PRoW network as part of the proposed development, rather than being returned to pre-construction condition.	<p>The Proposed Development will not directly cross a PRoW. Halfpenny Lane PRoW terminates at the point it crosses the A47. The works to construct the Grid Connection will be done at night and the informal right of way reinstated.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) which provides the opportunity for local environmental works to be funded in the local area and this could include enhancements to the local PRoW network subject to consultation with the local community.</p>
EV232	Local Community	Suggestion that a detailed tree planting scheme be provided to ensure the replacement of any trees lost during construction and provision of a net gain in local tree assets.	<p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy within the ES (Volume 6.3, Figure 3.14).</p> <p>The Applicant has had regard to the Environment Act 2021 which in the future will require a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for NSIPs. Accordingly, the Applicant has set out the options it will consider to deliver BNG within Appendix 11M (Volume 6.4).</p>
EV233	PIL	Concern that further environmental surveys and equipment installations could result in triggering another incident of equine grass sickness at a nearby farm.	Field survey staff follow good practice biosecurity measures for boots and survey equipment, and any additional measures requested by specific landowners.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV234	<p>Commercial Safety Systems Ltd</p> <p>CPRE</p> <p>English Brothers Ltd</p> <p>Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd</p> <p>Fascinating Fens</p> <p>Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth</p> <p>Local Community</p> <p>MJ Acoustics</p> <p>Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School</p> <p>PIL</p> <p>The Sportsman Pub</p>	<p>Concerns about the visual impact of the proposed development against the existing properties and landscape.</p>	<p>A Residential Visual Amenity Assessment was undertaken as part of the PEIR. Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV235	<p>Wisbech Town Council</p> <p>Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council</p>	<p>Concern about the height of the proposed chimney due to its visual impact on the surrounding environment of the Fenland landscape.</p>	<p>A Residential Visual Amenity Assessment was undertaken as part of the PEIR. Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates).</p> <p>A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application</p> <p>Chimney height is determined through a scientific process of modelling taking into account the requirement to disperse any emissions. The chimney height also needs to be determined as a requirement for the Environmental Permit. Details of the chimney height assessment are provided in Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report (Volume 6.4).</p>
EV236	<p>Local Community</p>	<p>Objection to the proposed development due to the impacts on the local landscape.</p>	<p>An assessment of the construction and operation of the Proposed development upon local landscape character has been undertaken and is reported within Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). It is accompanied by technical appendices and figures (Volumes 6.4 and 6.3 respectively). The assessment concludes that effects upon the landscape will not be significant.</p>
EV237	<p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern about the visual impact of the aviation lights on the chimney and the effects on the receiving environment.</p>	<p>To minimise visual impacts, rather than a flashing light, the Applicant proposes to fit an equivalent infra-red light at the highest practical point of the structure. Details are secured by a suitably worded DCO requirement. The MoD confirmed their agreement to this approach via email on 5 May 2021.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV238	Local Community	Concern that the grid connection to the proposed development will cause additional negative visual impacts across farmland and countryside.	Since Stage 2 statutory consultation options for the Grid Connection have now been refined and the route to Walpole DNO Substation has been eliminated. The Grid Connection will now be underground for its entirety from the EfW CHP Facility to a connection at the Walsoken Substation.
EV239	Local Community	Concern that there is no mitigation measures to reduce the visual effects of the proposed development.	<p>Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which is submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Several changes between the PEIR and ES have been adopted to reduce the visual impact of the proposals: 1) A reduction in the vertical limit of deviation of the buildings of 3m i.e. the buildings will be 3m lower than assessed at PEIR, 2) A cladding colour scheme has been adopted that grades from darker grey at the base to lighter grey at the upper parts of the taller buildings will help reduce the perceived massing, 3) New woodland and tree planting has been proposed on the site to partly mitigate the tree and scrub cover lost to facilitate the new access road from New Bridge Lane.</p>
EV240	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development will adversely impact on the local character and surrounding countryside due to its large, prominent, and industrial appearance.	<p>Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Several changes between the PEIR and ES have been adopted to reduce the visual impact of the proposals: 1) A reduction in the vertical limit of deviation of the buildings of 3m i.e. the buildings will be 3m lower than assessed at PEIR, 2) A cladding colour scheme has been adopted that grades from darker grey at the base to lighter grey at the upper parts of the taller buildings will help reduce the perceived massing, 3) New woodland and tree planting has been proposed on the site to partly mitigate the tree and scrub cover lost to facilitate the new access road from New Bridge Lane.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV241	CPRE	Concern that the proposed development is not sensitive to the environmental, social, artistic, or cultural value associated with the English countryside and the Fens landscape.	<p>Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Details of the design of the EfW CHP Facility are provided in the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5).</p> <p>The built volume of the Proposed Development has been minimised where technically possible, noting there has been a reduction in the vertical limit of deviation between PEIR and ES of 3m i.e. the proposed buildings will be 3m lower than assessed at PEIR. The selection of cladding materials to both minimise visual impact and provide a high quality architectural solution has been developed between PEIR and ES submission. Potential design motifs to reflect the local context are set out in the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5).</p>
EV242	Natural England	Support for the use of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in carrying out the landscape and visual assessment set out in PEIR Chapter 9.	The Applicant welcomes the support.
EV243	Norfolk County Council	Satisfied with the study area chosen.	Noted.
EV244	Norfolk County Council	Satisfied with the justification for the selected viewpoints.	
EV245	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern about the adverse visual impacts of the proposed development on the Fen landscape.	<p>Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>Details of the design of the EfW CHP Facility are provided in the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5).</p> <p>The built volume of the Proposed Development has been minimised where technically possible, noting there has been a reduction in the vertical limit of deviation between PEIR and ES of 3m i.e. the proposed buildings will be 3m lower than assessed at PEIR. The selection of cladding materials to both minimise visual impact and provide a high quality architectural solution has been developed between PEIR and ES submission. Potential design motifs to reflect the local context are set out in the design and Access Statement.</p>
EV246	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the projected facility will be a visual impact affecting both the residents and the community.	An assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on the visual amenity of individual properties closest to the Main Site is covered in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9K) . Assessment of all settlements within the LVIA Study Area that fall within the ZTV is included in the ES (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9J and Appendix 9K).
EV247	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the visual impact on the architectural and cultural heritage of Wisbech from the proposal. The cities heritage is a key component to attracting visitors which may be impacted by the proposal.	Assessment of effects, including on the setting of Wisbech Conservation Area is included in the ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes they will not be significant.
EV248	Fenland District Council	Concern that no indication of the visual appearance of the main facility building, or assessment of the chimney height against existing buildings has been provided to enable the assessment of visual impacts on heritage assets.	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within the ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development on historic assets has been undertaken and the results presented in the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). The assessment has concluded that there are no likely significant effects on the landscape and townscape Receptors.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV249	Fenland District Council	Concern that the ZTV maps are unclear and do not reflect the assertion in the PEIR that visual impacts of the chimney and building on the Wisbech, Bowthorpe and Elm Conservation Areas is negligible.	<p>Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). On the 11/01/2022 the viewpoints and approach were agreed at a meeting between Liz Lake Associates and the Applicant's LVIA consultants. A significant number of viewpoints (30) have now been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>In the absence of a published Townscape Character Assessment by the Local Planning Authority, for the settlement of Wisbech, a Townscape Characterisation Baseline Study (Volume 6.4 Appendix 9D) has been completed. This defines 8 TCAs including Wisbech Town Centre and Bowthorpe conservation areas, and Elm, with key characteristics set out .</p>
EV250	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that the ZTV maps in the PEIR contain figures indicating the level of additional impact of the proposal on heritage assets, given the context of industrial buildings included in the proposals.	<p>The ZTV maps have been reviewed and updated in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p>
EV251	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that photomontages of key viewpoints be provided to clarify the impact of the view towards the proposed development site from affected heritage assets.	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within the ES (Chapter 10, Volume 6.2.) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and the results presented in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>Agreement on the viewpoints for the production of photomontages and photowires was reached with Cambridgeshire County Council's appointed landscape architects, Liz Lake Associates. Details of the agreed locations for</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV252	Fenland District Council	Concern that the proposed development will be large and not sit comfortably when viewed from surrounding landscape angles.	<p>photomontages and photowires are presented in Table 9.1 in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Details of the design of the EfW CHP Facility are provided in the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5).</p> <p>The built volume of the Proposed Development has been minimised where technically possible, noting there has been a reduction in the vertical limit of deviation between PEIR and ES of 3m i.e. the proposed buildings will be 3m lower than assessed at PEIR. The selection of cladding materials to both minimise visual impact and provide a high quality architectural solution has been developed between PEIR and ES submission. Potential design motifs to reflect the local context are set out in the design and Access Statement.</p>
EV253	Fenland District Council	Concern about the adverse visual impacts of the proposed grid connection to the Walpole substation on the open Fen countryside and landscape.	<p>Since Stage 2 statutory consultation options for the Grid Connection have now been refined and the route to Walpole DNO Substation has been eliminated. The Grid Connection will now be underground for its entirety from the EfW CHP Facility to a connection at the Walsoken DNO Substation.</p>
EV254	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that it is not clear how the assessment of likely significant landscape and visual effects has been undertaken as embedded environmental measures have yet to be determined.	<p>Since Stage 2 consultation and the publication of the PEIR the design of the development has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). A significant number of viewpoints (30) have been provided within the ES (see LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>Details of the design of the EfW CHP Facility are provided in the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV255	Wisbech Town Council	No information is provided on the impact on the landscape character or views of depositing the excavated materials from the construction of the waste bunker 15m below ground level on the site or the impact of transporting it off-site.	The opportunities for views into the construction site from surrounding public locations will be limited by hoarding, perimeter bunding and other low-level buildings and consequently views towards and into the site during excavation and construction from publicly accessible locations would be screened.
EV256	Wisbech Town Council	Concern that the height of the development will be taller than existing buildings and will change the character of Wisbech to an industrial setting rather than a quaint Georgian Market Town.	<p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and the results presented in the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>In the absence of a published Townscape Character Assessment by the Local Planning Authority, for the settlement of Wisbech, a Townscape Characterisation Baseline Study (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9D) has been completed. This defines 8 TCAs including Wisbech Town Centre and Bowthorpe conservation areas, and Elm, with key characteristics set out. Visibility from the historic core of Wisbech is typically limited by intervening buildings. Closer to the site large scale industrial buildings already exist in close proximity to the Site, notably the cold store.</p>
EV257	Cambridgeshire County Council	Satisfied that the LVIA follows most of the principles set out within GLVIA3.	Noted. The County Council's landscape consultants, Liz Lake Associates, confirmed by memo dated 11/01/2022 that the approach set out in the PEIR is acceptable and complies with GLVIA3.
EV258	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to incorporate new LI Guidance on landscape value in the LVIA.	This has been added to the list of Technical Guidance although it should be noted that the LCA and TCA sensitivity assessment already align with the principles set out within Guidance TGN 02/21.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV259	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that some effects on landscape, townscape and visual may have been underrepresented, such as impacts on landscape or townscape character.	<p>In the absence of a published Townscape Character Assessment by the Local Planning Authority, for the settlement of Wisbech, a Townscape Characterisation Baseline Study (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9D) has been completed. This defines 8 TCAs. The LCA characteristics summaries are presented in Appendix 9C: NCA & LCT/LCA Key Characteristics Summaries (Volume 6.4) and TCA and LCA character assessment tables are presented in Appendices 9G and 9H (Volume 6.4), respectively. Both TCA and LCA assessments align with the principles set out within the Guidance TGN 02/21.</p> <p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and the results presented in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV260	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to review the effect on landscape and townscape character and visual receptors as the project progresses and to re-evaluate following design freeze.	<p>Noted. In the absence of a published Townscape Character Assessment by the Local Planning Authority, for the settlement of Wisbech, a Townscape Characterisation Baseline Study (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9D) has been completed. This defines 8 TCAs. The LCA characteristics summaries are presented in (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9C) and TCA and LCA character assessment tables are presented at (Volume 6.4, Appendices 9G, and 9H). Both TCA and LCA assessments align with the principles set out within the Guidance TGN 02/21.</p>
EV261	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to undertake cumulative assessment.	<p>A cumulative assessment has been included in ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV262	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that there is no landscape mitigation proposed.	<p>Noted. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Volume 7.7) and this is secured via a DCO requirement. It sets out the management principles to maintain the landscaping which will</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV263	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about lack of assessment of the plume, or inclusion within Zone of Theoretical Visibility.	be planted in accordance with Figure 3.14: Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy (Volume 6.3) . This figure illustrates the locations of the proposed native planting that will be provided within the operational EfW CHP Facility Site. This landscape planting will include native shrub mix; native hedgerow with trees; native wet woodland, native species rich grassland, brown roof, and green walls. The full details of the final scheme will be based on the Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy and are secured via DCO requirement.
EV264	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that no assessment of the Thomas Clarkson Academy has been undertaken, despite previous request.	Noted. ZTV modelling of the plume using nodes and assessment work have been undertaken as part of the ES in Appendices 9G to 9K (Volume 6.4) .
EV265	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that some effects on landscape, townscape and visual may have been underrepresented, such as impacts on landscape or townscape character.	<p>In the absence of a published Townscape Character Assessment by the Local Planning Authority, for the settlement of Wisbech, a Townscape Characterisation Baseline Study (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9D) has been completed. This defines 8 TCAs. The LCA characteristics summaries are presented in Appendix 9C: NCA & LCT/LCA Key Characteristics Summaries (Volume 6.4) and TCA and LCA character assessment tables are presented in Appendices 9G and 9H (Volume 6.4), respectively. Both TCA and LCA assessments align with the principles set out within the Guidance TGN 02/21.</p> <p>The effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment have been assessed and are set out within the ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) which concludes that during construction and</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>operation, any effects from the Proposed Development, on the historic environment, would be not significant.</p> <p>An assessment of the visual impact of the Proposed Development has been undertaken and the results presented in the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV266	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Zone of Theoretical Visibility Study has been undertaken using individual nodes as opposed to a full 3D block model as requested, therefore the study fails to accurately represent the scale, depth and width of the structures.	<p>Since Stage 2 Consultation and the publication of the PEIR the methodology has been updated in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council (Liz Lake Associates). On the 11/01/2022 the viewpoints and approach were agreed at a meeting between Liz Lake Associates who are the County Council's landscape consultants and the Applicant's LVIA consultants. A significant number of viewpoints (30) have now been provided within the ES (LVIA Figures in Volume 6.3) which are submitted with the DCO application. In agreement with Liz Lake Associates the Applicant undertook to survey the heights of key buildings to ensure that they would be accurately represented in the visualisations.</p> <p>Details of the agreed locations for photomontages and photowires are presented in Table 9.1 in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2).</p>
EV267	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to include a separate Zone of Theoretical Visibility for the plume within the application, as it is missing within the PEIR.	Noted. ZTV modelling of the plume using nodes and assessment work have been undertaken as part of the ES in Appendices 9G to 9K (Volume 6.4) .
EV268	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the LVIA does not include an assessment of the plume.	ZTV modelling of the plume using nodes and assessment work have been undertaken as part of the ES in Appendices 9G to 9K (Volume 6.4) .
EV269	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that a composite Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) has not been produced and a comparison between the plume ZTV and the ZTV for the stack alone has not been included within the PEIR.	Separate and composite ZTVs have been developed to reflect consultee feedback and these are included in the DCO application in ES Figure 3.6 and Table 3.1: Limits of Deviation (Volume 6.3) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV270	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that a cumulative LVIA has not been included within the PEIR.	Based on consultee feedback at Stage 2 Statutory Consultation, 2 composite ZTVs have been considered in the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) . These are presented in Figures 9.4i and 9.4ii (Volume 6.3) . These show that the baseline conditions would ensure there would be only minor variations in relative visibility of the top of the main building and the chimney.
EV271	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to use a blimp to demonstrate the height of the proposals.	Using blimps are an unreliable technique as the blimp would be at a height where it could be significantly influenced by wind and as such is unlikely to be an accurate representation of height. The use of verified photomontage and photo wire visualisations prepared in accordance with best practice guidance is considered appropriate.
EV272	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that it is unclear whether a baseline townscape character assessment or a review of selected viewpoints has been undertaken, as there is no assessment of the effects to receptors within the Thomas Clarkson Academy within the LVIA.	In the absence of a published Townscape Character Assessment by the Local Planning Authority, for the settlement of Wisbech, a Townscape Characterisation Baseline Study (Volume 6.4, Appendix 9D) has been completed. Notwithstanding the agreement of PINS to scope out the Thomas Clarkson Academy it was added to the list of viewpoints presented in Appendix 9J: Visual Assessment Tables (Volume 6.4) .
EV273	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that a better viewpoint would be from the Nene Way Public Right of Way, rather than the Nene Washes Nature Reserve/ Nene Valley Way car park at Eldernell.	Agreement on the viewpoints for the production of photomontages and photowires was reached with Cambridgeshire County Council's appointed landscape architects, Liz Lake Associates. Details of the agreed locations for photomontages and photowires are presented in Table 9.1 in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) .
EV274	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the Landscape Strategy to be designed using the ecological mitigation hierarchy and be designed to maximise biodiversity net gain and contribute to strategic and local biodiversity objectives.	The Applicant has prepared an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Volume 7.7) , and this is included in the application documentation. Figure 3.14: Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy (Volume 6.3) illustrates the locations of the proposed native planting that will be provided within the operational EfW CHP Facility Site. This landscape planting will



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
EV275	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for further discussions with the local authority on the development of the landscape strategy prior to submission of the DCO application.	<p>include native shrub mix; native hedgerow with trees; native wet woodland, native species rich grassland, brown roof, and green walls. The full details of the final scheme will be based on the Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy (Volume 6.3) secured via DCO requirement.</p> <p>The Applicant has had regard to the Environment Act 2021 which in the future will require a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% for NSIPs. Accordingly, the Applicant has set out the options it will consider to deliver BNG within Appendix 11M (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>ES Chapter 11: Biodiversity (Volume 6.2) sets out how the Applicant has had regard to the overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2036 (adopted 28 July 2021).</p>



Applicant's response to issues raised regarding grid connection

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 7.1 Issues raised regarding grid connection** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 7.7 Issues raised regarding grid connection

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
GC01	Local Community	Why will it only be industrial users who benefit from any electricity produced at the proposed development?	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) states the Applicant's intention to provide a private wire to local businesses within the industrial estate. It is anticipated that electricity will be generated at 11kV or 15kV and supplied to those local businesses with a suitably large demand. To supply domestic users, who have a comparatively low demand, further cables and transformers to reduce the voltage to 400V are required, before single phase 230V supplies can be made. The cost of this additional equipment plus installation of the necessary additional underground cables would make private wire electricity supply to domestic customers uneconomic for both the Applicant and any potential domestic customer.</p> <p>Whilst the electricity generated by the EfW CHP Facility will not be connected directly into other users the electricity generated by the Proposed Development will benefit others indirectly as surplus electricity not used by the EfW CHP Facility or private wire customers will be fed into the national grid providing predictable and controllable low carbon electricity contributing to the security of UK supplies.</p>
GC02	Local Community	Concern about additional pylons being required to enable the grid connection to be implemented.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the development for which consent is sought. It confirms that the Applicant proposes a wholly underground cable connection such that no pylons will be required.</p>
GC03	Local Community	Concern that the location of the proposed development is not in the proximity of the	<p>ES Chapter 5: Legislation and Policy (Volume 6.2) confirms that the EfW CHP Facility Site is in a waste management area, whilst ES Chapter 3:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		options for a grid connection and should be reconsidered.	Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the EfW CHP Facility Site location as being close to potential customers of heat and power. In the opinion of the Applicant the site chosen represents an appropriate balance between these locational advantages and the availability of a point of connection which is approximately 3.8km away.
GC04	Local Community	Concern that the proposed approach to a grid connection will cause additional disruption for the local community on main roads which are already congested.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development and ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) describe the Proposed Development and the means by which the Grid Connection will be constructed relative to the potential to affect main roads. The Applicant has consulted with National Highways to agree an approach to construction which it believes will minimise disruption to road users as set out in in the Outline CTMP (Appendix 6A) (Volume 7.12) .
GC05	Local Community	Request for confirmation of how much electricity will be sent to the national grid after all operation power needs are met from the proposed development.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that the EfW CHP Facility will be able to export up to 55MW to the national grid. However, some of this electricity may be exported via private wire to industrial customers instead.
GC06	Local Community	The connection to the 132 kV at Walsoken looks to be the best option for local residents.	Noted. This is the point of connection selected by the Applicant as described in ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) .
GC07	Local Community	Concern that the current location of the proposed development is not effective for implementing a grid connection without further disruption to the community of Wisbech.	The approach taken to identifying and selecting the Grid Connection is set out within ES Chapter 2: Alternatives, Appendix 2A Grid Connection Options (Volume 6.4) . This document explains the evolution of Grid Connection design and the way in which the Applicant has sought to minimise significant adverse impacts upon the local community. The technical chapters of the ES Chapters 6 to 17 (Volume 6.2) provide an assessment of the construction and operation effects arising from the Grid Connection and are accompanied by construction management plans the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and CTMP (Appendix 6A) (Volume 6.4) . These plans seek to mitigate the effects of the Grid Connection.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
GC08	PIL	The specific effects of the grid connection on a property on Broadend Road are significant and unacceptable.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2), describes the development for which consent is sought. It confirms that the Applicant proposes a wholly underground cable connection within New Bridge Lane, the A47 verge and Broadend Road to the Walsoken DNO Substation. As a result no pylons will be required in proximity to the property on Broadend Road.</p>
GC09	PIL	Concern that if the CHP pipeline is routed along the disused railway line behind Crown Packaging Manufacturing Ltd that measures will need to be applied to the fencing and surface water drains in the event of a pipe failure and discharge alongside the removal of Japanese Knotweed which is present.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the proposed CHP Connection and how it will operate. Should the CHP Connection fail it would emit steam such that it is unlikely to affect nearby boundary fencing. The return pipe from customers may carry water back to the EfW CHP Facility, the amount dependent upon the steam customers. Under general operational conditions the condensate flow would be minimal although there would be higher levels in winter and lower levels in the summer. The flow, temperature and pressure would be monitored and any sudden drop investigated and the system potentially shut down. The CHP Connection will also be sited such that it does not impinge upon the boundary of properties which adjoin the disused March to Wisbech Railway. The construction and operation of the CHP Connection should not therefore affect adjoining fencing. The Applicant is aware of the Japanese Knotweed and proposes its removal following appropriate procedures which are set out in the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12).</p>
GC10	PIL	A planning application is being prepared for a high density residential development scheme on land between Halfpenny lane and Elm Low Road. More information is required to ensure that neither the proposed waste development or the proposed housing development are not affected or in detriment.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection. The Applicant proposes to place the Grid Connection within the verge of the A47 thereby avoiding the land in question.</p>
GC11	PIL	Request for more information regarding a cable route proposed between halfpenny lane and elm low road, with HGV access point references UG3 and UG4a and a proposed	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection. The Applicant proposes to place the Grid Connection within the verge of the A47 thereby avoiding the land on which the proposed high density residential development would be located.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		high density residential development application in the vicinity.	
GC12	National Grid	If the Walpole Grid Connection Corridor and substation is selected, protective provisions and wayleaves will need to be secured.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection. The Applicant has chosen the Walsoken option for the Grid Connection and as such the need for protective provisions and wayleaves in the Walpole grid connection corridor are no longer required.
GC13	Local Community	Concern about the negative effects on those people with animals on the land where the electricity cables will be laid if this is compulsory purchased.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection. At PEIR stage sections of the Grid Connection included crossing agricultural land. However, the Grid Connection which forms part of the Proposed Development will be underground and within the verge of the A47 or adopted highways therefore avoiding private fields where animals could be present.
GC14	Local Community	Concern about the close proximity of the 132Kv grid connection and pole to local business and the health and safety impact of the resulting electromagnetic field on workers.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection. The Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground such that there will be no poles. ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) concludes that with the Grid Connection underground and in the highway and highway verge will reduce significantly any potential for electromagnetic effects upon workers.
GC15	Local Community	Concern that the proposed approach to securing a grid connection will create a significant visual impact as it is above ground.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the Grid Connection. The Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground to connect to the existing substation as an extension, as such that there will be no poles along the route of the Grid Connection between the EfW CHP Facility Site and the Walsoken Substation and hence no visual impact when in operation. This is confirmed in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) .
GC16	Local Community	Concern that the Walpole connection option would require the construction of a new	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		overhead line, whereas the Walsoken connection has an existing overhead line which would not impact on land and property if it was used.	chosen Walsoken as the point of connection. The Grid Connection to Walsoken will consist of new infrastructure rather than an existing overhead line however it will be underground and in highway land.
GC17	Local Community	Concern that the proposed approach to securing a grid connection causes significant adverse impact on the local community.	The approach taken to identifying and selecting the Grid Connection is set out within Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) , Appendix 2A Grid Connection Options (Volume 6.4) . This document explains the evolution of design and the way in which the Applicant has sought to minimise significant adverse impacts upon the local community. The technical chapters of the ES Chapters 6 to 17 (Volume 6.2) provide an assessment of the construction and operation effects arising from the Grid Connection and are accompanied by construction management plans the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) and Outline CTMP (Appendix 6A Volume 6.4) . These plans seek to mitigate the effects of the Grid Connection.
GC18	Local Community	Suggestion that the proposed connection could run a shorter distance the whole way on the North/West of the A47.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47.
GC19	Local Community	Request for information as to why the proposed connection is not undergrounded through to the substation.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground.
GC20	Local Community	What impact has been assessed for the additional Electromagnetic pollution that will be generated by the grid connection?	ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) considers the potential for effects arising from electromagnetic fields. It notes that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and within the highway and highway verge. It is concluded that this will reduce significantly any potential for electromagnetic effects.
GC21	Local Community	None of the grid connections are acceptable due to the need for compulsory purchase of land.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			the A47. In highway land there will be no requirement for compulsory acquisition.
GC22	Local Community	All connections should be undergrounded.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47.
GC23	Local Community	Concern that the grid connection will cause further disruption and traffic delays.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47. The Applicant has consulted with National Highways to agree an approach to construction which it believes will minimise disruption to road users. The approach to construction is described in ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development and in ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport including Appendix 6A the CTMP (Volume 6.4).
GC24	Local Community	The proposed connections do not consider the impact on the local villages.	The technical chapters of the ES Chapters 6 to 17 (Volume 6.2) provide an assessment of the construction and operation effects arising from the Grid Connection and are accompanied by construction management plans the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12). These plans seek to mitigate the effects of the Grid Connection upon local communities.
GC25	Local Community	Suggestion to build the EfW plant close to the A17 and the power plant to reduce the connection requirement.	ES Chapter 5: Legislation and Policy (Volume 6.2) confirms that the EfW CHP Facility Site is in a waste management area, whilst ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the EfW CHP Facility Site location as being close to potential customers of heat and power. In the opinion of the Applicant the site chosen represents an appropriate balance between these locational advantages and the availability of a point of connection which is approximately 3.8km away. ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) provides details of the alternatives considered in light of location and point of connection.
GC26	Local Community	There are two proposed options for connection, a 132kV line at the Walpole and	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		400kV line to the east of Walsoken, it is unclear whether these are part of the Development Consent Order (DCO).	chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken. It is this option which is part of the DCO.
GC27	Local Community	Concern that if the Walpole connection option is progressed there is a risk that it will impact on the operation of an existing solar farm through the provision of a new OHL infrastructure.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken. It is this option which is part of the DCO and not the connection to the Walpole Substation.
GC28	Local Community	Request for information regarding any operational restrictions surrounding the OHL, either during construction or during the lifecycle of the project.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken. Being located underground within highway land there will be no OHL.
GC29	Local Community	Concern that the Walsoken substation is not suitable for the connection and the Walpole connection will be required above ground.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken. The Applicant has been provided with a connection offer by UKPN and has discussed and agreed the technical requirements. UKPN has confirmed that the substation is suitable.
GC30	Local Community	Overhead power lines are now actively being removed and replaced with underground cables to reduce the visual impact, with the flat landscape around the incinerator overhead powerlines will be visible for miles. New installations should all be underground cables.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken.
GC31	Local Community	The connection to Walsoken is preferred.	
GC32	Local Community	Concern about the impact of grid connection installation and construction on property	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		structures, health and wellbeing, and quality of life.	chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken. Undergrounding and the use of the highway verge will significantly reduce any potential for effects upon property, structures, health and wellbeing. This is confirmed by the environmental assessments presented within ES Chapters 6 Traffic and transport, 7 Noise and Vibration, 15 Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use and 16 Health (Volume 6.2).
GC33	National Grid	Suggestion that any buildings in the proposed development must not be built directly beneath the overhead line and be no closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor, as set out in the EN 43-8 Technical Specification Issue 3 (2004).	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken.
GC34	National Grid	Suggestion that safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained, even if there are changes to ground levels beneath or close to existing overhead lines.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken. Safety clearances with existing overhead lines will be maintained.
GC35	National Grid	Suggestion that plant, machinery, equipment, buildings and scaffolding should not come within 5.3 metres of any high voltage conductors when they are under their worse conditions of maximum sag and swing.	
GC36	National Grid	Suggestion that no structure be built over NGET high voltage underground cables or within the easement strip.	Subsequent to Statutory Consultation, in an email dated 6 September 2021, National Grid confirmed that based upon the Order limit boundary provided to it at that time (the Order limits including the Grid Connection to Walsoken Substation) it would have no assets affected by the Proposed Development, including the Grid Connection.
GC37	National Grid	Suggestion that ground levels above NGET high voltage underground cables remain unaltered to avoid impacting on the reliability, efficiency and safety of the electricity network.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
GC38	National Grid	Suggestion that MVV review the ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft, to be agreed with National Grid, required to protect the National Grid gas pipeline.	
GC39	National Grid	Suggestion that no protective measures, such as concrete slab protection, be installed over the National Grid gas pipeline without permission from National Grid.	
GC40	National Grid	Suggestion that the depth and position of National Grid's pipelines must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under supervision of a NG representative.	
GC41	National Grid	Suggestion that the ground cover above National Grid's pipelines not be increased or reduced.	
GC42	Norfolk County Council Norfolk County Council Highways	Suggestion to provide evidence to Norfolk County Council that the cable and associated apparatus for the grid connection options will be adopted and maintained by a Statutory Undertaker, otherwise Norfolk County Council will object to the proposals within the highway.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that the Applicant proposes to maintain and operate the Grid Connection. This has been agreed with UKPN. The Applicant has undertaken further discussions with the local highway authority subsequent to the close of consultation and has included within the draft DCO (Volume 3.1) the relevant provisions to enable it to place with connection within the highway.
GC43	Wisbech Town Council	Complaint that the horizontal directional drilling for the grid connection is not referred to in the NTS.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that the final design of the Grid Connection will not require HDD in its construction. It should be noted that there remains an option to HDD across the A47 to construction the potable Water Connection however.
GC44	Borough Council of King's Lynn	Request for clarification on why the grid connection cables cannot be underground.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	and West Norfolk		chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken.
GC45	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that the consultation is premature due to the absence on a final decision on the grid connection.	The Applicant set out to undertake engagement at an early stage in the project development process, to provide consultees with an opportunity to influence the proposals whilst options were still being considered. Having taken account of feedback received at Statutory Consultation ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken.
GC46	Norfolk County Council	Concern that the location of the poles of the overhead cables, for the preferred route, are not included in Chapter 3 of the PEIR and it is not clear whether new poles would be required or if existing ones could be used.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken as such poles are not required.
GC47	Local Community	Request for clarification on whether the grid connection options are part of the DCO.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken. The Applicant has chosen to only include for the option to connect to Walsoken.
GC48	PIL	Further information on acceptable easement widths are required for the proposed cable route and a residential house build in proximity to the A47.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection. The Applicant proposes to place the Grid Connection within the verge of the A47, requiring a permanent easement of approximately 0.6m within the highway/highway verge. There is no requirement for easements for the Grid Connection within private land along the A47.
GC49	PIL	Request for more information regarding proposed cable route in proximity to the A47 and its location.	ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection. The Applicant proposes to place the Grid Connection within the verge of the A47.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
GC50	Cambridgeshire County Council	Recognition that at the time of Statutory Consultation the final decision on the Common Grid Connection Route had not been concluded and that further highway, ecological, air quality and noise monitoring surveys were outstanding. Request for the opportunity to consider this additional survey information and its impact in respect of the proposed development once clarity has been provided.	The Applicant has provided additional survey information where required within the relevant chapters of the ES as submitted with the Application. Following acceptance of the application, this information will be made available for comment during Examination.



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding health and wellbeing

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 8.1 Issues raised regarding health and wellbeing** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 8.8 Issues raised regarding health and wellbeing

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW01	Cambridge Friends of the Earth Local Community PIL	Concern that the proposed development does not consider the WHO guidance in relation to the siting of EfW technology within a 30 mile radius of a food growing area or a centre of population due to pollution levels.	<p>It is the Applicant's understanding that the "WHO guidance" referred to relates to a report titled <i>Findings on an Assessment of Small-scale Incinerators for Health-care Waste, S Batterman (2004)</i>. This report provides an analysis of low-cost small-scale incinerators used to dispose of healthcare waste in developing countries. Research papers can be unintentionally misinterpreted and/or misapplied in relation to energy from waste proposals and the Applicant believes this might be the case here.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an EP from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that: "...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/municipal-waste-incinerators-emissions-impact-on-health). PHE's risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW02	Local Community PIL	Concern about the proximity of the proposed development to local schools and residential areas and the effect on health and wellbeing.	<p><i>health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small..."</i></p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
HW03	Local Community	Concern that there is insufficient information on historic health data for Energy from Waste proposals to make informed choices.	<p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that:</p> <p><i>“...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed published research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/municipal-waste-incinerators-emissions-impact-on-health). PHE’s risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small...”</i></p>
HW04	Cambridge Friends of the Earth South Wooton Parish Council Local Community	Concerns about health impacts due to adverse effects of air quality with an increase in respiratory disease.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW05	Local Community	Concern about the increase in HGV movements and the heightened risk of risk to pedestrians and other road users.	<p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including pedestrian and road safety, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) These documents conclude that the Proposed Development can be accessed satisfactorily and without undue significant negative effects upon pedestrians taking into account the provision of new pedestrian crossings on New Bridge Lane.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW06	<p>Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council</p> <p>Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth</p> <p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern about the effects on mental health and wellbeing and human health due to the construction and operation of the proposed development.</p>	<p>The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • Construction Travel Management Plan (CTMP); • Operational Travel Plan; and • Operational Travel Management Plan (OTRP). <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents from traffic, such as, health and wellbeing, have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing. With mitigation in place, to be secured by a DCO requirement and/or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme; • The Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development; • Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EfW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards; • Various operational management plans to control, e.g., noise, dust, odour and fire prevention; and • A CTMP and operational route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages.
HW07	<p>Cambridge Friends of the Earth</p> <p>South Wooton Parish Council</p>	<p>Concern about the increase in HGV movements and the effects on human health from increased emissions.</p>	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents from traffic, such as, health and wellbeing, have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
	Local Community		<p>With mitigation in place, to be secured by a DCO requirement and/or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme; • The Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development; • Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EfW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards; • Various operational management plans to control, e.g., noise, dust, odour, and fire prevention; and • A CTMP and operational route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages.
HW08	Local Community	Concern about the effect on local people's mental health and wellbeing from increased light pollution during operational periods.	An Operational Lighting Scheme has been submitted with the DCO application (Volume 6.4, Appendix 3A). The external lighting for the development will be designed to ensure a safe working environment in all relevant areas of the EfW CHP Facility during night-time whilst avoiding unnecessary light pollution and minimising the visual impact on nearby and distant receptors. The lighting will be designed and controlled so that sky glow and light pollution are avoided.
HW09	Local Community	Concern about health and wellbeing impacts on local residents and businesses due to risk of a major accident at the proposed development during operation.	A qualitative risk assessment was undertaken at the Scoping stage and determined there was not a significant risk of Major Accidents due to the Applicants processes and the existing regulatory requirements. This was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate. and not challenged by any consultees. ES Chapter 17: Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2) provides details of how those processes would work and be secured. Significant effects on health and well-being associated with Major Accidents were screened out based on the conclusions reached at the Scoping stage. However, the environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including risk of major accidents, has been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 17: Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2) . The assessment concludes there are no significant impacts. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>within the design of the Proposed Development. and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of an accredited Integrated Management System (IMS); • Proposed Development to be designed to meet industry standards, including building regulations; • A Hazard and Operability (HAZOP) study; and • A Fire Prevention Plan; <p>A requirement of the Environmental Permit, a detailed procedure for start-up, planned shutdowns and emergency shutdowns will be developed prior to the commissioning of the EfW CHP Facility.</p>
HW10	Local Community	Concern about the creation of the electricity generator and associated distribution network increasing the risks associated with electromagnetic radiation.	<p>Since Stage 2 Statutory Consultation, the scheme design has developed such that the Grid Connection will now comprise entirely of an underground cable from the EfW CHP Facility to the Walsoken sub-station. The generation of electric fields is eliminated with the placement of cables underground.</p> <p>As noted in national guidance NPS EN-5, EMF intensity is less of an issue with voltages of 132kV or lower and decreases with distance. The Grid Connection is proposed at 132kV. This guidance also states that the balance of scientific evidence, over several decades of research has not proven a causal link between EMF and cancer or any other disease. Further detail is presented in the ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2).</p>
HW11	Local Community	Concern about an increase in allergic reactions in the local community as a consequence of the proposed development.	<p>The potential effects of emissions to air are considered in the ES Chapter 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2). A Human Health Risk Assessment has also been undertaken (Volume 6.4, Appendix 8B Annex F). The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW12	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Local Community	Concerns about the effects of emissions being released in to the atmosphere in an area where food production for human consumption takes place.	<p>The potential effects of emissions to air on the natural environment are considered in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2). A Human Health Risk Assessment has also been undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of metals in the food chain. The assessment addresses potential impacts of particulates and nitrogen deposition on the local area, including farmland (Chapter 8, Volume 6.2, Appendix 8B Annex F). The assessment concluded that impacts are not significant.</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits, and which is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
HW13	CPRE South Wooton Parish Council Local Community	Concern about Health Hazards arising from Emissions of Fine Particulates (PM2.5) 10).	<p>Detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken, including traffic modelling, demonstrating acceptable levels of impacts. The assessment was undertaken considering air quality objectives set for the protection of human health. The assessment concluded that impacts are not significant.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including particulates. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation, with regards to particulate pollution. In addition, it should be noted that the EfW CHP Facility is unlikely to emit ultrafine particles considering the fabric filter system, and the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) used to define emissions or particles was based on total particulate matter.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. Continuous emissions monitoring includes particulate matter (total dust including PM2.5).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW14	CPRE South Wootton Parish Council Local Community	Concern about Health Hazards arising from Emissions of Toxic Metals and Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons.	<p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW15	Local Community	Objection to the proposed development due to the effects on health and wellbeing.	<p>and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents from traffic, such as, health and wellbeing, have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing. With mitigation in place, to be secured by a DCO requirement and/or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme; • The Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW16	Local Community	Concern about the effects of the proposed development on the wellbeing of local residents and their quality of life due to increased noise at night.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EfW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards; • Various operational management plans to control, e.g., noise, dust, odour and fire prevention; and • A CTMP and operational route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. <p>Potential noise effects due to the construction and operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed in accordance with the relevant British Standards. The results are set out in detail in the ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2). Where any potentially significant effects are identified, appropriate control measures will be implemented. As proposed in the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) proposed working hours during construction will be 07.00 – 19.00 Monday - Friday, 08.00 – 16.00 Saturday, with no working on Sundays or Public Holidays. The assessment concluded that the impacts are not significant.</p>
HW17	Local Community	Potential impacts to human health from all potential contaminants should be assessed within construction, operational and decommissioning stages of the proposed development.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents from traffic, such as, health and wellbeing, have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing. With mitigation in place, to be secured by a DCO requirement and/or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme; • The Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development; • Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EfW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW18	Local Community	Concern about the effects of the proposed development on the wellbeing of local residents and their quality of life due to increased noise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various operational management plans to control, e.g., noise, dust, odour and fire prevention; and • A CTMP and operational route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. <p>Potential noise effects due to the construction and operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed in accordance with the relevant British Standards. The results are set out in detail in the ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2). Where any potentially significant effects are identified, appropriate control measures will be implemented. As proposed in the Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) proposed working hours during construction will be 07.00 – 19.00 Monday - Friday, 08.00 – 16.00 Saturday, with no working on Sundays or Public Holidays. The assessment concluded that the impacts are not significant.</p>
HW19	Local Community	Concern that statistics suggest living near or being exposed to toxins generated by Incinerators increase the risk of many health conditions to adults, children and unborn babies including cancers and respiratory issues.	<p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that:</p> <p><i>“...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed published research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/municipal-waste-incinerators-emissions-impact-on-health). PHE’s risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small...”</i></p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
HW20	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development will further burden the NHS with additional health issues particularly related to ingesting poisonous particulates.	<p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that: “...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed published research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/municipal-waste-incinerators-emissions-impact-on-health). PHE’s risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small...”</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including particulates. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation, with regards to particulate pollution. In addition, it should be noted that the EfW CHP Facility is unlikely to emit ultrafine particles considering the fabric filter system, and the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) used to define emissions or particles was based on total particulate matter.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The Health Chapter of the ES relies on the findings in relation to air quality, including the HHRA and these are summarised in the health chapter. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include air emission limits.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. Continuous emissions monitoring includes particulate matter (total dust including PM_{2.5}).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW21	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development will generate micro pollutants which are potentially carcinogenic.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including particulates. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation, with regards to particulate pollution. In addition, it should be noted that the EfW CHP Facility is unlikely to emit ultrafine particles considering the fabric filter system, and the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) used to define emissions or particles was based on total particulate matter.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. Continuous emissions monitoring includes particulate matter (total dust including PM_{2.5}).</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW22	Local Community	What compensation will be provided to the community due the effects to physical and mental health?	<p>The Health Chapter of the ES relies on the findings in relation to air quality, including the HHRA and these are summarised in the health chapter.</p> <p>The Health Chapter of the ES undertakes an assessment of the potential for the Proposed Development to significantly affect human health. It follows a methodology developed in consultation with the host authorities and former Public Health England and concludes that effects will not be such that mitigation (for example a fund) is required. Notwithstanding the conclusions the Applicant is proposing a local community fund as part of the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14).</p>
HW23	Local Community	Concern about the level of odour that will be released from the proposed development and the effect on the community and their wellbeing.	<p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) which details all sources of odour, control measures, monitoring, and reporting. Odour awareness training will be undertaken as part of general site operational training, and daily checks for odour levels will carried out.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits, including for odour. Compliance with the EP will be regulated and monitored by the Environment Agency.</p>
HW24	Local Community	Concern that the proposed development poses a fire risk to neighbouring residents, businesses, and local hospital.	<p>Both Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service and Cambridgeshire FRS have been consulted multiple times as the development of the Project has progressed.</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will require a Fire Prevention Plan to be submitted to the Environment Agency for approval prior to the granting of an Environmental Permit to operate. An Outline Fire Prevention Plan has been prepared (Volume 7.10).</p> <p>The Applicant will maintain an up to date fire risk assessment and its Integrated Management System will cover safe systems of work and detailed emergency response procedures.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW25	Local Community	Concern that employment associated with the proposed development will result in additional pressure on local hospitals and healthcare facilities.	<p>Significant effects on local hospitals and health facilities are not anticipated during the construction or operational phases of the Proposed Development. ES Chapter 16 Health sets out the reasons for this conclusion.</p>
HW26	CPRE	Concern about the health impacts of particulate emissions from the proposed development on local schools and crop growing areas.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including particulates. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health, including PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation, with regards to particulate pollution. In addition, it should be noted that the EfW CHP Facility is unlikely to emit ultrafine particles considering the fabric filter system, and the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) used to define emissions or particles was based on total particulate matter.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. Continuous emissions monitoring includes particulate matter (total dust including PM_{2.5}).</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW27	CPRE	<p>Concern that the emissions of toxic metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from the proposed development will present a long term health hazard to local residents, including children at nearby schools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. <p>Detailed dispersion modelling has been undertaken, including traffic modelling, demonstrating acceptable levels of impacts. The assessment was undertaken considering air quality objectives set for the protection of human health. The assessment concluded that impacts are not significant. An HHRA has been undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of metals in the food chain. The assessment concluded that impacts are not significant.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
HW28	CPRE	Suggestion that the proposed development should be registered and managed as a COMAH site due to the handling of high volumes of waste of a flammable nature, and the close proximity to schools and residential areas.	<p>The Proposed Development is not a COMAH site. It will not handle significant (if any) volumes of flammable material. The EfW CHP facility is designed, and will accept, only residual household and commercial and industrial waste (which is similar in nature and composition to residual household waste).</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will require a Fire Prevention Plan to be submitted to the Environment Agency for approval prior to the granting of an Environmental Permit to operate. An Outline Fire Prevention Plan has been prepared (Volume 7.10).</p> <p>The Applicant will maintain an up to date fire risk assessment and its Integrated Management System will cover safe systems of work and detailed emergency response procedures.</p>
HW29	Public England	Health	<p>Satisfied that well-regulated municipal waste incinerators do not pose a significant risk to public health and that any adverse effects from the incinerator are likely to be small.</p> <p>Comment is noted.</p>
HW30	Public England	Health	<p>Suggestion to put approaches in place to minimise public exposure to non-threshold air</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		pollutants in order to minimise public health impacts.	<p>potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p>
HW31	National Grid	Suggestion that MVV should ensure that all construction and operation staff are aware of HSE Guidance Notes GS 6 and understand the guidance.	<p>Since Stage 2 Statutory Consultation, the scheme design has developed such that the Grid Connection will now be entirely underground from the EfW CHP Facility to the Walsoken sub-station. HSE Guidance Note GS6 therefore does not apply.</p> <p>The design of the Grid Connection has been undertaken by Freedom Group, an accredited Independent Connection Provider (ICP). The design has been agreed with UKPN in its role as the District Network Operator (DNO) for the area within which the Proposed Development is located.</p>
HW32	National Grid	Suggestion that the HSE guidance document HS(G) 47 and National Grid requirement specification T/SP/SSW22 be noted with regards to safe working near pipelines.	<p>The Applicant has consulted with Statutory Consultees, including utility providers, and has identified the location of all relevant underground services. An Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) has been prepared which details the requirement for EPC contractors to have accurate records of utilities and third party assets as well as the necessary permissions and is secured via the DCO.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW33	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern of the toxic pollutants that are discharged during combustion.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW34	Fenland District Council	Concern about the impact of increased traffic movements transporting waste supply on the quality of life for residents in Wisbech.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic and its potential air quality impacts on the local community, have been assessed and reported ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including traffic modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health and concludes the significance of effect is negligible.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement considers potential effects associated with traffic, including those associated with air quality, noise and severance. This will include consideration of mitigation of potential significant effects and assessment of residual effects.</p>
HW35	Wisbech Town Council	Concern that there is a lack of key information regarding health and wellbeing, despite it being a key concern among local residents.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents from traffic, such as, health and wellbeing, have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing. With mitigation in place, to be secured by a DCO requirement and/or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme; • The Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development; • Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EfW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards; • Various operational management plans to control, e.g., noise, dust, odour, and fire prevention; and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW36	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concerns about the adverse impacts of Nitrogen Oxide and Carbon Monoxide from the proposed development on the health of local residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A CTMP and operational route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Chapter 8 has also taken account of relevant legislation which includes Directive 2008/50/EC on Ambient Air Quality and Cleaner Air for Europe. The Directive sets limits for selected pollutants. Regulated pollutants include sulphur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), particulate matter PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, lead (Pb), benzene (C₆H₆) and carbon monoxide (CO).</p> <p>In addition, an Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B) was undertaken and this includes an assessment of Oxides of Nitrogen and Carbon Monoxide.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an EP from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p>
HW37	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the population living downwind or in proximity of the proposed site will experience an increased risk of developing cancer.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease. The air dispersion model used in the assessment employed site specific meteorological data to ensure it is representative of conditions at the site. It would have therefore picked up any potential for downwind locations to experience increased levels of pollution above the prescribed levels.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW38	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern regarding the potential effects bottom and fly ash has on human health.	<p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan; • Operational Workers Travel Plan; • Operational Traffic Management Plan; and • Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. <p>Incinerator bottom ash is an inert, non-hazardous, by-product of the combustion process. It will be removed and sent to a licenced facility for recycling, where the ferrous and non-ferrous metals will be removed and the</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW39	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the associated noises, light and odours from the operation will have a negative impact on the residents of the area.	<p>remainder processed by size for use as secondary aggregates, thereby negating the requirement to quarry for virgin aggregate.</p> <p>Fly ash is a component of the Air Pollution Control Residues (APCr) which are stored in sealed silos and collected in sealed containers, then transported to a fully licenced facility for treatment and disposal. Typically APCr represents 2%-3% of the input weight of waste delivered to the facility for thermal treatment. The Applicant, together with other companies in the industry, are actively investigating the potential to recycle the APCr for use in construction and civil engineering projects.</p> <p>Potential noise effects due to the construction and operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed in accordance with the relevant British Standards. The results are set out in detail in the ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2). The assessment concluded that the impacts are not significant. Where any potentially significant effects are identified, appropriate control measures will be implemented.</p> <p>An Operational Lighting Scheme has been submitted with the DCO application (Volume 6.4, Appendix 3A). The external lighting for the development will be designed to ensure a safe working environment in all relevant areas of the EfW CHP Facility during night-time whilst avoiding unnecessary light pollution and minimising the visual impact on nearby and distant receptors. The lighting will be designed and controlled so that sky glow and light pollution are avoided</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) which details all sources of odour, control measures, monitoring, and reporting. Odour awareness training will be undertaken as part of general site operational training, and daily checks for odour levels will carried out.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits, including for odour. Compliance with the EP will be regulated and monitored by the Environment Agency.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW40	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the human health will be affected by the accumulation of Cadmium in the environment.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of, amongst other things, metals in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by a DCO Requirement and/or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air emission limits; • Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust and travel management); • Operational Odour Management Plan; • Operational Noise Management Plan; • Operational Fire Prevention Plan; • Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational Workers Travel Plan; Operational Traffic Management Plan; and Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.
HW41	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the Cadmium exposure will exceed the daily limit for humans set by FAO/WHO.	<p>A detailed assessment of chimney emissions is presented in the ES (Volume 6.2, Chapter 8 – Air Quality) and the accompanying Technical Report (Chapter 8, Volume 6.2, Appendix 8B).</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits for Group 1 metals (including Cadmium) and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
HW42	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the dangers posed by Cadmium is not being taken seriously even though the metal/chemical has its own EU Directive indicating that it is a potential risk to emit it through processes.	<p>A detailed assessment of chimney emissions is presented in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2), and the accompanying Technical Report (Chapter 8, Volume 6.2, Appendix 8B).</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits for Group 1 metals (including Cadmium) and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency</p>
HW43	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Suggestion that there is no defined threshold where these metals/chemicals are considered not to pose a risk to human health.	<p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that: “...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed published research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/municipal-waste-incinerators-emissions-impact-on-health). PHE’s risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small...” Emission to air assessment against air quality objectives and standards set for the protection of health. The assessment concluded that impacts are not significant.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p>
HW44	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that in some cases it is not cost-effective to remove arsenic, cadmium, nickel and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in a degree where it end up not posing a significant risk to human health.	<p>A detailed assessment of chimney emissions is presented in the ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2), and the accompanying Technical Report (Chapter 8, Volume 6.2, Appendix 8B). ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling, including emissions modelling of metals and PAH, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>The pollutants assessed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxides of nitrogen (NOX as NO2); • Particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5); • Carbon monoxide (CO); • Sulphur dioxide (SO2); • Hydrogen chloride (HCl); • Hydrogen fluoride (HF); • Group 1 metals (cadmium (Cd) and thallium (Tl)); • Group 2 metals (mercury (Hg)); • Group 3 metals (antimony (Sb), arsenic (As), chromium (Cr), cobalt (Co), copper (Cu), lead (Pb), manganese (Mn), nickel, (Ni) and vanadium (V)); • Volatile organic compounds (VOCs);



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ammonia (NH₃); • Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs); • Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); and • Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). <p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an EP from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. It is usual for the Permit to include strict emissions limits for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arsenic, and its various compounds • Cadmium, and its various compounds • Nickel, and its various compounds • PAH <p>The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p>
HW45	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Suggestion that target values are set for airborne arsenic, cadmium, nickel and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons to minimise the harmful effect on human health.	<p>The EfW CHP Facility will be operated in accordance with an Environmental Permit, which will include strict emissions limits and associated monitoring requirements. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency. It is usual for the Permit to include strict emissions limits for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arsenic, and its various compounds • Cadmium, and its various compounds • Nickel, and its various compounds • PAH



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.
HW46	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that there is no defined safe limit for cadmium in the environment, when considering human health. There has not been given enough attention to the risk of accumulating Cadmium and other heavy metals in the surrounding soil during the life of the incinerator.	The ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) addresses increased emissions to air against health-based standard. As part of the scope (Volume 6.2) an assessment of deposition on land from emissions to air from metals is included as well as a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (Chapter 8, Volume 6.2, Appendix 8B Annex F) to address potential bioaccumulation of dioxins and furans in food. Both studies concluded that impacts were not significant.
HW47	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that heavy metals deposited in the soil will result with exposing people to heavy metals through the food chain.	<p>Assessment in the ES (Volume 6.2) details embedded measures to prevent pollution during the operational phase i.e., that the site will operate under an Environmental Permit which will require emissions to air to be limited and emissions to ground (soil or groundwater) will not be permitted. Air emissions will need to comply with mandatory Emission Limit Values (ELV). The operator of the EfW CHP Facility will need to demonstrate to the Environment Agency in the permit application for the EfW CHP that they are using Best Available Techniques (BAT) for pollution prevention - including use of filters to prevent particulates and particle-bound pollutants such as heavy metals, being released to air.</p> <p>Other embedded measures include the likely requirement for regular soil and groundwater monitoring at the EfW CHP facility as a permit condition. Adherence to the conditions of the Environmental Permit is monitored and regulated by the Environment Agency.</p>
HW48	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Support for the approach to the health assessment.	Comment is noted.
HW49	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the proposed development has been sited in a deprived area as the health	The methods adopted for the assessment of potential effects for relevant topics, e.g., air quality, noise, transport comply with relevant guidance and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		<p>impacts of the proposal is masked by deprivation from other sources.</p>	<p>standards and the potential for significant effects would not be masked by socio-economic conditions in the area.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including socio-economic factors, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2). The assessment concludes, there will be not significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including education; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW50	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the proposed development may increase rates of poor health and inequality in areas of existing deprivation.	<p>The methods adopted for the assessment of potential effects for relevant topics, e.g., air quality, noise, transport comply with relevant guidance and standards and the potential for significant effects would not be masked by socio-economic conditions in the area.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including socio-economic factors, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2). The assessment concludes, there will be not significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including education; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW51	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the proposed development perpetuates health and social inequalities, contrary to the Government's 'levelling up' policy.	<p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including socio-economic factors, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2). The assessment concludes, there will be not significant effects.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including education; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW52	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the impact of air and soil pollution on human health has not been adequately assessed.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of, amongst other things, metals in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing. With mitigation in place, to be secured by either a DCO requirement or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor the emissions and submit results to the EA. The EA also have the power to undertake announced and unannounced site visits to verify emissions data, and in cases where there is a risk of serious pollution, to suspend the environmental permit.</p>
HW53	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the fire risk of the proposed development and the impact on Norfolk's fire response.	<p>Both Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service and Cambridgeshire FRS have been consulted multiple times as the development of the Project has progressed. The Applicant will continue to consult with the Fire Services during the detailed design of the Proposed Development, which will take account of relevant regulatory requirements i.e., the Building Regulations and the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order and industry good practice (NFPA 850).</p> <p>The EfW CHP Facility will require a Fire Prevention Plan to be submitted to the Environment Agency for approval prior to the granting of an Environmental</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>Permit to operate. An Outline Fire Prevention Plan has been prepared (Volume 7.10).</p> <p>The Applicant will maintain an up to date fire risk assessment and its Integrated Management System will cover safe systems of work and detailed emergency response procedures.</p>
HW54	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the proximity of the proposed development to a local secondary school and the associated health risk to young people.	<p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health including impacts of air pollutants on respiratory disease.</p> <p>In addition, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) was undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of, amongst other things, metals in the food chain.</p> <p>The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible. With mitigation in place, to be secured by either a DCO requirement or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts.</p>
HW55	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the effects of particulate emissions in developing Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and other neurodegenerative diseases.	<p>To inform the ES, the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency and Officer for Health Improvement and Disparities). PHE confirmed in their response dated 17 August 2021 that: "...Regarding emissions to air from municipal energy from waste developments, PHE has reviewed published research to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/municipal-waste-incinerators-emissions-impact-on-health). PHE's risk assessment remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small..."</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			Emission to air assessment against air quality objectives and standards set for the protection of health. The assessment concluded that impacts are not significant.
HW56	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request for clarification on whether an assessment has been made on the release of building air through carbon filters into the atmosphere, or permanent odour neutralising system, and what the health impacts are.	During periods of abnormal operation, which may require a temporary shutdown of the furnace, waste is likely to remain within the storage bunker. In this event, either building air will continue to be extracted via the primary air supplied to the other furnace or, in the event that both furnaces are shutdown, building air would be extracted and vented through carbon filters, before being released to atmosphere, or a permanently installed odour neutralisation system will be deployed. An assessment of discharges via these vents was undertaken using the ADMS 5.2 dispersion model in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality and the assessment concluded potential effects are not significant. In addition procedures in an Odour Management Plan developed as a condition of the installation's Environmental Permit and consistent with the Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) will ensure full breakthrough does not occur.
HW57	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Health chapter of the Environmental Statement will need to assess chimney and vehicle emissions in abnormal operating scenarios and address additional dispersion modelling and metal deposition.	The ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) Table 8.28 Impact to air quality at human Receptors in abnormal operation scenario presents the model results during abnormal operating conditions of the combustion unit and associated Flue Gas Treatment (FGT) infrastructure for the specific Receptor experiencing the maximum PC and Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC). The impact at human Receptors is considered to be Not Significant in abnormal operating scenarios, as the PC for all pollutants modelled is less than 40% of AQAL, and the PEC is comfortably below the relevant objectives. Assuming High sensitivity in relation to health and a Very Low magnitude of change there would be a Minor (Not Significant) effect.
HW58	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Health chapter of the Environmental Statement will need to address additional mitigation measures to reduce the impact of operational noise.	Potential noise effects due to the operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed in accordance with the relevant British Standards. The results are set out in detail in the ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) . The assessment concluded that, with mitigation, the impacts are not significant.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW59	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Health chapter of the Environmental Statement will need to address mitigation measures for noise and vibration.	Potential noise effects due to the construction and operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed in accordance with the relevant British Standards. The results are set out in detail in the ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) . The assessment concluded that the impacts are not significant. Where any potentially significant effects are identified, appropriate control measures will be implemented.
HW60	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the health assessment regarding the demand for health care services also include community care services, not just primary care as provided by NHS data.	The ES includes a comment on community care services in Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) , however given the nature of the services it is not anticipated that the Proposed Development will have any significant effects in relation to these.
HW61	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that NHS data on the demand for health care services be cross checked with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure accuracy.	ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) includes updated information using the latest available published information. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and West Norfolk CCG were consulted as prescribed consultees.
HW62	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that NHS data on the demand for health care services referenced in the PEIR are not always accurate or up to date.	ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) includes updated information using the latest available published information.
HW63	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the proposed embedded environmental measures, including continued engagement with communities to address health risks associated with community perceptions of risk during construction and operation.	Support for the proposed embedded environmental measures to address human health risks are noted.
HW64	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Health chapter of the Environmental Statement includes consideration of impacts on air quality from construction and operational traffic, impacts during abnormal operations, metal deposition and a Human Health Risk Assessment.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development, including those that could affect local residents, from traffic have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2) . ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>With mitigation in place, to be secured by a DCO requirement and/or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A CEMP (Volume 7.12) includes a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme;• The Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development;• Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EFW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards;• Various operational management plans to control, e.g., noise, dust, odour and fire prevention;• An Operational Traffic Management Plan; and• A Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4, Appendix 6A) and operational route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. <p>A Human Health Risk Assessment has also been undertaken to assess potential impacts from bioaccumulation of metals in the food chain. The assessment addresses potential impacts of particulates and nitrogen deposition on the local area, including farmland (Chapter 8, Volume 6.2, Appendix 8B Annex F). The assessment concluded that impacts are not significant.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) Table 8.28 Impact to air quality at human Receptors in abnormal operation scenario presents the model results during abnormal operating conditions of the combustion unit and associated Flue Gas Treatment (FGT) infrastructure for the specific Receptor experiencing the maximum PC and Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC). The impact at human Receptors is considered to be Not Significant in abnormal operating scenarios, as the PC for all pollutants modelled is less than 40% of AQAL, and the PEC is comfortably below the relevant objectives. Assuming</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			High sensitivity in relation to health and a Very Low magnitude of change there would be a Minor (Not Significant) effect.
HW65	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Health chapter of the Environmental Statement clarify that the air quality topics screened out of the PEIR (dust, emissions from Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) and odour during normal operations), have been scoped out as there is no impact on air quality or no impact on human health.	ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) relies upon the findings in relation to air quality, including the HHRA and these are summarised in the health chapter. The various sources of air pollution assessed in ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) have been considered using commonly used screening criteria to determine where potential impacts may occur. Outside of the areas defined for each emission source using these screening criteria, no impacts are expected. ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) adopts the source – pathway – receptor model and screens out effects on this basis. Table 16.7 sets out the results of that exercise, drawing on the results of ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) .
HW66	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that additional noise assessments for Overhead Lines be undertaken and incorporated into the Health chapter of the Environmental Statement.	Since Stage 2 Statutory Consultation, the scheme design has developed such that the Grid Connection will now be entirely underground from the EfW CHP Facility to the Walsoken sub-station.
HW67	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the adverse impacts of disruption to use of green space and footpaths on mental health.	<p>The Proposed Development will not directly cross a PRow. Halfpenny Lane PRow terminates at the point it crosses the A47. An Access and PRow Plan (Volume 2.4) has also been prepared and will be submitted with the DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) which provides the opportunity for environmental works to be funded in the local area and this could include enhancements to the local PRow network and/or other green spaces, subject to consultation with the local community.</p>
HW68	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the health impact assessment consider any temporary impacts on footpath usage, as formal and informal footpath use has been raised as a local concern.	The Proposed Development will not directly cross a PRow. Halfpenny Lane PRow terminates at the point it crosses the A47. The works to construct the Grid Connection will be done at night and the informal right of way reinstated. An Access and PRow Plan (Volume 2.4) has also been prepared and will be submitted with the DCO application.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW69	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Transport and Health JSNA and New Housing Developments and the Built Environment JSNA be taken into account in the Environmental Statement.	Data from the JSNA has now been considered as detailed in the ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) .
HW70	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the Transport and Health JSNA and New Housing Developments and the Built Environment JSNA have not been considered in PEIR Chapter 16.	Data from the JSNA has now been considered as detailed in the ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) .
HW71	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the socioeconomic section of PEIR Chapter 16 uses inconsistent data sources for Norfolk and Cambridgeshire.	The ES includes an update to the baseline information. Data has been sourced from ONS and NOMIS.
HW72	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that Cambridgeshire Insight be used as a desktop data source for Cambridgeshire demographic data.	Demographic data was sourced from ONS and NOMIS. Cambridgeshire Insight was used for information on GP practices. A full list of data sources is presented in Table 6.5 in ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) .
HW73	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Health chapter of the EIA include actions and mitigations that minimise potential adverse health impacts and maximise positive health impacts, referencing the most affected vulnerable groups.	<p>The four themes of Access, Traffic and Transport, Socio Economics and Land Use, provided by PHE in their response to the Scoping Report, as well as the 21 determinants have been used to inform the assessment (see Table 16.7 in Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2)). The Chapter focusses on significant effects, drawing on relevant topic-specific chapters of the ES and includes consideration of vulnerable groups where relevant, no significant adverse effects on such groups are anticipated.</p> <p>The ES, submitted as part of the DCO application, includes details of mitigation measures proposed to avoid or reduce the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development. The schedule of mitigation and monitoring can be found in the ES Chapter 19: Schedule of Mitigation (Volume 6.2).</p>
HW74	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Health chapter of the EIA include any potential distribution effects of health impacts among groups within the	ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the impacts on health and wellbeing. A study area was defined, taking into account all of components of the Proposed Development. The study area is shown in Figure 16.B2: Study



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		<p>population by asking ‘who is affected’ by identified impacts.</p>	<p>Area (Volume 6.3). The assessment was informed by consultation responses and copies of the proposed methodology were submitted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fenland District Council • Cambridgeshire County Council • Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council • Norfolk County Council, and • Public Health England. <p>As a result of the consultation on the Technical Note in September 2020 it was proposed that the Applicant would use the 21 wider determinants of health provided by Public Health England (PHE) with the factors identified in the Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment (MWIA) toolkit to help determine the scope of the assessment. In April 2021 a further consultation took place with the stakeholders listed above to agree this approach.</p>
HW75	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council</p>	<p>Suggestion that the Health chapter of the EIA include an appraisal of the positive and negative health and wellbeing impacts of the proposed development on any planned new communities and adjacent existing communities in the study area.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development will not impact on any planned new developments. ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.2) considers the potential for effects on existing communities in the study area. It draws on other ES Chapters and concludes that, with mitigation in place, no significant adverse effects will occur.</p>
HW76	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council</p>	<p>Suggestion that a Health Impact Methodology be used in the Health chapter of the EIA to enable the consideration of effects of wider health determinants on the physical and social environment.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the impacts on health and wellbeing. The approach to the Health Chapter has been agreed with a range of stakeholders. The assessment was informed by consultation responses and copies of the proposed methodology were submitted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fenland District Council • Cambridgeshire County Council • Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council • Norfolk County Council, and • Public Health England.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW77	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the health chapter of the Environmental Statement will need a systematic approach to identifying beneficial and adverse impacts.	<p>As a result of the consultation on the Technical Note in September 2020 it was proposed that the Applicant would use the 21 wider determinants of health provided by Public Health England (PHE) with the factors identified in the Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment (MWIA) toolkit to help determine the scope of the assessment. In April 2021 a further consultation took place with the stakeholders listed above to agree this approach. A summary of consultation responses is presented at Appendix 16A: Summary of Consultation Responses (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the impacts on health and wellbeing. The approach to the Health Chapter has been agreed with a range of stakeholders. The assessment was informed by consultation responses and copies of the proposed methodology were submitted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fenland District Council • Cambridgeshire County Council • Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council • Norfolk County Council, and • Public Health England.
HW78	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the hyperlinks to bookmarks and references in PEIR Chapter 16 are broken so source data cannot be checked or verified.	<p>As a result of the consultation on the Technical Note in September 2020 it was proposed that the Applicant would use the 21 wider determinants of health provided by Public Health England (PHE) with the factors identified in the Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment (MWIA) toolkit to help determine the scope of the assessment. In April 2021 a further consultation took place with the stakeholders listed above to agree this approach. A summary of consultation responses is presented at Appendix 16A: Summary of Consultation Responses (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>Hyperlinks were checked prior to issue and from a review of a sample of links in the PEIR they appear to be working. PINs advice note requests that hyperlinks are avoided and consequently they are not used in the ES.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
HW79	Cambridgeshire County Council	Opportunities to improve public rights of way should be considered to provide mental health benefits to local communities.	<p>The Proposed Development will not directly cross a PRoW. Opportunities to improve PRoW for the benefit of local communities could be considered via the Community Benefits Strategy which provides the opportunity for local environmental works to be funded in the local area.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including waste education and awareness; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding operations

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 9.1 Issues raised regarding operations** below and are accompanied by an indication of which consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 9.9 Issues raised regarding operations

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
OP01	Local Community	Request for clarification as to how the ash generated by the incineration process will be disposed of.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the process for dealing with the two types of ash (Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) and Air pollution Control residues (APCr)) generated by the incineration process. It states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that IBA would be sent to a suitably licenced facility in the UK, for recycling, where metals contained within the IBA would be extracted and the remainder reclaimed for use as secondary aggregate; and APCr would be sent to a suitably licenced facility for disposal.
OP02	Local Community	Request for clarification as to the operational life of the proposed facility.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that; for the purpose of the assessment, a working assumption has been made that the Proposed Development has an operational lifespan of approximately 40 years. However, it should be noted that it is common for such developments to be operational for longer periods.</p>
OP03	Local Community	Clarification as to the process and procedures required to assess and inspect waste prior to incineration for suitability.	<p>The Applicant will ensure that a robust 'non-conforming deliveries' procedure is put in place which aims to intercept any non-conforming waste at the point of delivery. This has proven effective at MVV's existing UK facilities where such procedures are implemented and is an Environmental Permit requirement.</p>
OP04	Local Community	What procedures and processes will MVV implement to manage subcontractors and ensure that they fulfil their requirements?	<p>The Applicant will operate the Proposed Development in accordance with an integrated management system which includes a detailed procurement process for the selection of subcontractors prior to appointment and further processes for their ongoing evaluation of suitability, including during the execution of on-site works. This has proven effective at MVV's existing UK</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			facilities where such procedures are implemented and is an Environmental Permit requirement.
OP05	Local Community	Is MVV certified to any British Standards?	The Applicant intends to obtain certification to international standards ISO 9001 Quality Management, ISO 14001 Environmental Management, ISO 45001 Occupational Health and Safety Management and ISO 50001 Energy Management within 18 months of full operations at the Proposed Development commencing. MVV's existing facilities in the UK and Europe also operate in accordance with these standards.
OP06	Local Community	What standards are being applied for the calibration of monitoring and measuring equipment for the operation of the proposed development?	All monitoring and measuring equipment will conform to all relevant UK standards as a minimum. All devices fulfilling safety, environmental compliance or critical process monitoring functions will be calibrated by a certified contractor at the prescribed frequency and to the relevant standard using UKAS certified test equipment.
OP07	Local Community	Does MVV specify within their contracts with waste suppliers the type of waste and materials that are required?	Under the requirements of the Environmental Permit only those types of wastes specified will be permitted to be accepted at the EfW CHP Facility. Consequently, the Applicant's contracts with its suppliers will reflect these permitted waste codes. A list of waste codes to be accepted at the EfW CHP Facility is set out in Section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) .
OP08	Local Community	Concern that all waste received is not assessed for suitability leading to all waste being incinerated regardless of its contents.	The Applicant will ensure that a robust 'non-conforming deliveries' procedure is put in place which aims to intercept any non-conforming waste at the point of delivery and includes random inspection of tipped waste loads in a quarantine area. Any non-conforming waste identified will be rejected and the relevant supplier informed. This has proven effective at MVV's existing UK facilities where such procedures are implemented and is an Environmental Permit requirement
OP09	Local Community	What provisions have been made to ensure that the proposed development can be decommissioned at the end of its life?	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that the Proposed Development will be decommissioned at the end of its operational life. The decommissioning will take approximately one-year and the appropriate decommissioning and reinstatement activities will be



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
OP10	Local Community	Concern that future national policies will reduce the volume of municipal waste available for the size of facility proposed through a greater emphasis on reuse and recycling.	<p>undertaken in accordance with a scheme which will be first agreed with the relevant local authority. The decommissioning scheme will be a DCO Requirement.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) which assesses the amount of residual waste generated presently and, in the future, taking into account government targets for reuse and recycling. The Assessment concludes that there will be sufficient residual waste for the size of facility proposed.</p>
OP11	Local Community	Concern that the benefits of the electricity being generated by the proposed development will not be sufficient to offset the impacts of the development on the local community.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect the local community, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) • Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) • Outline Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7). <p>Regardless of the balance of effects, the Applicant is committed to delivering a package of community benefits; an approach undertaken at MVV's other UK facilities. The commitments to the local community are reported in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) and the Outline Community Benefits Plan (Volume 7.14) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; • Support the local supply chain; • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; and • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund;
OP12	Local Community	Concern that there is insufficient demand from local businesses for the use of the steam and heat generated from the proposed development to meet its stated efficiency.	<p>ES Chapter 2 Alternatives (Volume 6.2) explains the reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development. One of the Applicant's essential criteria for selecting the location for the Proposed Development was its close proximity to industrial users who have a heat/steam demand. To provide reassurance, the Applicant's Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) has investigated the potential heat demands and concludes that there is sufficient potential demand to justify the supply of heat/steam in the location chosen to site the EfW CHP Facility.</p>
OP13	Local Community	Concern about the scale of energy that will be used purely to power the proposed development.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the parasitic load (the amount of electricity required to power the EfW CHP Facility) as being 5MW. This means that the EfW CHP Facility when operational will be able to supply a maximum of 55MW of electricity to the national grid.</p>
OP14	Local Community	Request for more information about how the proposed development will prevent the pollution of local waterways from operational discharges.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with the water environment, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 12 Hydrology (Volume 6.2). Appendix 12A (Volume 6.4) presents the Applicant's a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. Under normal operational conditions there would be no discharge of pollutants to watercourses. Water used in the process is recycled for re-use. Only rainwater will be discharged to local watercourses and this will be fed through</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
OP15	Local Community	Concern that the operational days and times are excessive and will have a negative impact on the communities of Wisbech.	<p>a number of controls, such as, oil interceptors, before it can be discharged at a controlled rate.</p> <p>The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4); • Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10); and • Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9).
			<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including operational hours and their effect on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a ranges of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise) (Volume 7.12); • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4); and • Outline Travel Plan (Volume 6.4).
OP16	Local Community	Concern about operational failures at the proposed development causing risk of harm and disturbance to local communities.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including risk of accidents, has been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 17 Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
OP17	Local Community	Concern that operational by products will be created through incineration and that these will be more difficult to dispose of than the waste that is being burned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of an accredited Integrated Management System (IMS); • Proposed Development to be designed to meet industry standards, including building regulations; • A Hazard and Operability (HAZOP) study; and • An Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10); <p>is a requirement of the Environmental Permit, a detailed procedure for start-up, planned shutdowns and emergency shutdowns will be developed prior to the commissioning of the EfW CHP Facility.</p>
			<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) reports the by-products from the incineration process; Incinerator bottom ash (IBA) and Air Pollution Control residues (APCr).</p> <p>The IBA (a non-hazardous waste) would be sent to a suitably licenced facility in the UK for recycling, where metals contained within the IBA would be extracted and the remainder reclaimed for use as secondary aggregate.</p> <p>The APCr (a hazardous waste) would be sent to a suitable licenced facility for disposal.</p>
OP18	Local Community	Concern that the filters being applied to the proposed development do not prevent PM1 particles, CO2, NOx, Furans, PM 2.5 particles, gases like Ammonia, or heavy metals like Mercury and Lead, for which there are no safe limits, stated by W.H.O.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions from the chimneys has been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation,</p> <p>ES Annex F, Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report of Chapter 8 Air Quality provides the HHRA (Volume 6.4). this assessment was completed (amongst other matters) to assess bioaccumulation of dioxins and their potential effect on health.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>The EfW CHP Facility includes high efficiency bag filters to remove particulates. Filter bag manufacturers do not provide efficiency figures however, the removal efficiency for PM2.5 is expected to be better than 99.9%. as reported in publicly available technical papers online.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p> <p>All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP will set the emission limits and monitoring requirements for the facility and requires an operator to continuously monitor total dust (particulates) and submit results to the EA.</p>
OP19	Local Community	Request for clarification on where the waste supplied to the facility would come from.	<p>No contracts have been placed with the Applicant for the disposal of waste at the proposed EfW CHP Facility. However, the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) clearly demonstrates that there is an existing and future need for suitable facilities - both regionally (in the East of England area) and nationally (England). The WFAA has focussed entirely on the need for facilities to manage residual waste (i.e. that left over after reuse and recycling has taken place). The assessment is based upon publicly available data and considers future changes in residual waste management generation as well as existing and emerging disposal capacity.</p> <p>The WFAA (Volume 7.3) concludes that locally, the Proposed Development would contribute to meeting a conservatively estimated 1.8 million tonnes per annum gap in residual waste management capacity, which will occur by 2035. On this basis, the Applicant is confident that there is sufficient demand for the Proposed Development.</p>
OP20	Local Community	Request for clarification on whether the waste handled by the proposed facility would include clinical waste.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the types of waste will be received by the EfW CHP Facility. Clinical waste is not included within the waste classification codes identified.</p>
OP21	Local Community	Concern that local authorities will be tied into waste management contracts with MVV even if environmental legislation changes to prohibit incineration.	<p>Presently there are no contracts with local authorities in place and the Applicant is of the opinion that the Proposed Development is compliant with National Planning Statements for energy, see Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) for</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			full details. Ultimately, contract risks will be a matter for the Applicant and potential residual waste suppliers to agree.
OP22	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern whether the bottom and fly ash generation and the proper management of it is in place.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the process for dealing with Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) and APC residues (APCr), the ‘fly ash’. It states that the IBA would be sent to a suitably licenced facility in the UK, for recycling, where metals contained within the IBA would be extracted and the remainder reclaimed for use as secondary aggregate. Fly ash collected with APCr would be disposed of off-site at a suitably licensed hazardous waste landfill facility.
OP23	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that the Environment Agency’s emissions monitoring standards are inadequate.	The Environment Agency will be required to issue a permit before the EfW CHP Facility can be allowed to operate. The Agency’s standards conform with domestic and European standards for the operation of EfW facilities.
OP24	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Suggestion that environmental inspections be conducted through the use of unannounced site visits.	Environmental compliance of the EfW CHP Facility is regulated by the Environment Agency, this will require the Applicant to regularly report performance monitoring data to the Environment Agency, as well as provide for unannounced compliance assessment visits conducted by the Environment Agency.
OP25	BC of King’s Lynn and West Norfolk	Request for clarification on how the bottom ash is disposed, including whether it is disposed off-site or treated on site.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the process for dealing with Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA). It states that the IBA would be sent to a suitably licenced facility in the UK, for recycling, where metals contained within the IBA would be extracted and the remainder reclaimed for use as secondary aggregate.
OP26	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the operating hours run later than expected.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including operational hours and their effect on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) . Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a ranges of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise) (Volume 7.12); • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4); and • Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4).
OP27	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that operating hours should end at 6pm at the latest without pre-approved exceptional circumstances.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the operational hours for the acceptance of waste as 07.00 to 20.00 although the EfW CHP Facility itself will operate 24 hours a day.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including operational hours and their effect on the local community, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a ranges of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise) (Volume 7.12); • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4); and • Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4).
OP28	Steve Barclay MP	Objection to treating the waste by incineration as most of it could be recycled or treated in less harmful ways.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that the waste which is the fuel for the EfW CHP Facility is residual waste, meaning that it is waste which is left over after recycling and reuse and would otherwise be sent to landfill.</p>
OP29	Steve Barclay MP	Objection as bottom ash and air pollution is generated as hazardous waste which the	<p>ES Chapter 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2) confirms that significant effects are unlikely to occur as a result of incinerator bottom ash, a non-hazardous waste</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		<p>developer has failed to provide information about.</p>	<p>or APC residue (APCr) as it will be stored in enclosed buildings. These effects were therefore scoped out of the air quality assessment.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that the non-hazardous Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) would be stored in a bunker within the EfW CHP Facility prior to being loaded by crane into enclosed/sheeted HGVs for exports to a suitably licenced facility in the UK, for recycling. At these facilities metals contained within the IBA would be extracted and the remainder reclaimed for use as secondary aggregate. The much smaller volume of APC residues generated by the Proposed Development and classified as a hazardous waste will be stored in contained silos prior to being loaded into sealed tankers (similar to cement tankers) which then export the ACPr off-site for disposal at a suitably licensed hazardous waste facility.</p>
OP30	Steve Barclay MP	<p>Suggestion that the assertion that the proposed development will be operating 91% of the time is unrealistic.</p>	<p>An availability of 90% for a facility such as the Proposed Development is industry standard. The Applicant's comparable UK facilities achieve this level of performance or higher on average. Furthermore, the EPC contractor will be required to provide a performance guarantee of 91% availability.</p>
OP31	Steve Barclay MP	<p>Request for information on how the requirements for good design set out in the National Policy Statements have been considered in the operation of the proposed development.</p>	<p>NPS EN-1 provides criteria for 'good design' for energy infrastructure. It states that this goes beyond visual appearance to include functionality, fitness for purpose and sustainability providing sustainable infrastructure that is sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible. Consideration of how the visual appearance of the Proposed Development has evolved and responded to the context of the location is set out within ES Chapter 2 Alternatives (Volume 6.2) and the Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5).</p> <p>The Design and Access Statement (Volume 7.5) takes the NPS criteria for 'good design' and explains how these have been applied beyond the issue of context. It demonstrates how the functionality of the EfW CHP Facility has informed the design and how, within the limits of this functionality approaches have been considered to improve the aesthetics, of the buildings, the options considered and conclusions reached.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
OP32	Local Community	Request for clarification on what timescale is expected for the facility to reach 50MW to meet the NSIP threshold.	<p>An assessment of the Proposed Development's impacts on landscape and surrounding townscape is set out within ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual and in Chapter 10 Historic Environment (both Volume 6.2) whilst Chapter 2 Alternatives (Volume 6.2) confirms that the majority of the EfW CHP Facility Site is an existing brownfield site thereby reducing the requirement for new greenfield land, a natural resource. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that steam condensate will be recycled and reused, that the Administration building will operate a rain water reuse system and solar panels to reduce the use of natural resources when the EfW CHP Facility is operational.</p>
OP33	Local Community	Request for clarification on the lifespan and decommissioning timeframe for the proposed facility.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms that; for the purpose of the assessment, a working assumption has been made that the Proposed Development has an operational lifespan of approximately 40 years. However, it should be noted that it is common for such developments to be operational for longer periods.</p>
OP34	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council	Concern about the fire risk of the proposed development and the impact on Norfolk's fire response.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including risk of fire have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 17 Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2)</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
OP35	Cambridge Friends of the Earth	Concern that Nickel-Cadmium batteries, an outlet of cadmium contamination, will be included in the waste stream.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., safe storage of fuel, oil and chemicals) (Volume 7.12); • Adoption of an accredited Integrated Management System (IMS); • Proposed Development to be designed to meet industry standards, including building regulations; • A Hazard and Operability (HAZOP) study; and • An Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10). <p>The majority of batteries should be recycled and therefore, not enter the waste stream. However, the environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including emissions of metal and related compounds have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) includes detailed dispersion modelling. The assessment was undertaken considering Air Quality objectives set for the protection of human health. Therefore, the assessment considered the most stringent objective, prescribed in legislation.</p> <p>The assessment has considered potential emissions of cadmium and nickel from the EFW CHP Facility chimney, including metal deposition on land. The ES Air Quality assessment concludes the significance of effect on sensitive receptors is negligible.</p>



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding socio-economic and community

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 10.1 Issues raised regarding socio economic and community** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 10.10 Issues raised regarding socio economic and community

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE01	Fenland District Council Kirk Coach Works Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development provides little or no benefit to the community.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE02	MK Acoustics Engineering & Factory Supplies Local Community	Concern that the detrimental impact of the Proposed Development will outweigh any community benefits generated.	<p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The impacts of the Proposed Development have been examined in great detail and reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Volume 6.2). The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) considers the outcome of the ES and assesses conformity with national and local planning policy. The planning balance for the Proposed Development concludes it is firmly in favour of the Proposed Development. Therefore, development consent should be granted. Ultimately a decision as to whether employment benefits outweigh potential negative benefits will be taken by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Regardless of the balance of effects, the Applicant is committed to delivering a community benefits package, an approach undertaken at MNV's other UK facilities. These benefits are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.
			<p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE03	MK Acoustics Engineering & Factory Supplies Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development is in close proximity to homes, schools, retail park and health facilities.	The EfW CHP Facility is located within an industrial estate which is allocated for future development and primarily on land currently operating as a waste transfer station (WTS). Where relevant, for example, to assess the impacts of the Proposed Development on air quality at sensitive receptors, such as, schools and homes, these have been assessed and are reported in the ES. The assessments include for consideration of effects upon health (ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2)) and the conclusion reached is that effects would not be significant. Further details of how all of the environmental assessments have been undertaken, what mitigation is proposed (where necessary) and the overall conclusion of the assessment of effects are reported in full in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) .
SE04	Local Community PIL	Concern that the proposed facility will make the area a less desirable place to live which will lower house prices.	<p>As part of the assessment undertaken in ES Chapter 15 Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2), the Applicant reviewed the local housing market. The review shows that house prices within the Study Area are lower than the county and national averages.</p> <p>House prices are however driven by a range of factors and it is considered generally that the Proposed Development would not by itself decrease house prices. For a limited number of properties that may be affected by physical factors (such as noise) during the operation of the Proposed Development, and should such factors result in a diminution in value, a claim for compensation can be made under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.</p>
SE05	Icon Engineering Ltd MJ Acoustics	Concern that employment opportunities would not benefit the local community as jobs are minimal and would likely require skills not available locally.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing local employment and skills opportunities. These commitments include the following and are discussed in further detail in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
	Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain.
	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School		The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.
	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council		
	Local Community		
SE06	Icon Engineering Ltd Commercial Safety Systems Ltd Local Community PIL	Concern that the proposed new facility will result in businesses relocating away from Wisbech.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local businesses, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) assesses impacts on local businesses and concludes, there will be not significant effects. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust, and travel management) • Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10)



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE07	<p>WEP Fabrications Ltd</p> <p>English Brothers Ltd</p> <p>Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council</p> <p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern that the jobs created will be less than the number of jobs lost overall as a result of the proposed development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) • Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7) <p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms it is the intention for the Proposed Development to provide alternative low carbon sources of heat and power to local businesses, thereby provide an attractive alternative option for power supplies that does not rely on fossil fuels. This could benefit existing (and future) manufacturing businesses within the local area making it attractive in comparison to other areas.</p> <p>During the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development, local goods and services are required and could include, for example, engineering and commercial safety equipment, therefore consolidate rather than relocate local businesses within the area. Overall, the Proposed Development would contribute to the local economy and businesses. Further details of the goods and services required by the Proposed Development are reported in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8).</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development(Volume 6.2) states, during construction, around 700 jobs will be created and once operational the Proposed Development will create up to 40 FTE new skilled jobs including waste acceptance personnel, operational engineers and facility-based support staff. The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) will be in place to support local people to respond to these opportunities. The Applicant does not believe that any jobs will be lost as a result of the Proposed Development other than those employed at the operational WTS. However, opportunities for these employees, if not relocated by their employer, may arise during the construction and operational phase of the Proposed Development</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE08	Commercial Safety Systems Ltd Fascinating Fens Local Community	Concern that the increased traffic as a result of the Proposed Development will affect retail and tourism.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) has assessed the levels of traffic generated by the Proposed Development at both construction and operation. The assessment concludes that the local highway network can accommodate the Proposed Development without giving rise to congestion or to other traffic-related environmental effects. As such, the Applicant considers it unlikely that the Proposed Development will affect tourism and retail in this way.</p>
SE09	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development will inhibit future town rehabilitation, such as by making Wisbech a Garden Town, thereby making Wisbech a less desirable location to set up a new business or to live.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local businesses or residents, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) assesses impacts on local businesses and concludes, there will be not significant effects. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust, and travel management) • Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) • Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) • Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7) <p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms it is the intention for the Proposed Development to provide alternative</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE10	Local Community	Concern that the community will see no financial benefit in terms of power supply as a result of the proposed facility.	<p>low carbon sources of heat and power to local businesses, thereby provide an attractive alternative option for power supplies that does not rely on fossil fuels. This could benefit existing (and future) manufacturing businesses within the local area making it attractive in comparison to other areas.</p> <p>During the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development, local goods and services are required, therefore attract new businesses to the area. Overall, the Proposed Development would contribute to the local economy and businesses. Further details of the goods and services required by the Proposed Development are reported in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8).</p> <p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2). confirms the current intention is that heat and power would be supplied to commercial and industrial users within the adjoining industrial estate, consent for the CHP Connection is included in the DCO application. To supply domestic users, who have a comparatively low demand, further cables and transformers to reduce the voltage to 400V are required, before single phase 230V supplies can be made. The cost of this additional equipment plus installation of the necessary additional underground cables would make private wire electricity supply to domestic customers uneconomic for both the Applicant and any potential domestic customer residential properties, providing a 'private wire' from the Proposed Development would be more complex in that it would ideally require a whole neighbourhood to take part. However, the Proposed Development will provide an alternative source of decentralised low carbon energy, supply this to the national grid and therefore increasing energy security.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE11	Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development will impact negatively on resident's privacy.	Due to the industrial nature of the Proposed Development, it is designed to be enclosed with minimal windows at a level that could impact negatively on residents' privacy.
SE12	Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development would affect quality of life for the community.	Quality of life can be said to compromise a number of attributes. The topic chapters of the ES (Chapters 6 to 17 (Volume 6.2)) have sought to assess the effects arising from the Proposed Development against specific environmental topics which include visual, historic environment, air quality, water, noise, health and traffic for example. Where significant effects have been identified, these have been noted and mitigation, where appropriate identified. Cumulative effects have also been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) .



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE13	<p>Nordelph Parish Council</p> <p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern that there is no benefit of siting the proposed facility in a predominantly agricultural environment.</p>	<p>The agricultural environment surrounding Wisbech has led to the development of a food manufacturing industry within the town, including national and international companies. To process the food there is a high demand for energy and the Proposed Development could supply this, therefore reducing reliance on fossil fuels by providing decentralised low carbon energy.</p> <p>In selecting the site of the EfW CHP Facility, the proximity to potential heat and electricity customers was an essential criterion applied by the Applicant. Further information on the essential and preferable siting criterion and heat and power demands in the area are reported in ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) and the Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) respectively.</p>
SE14	<p>Kirk Coachworks</p> <p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern that access to the site via Newbridge Lane and the proposed widening of the road will impact on current business and residential property in the area.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) states that the Applicant has designed the proposed improvements to New Bridge Lane consistent with those previously produced as part of the Wisbech Access Strategy. Whilst there would be some temporary disruption to businesses and residential properties along New Bridge Lane when the works are being constructed, this will be appropriately managed in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council as local highways authority.</p> <p>To accommodate the Access Improvements, land within the curtilage of 9 New Bridge Lane is required, however this property will be acquired by the Applicant and its residential use shall cease.</p>
SE15	<p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern that by building the proposed facility it will have a bad influence on the younger residents which could potentially reduce their future successes in life.</p>	<p>It is unclear as to how the Proposed Development would have such an effect. However, the Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the potential effects arising from the Proposed Development upon the health of the local population. This is reported in ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2). The conclusion reached is that effects upon health would not be significant.</p>
SE16	Emneth Parish Council Local Community	Commented that it was inappropriate to locate the Proposed Development close to high value agricultural land.	A Human Health Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) has been prepared which considers the potential effects arising from chimney emissions upon humans and assumes that receptors would eat food grown in the local area. It concludes that that effects upon human health would be negligible and not significant.
SE17	Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development will present contamination risk to nearby food producing businesses.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE18	Local Community	Concern that if pests become prevalent the Proposed Development will pose a risk to the survival of a nearby food related business.	<p>To monitor and control pests, insects and vermin, specialist firms will be contracted to undertake regular inspections of the EfW CHP Facility Site. Bait boxes will be maintained around the perimeter of the EfW CHP Facility if required.</p> <p>ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) assesses impacts on local businesses arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development at a more holistic level and concludes, there will be not significant effects.</p>
SE19	Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development will have a damaging effect on the profitability of a nearby food related business including the effect on the Pension Trust that owns the land.	<p>It is unclear the means by which the Proposed Development would affect the profitability of nearby food businesses. ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) states that the Applicant is providing an opportunity for local food businesses to take heat and electricity from the Proposed Development which could support them in reducing their emissions and potentially provide commercially attractive sources of power which could support their profitability.</p> <p>ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) assesses impacts on local businesses. It considers both the potential benefits arising from local supply chain opportunities through to the potentially negative effects arising from disruption during construction for example. In all cases the conclusion reached is that effects would not be significant.</p>
SE20	Local Community	Opposition to the Proposed Development due to the adverse effects on Horticulture, Agriculture, Food processing factories and buildings.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) states that the Applicant is providing an opportunity for local food businesses to take heat and electricity from the Proposed Development which could support them in reducing their emissions and potentially provide commercially attractive sources of power which could support their profitability.</p> <p>A Human Health Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 8B: Air Quality Technical Report, Annex G (Volume 6.4)) has been prepared which considers the potential effects arising from chimney emissions upon humans</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>and assumes that receptors would eat food grown in the local area. It concludes that that effects upon human health would be negligible.</p> <p>ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) assesses impacts on local businesses. It considers both the potential benefits arising from local supply chain opportunities through to the potentially negative effects arising from disruption during construction for example. In all cases the conclusion reached is that effects would not be significant.</p>
SE21	Local Community	Request for clarification as to whether compensation will be made available should businesses suffer financial loss as a result of the proposed development.	The Applicant will comply with the relevant land compensation regime applicable to the Proposed Development. At this stage, the Applicant does not consider it likely that any local businesses will suffer a financial loss as a result of the Proposed Development. However, if a small business was affected by physical factors (such as noise) during the operation of the Proposed Development, and such factors results in a diminution in value, a claim for compensation can be made under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.
SE22	Local Community PIL	Request for clarification as to whether compensation will be made available should homes suffer from devaluation.	The Applicant will comply with the relevant land compensation regime applicable to the Proposed Development. For a limited number of properties that may be affected by physical factors (such as noise) during the operation of the Proposed Development, and such factors results in a diminution in value, a claim for compensation can be made under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.
SE23	Local Community	Request for clarification on how local residents who are affected the most will benefit from this development.	<p>The Proposed Development will help to address climate change by reducing emissions over those that would be generated should the waste be landfilled.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE24	Local Community	Request for clarification on how the grid connection options will benefit the local community.	<p>The Grid Connection by itself is unlikely to benefit the local community. However, ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) explains that the EfW CHP Facility will export low carbon energy to the national grid at Walsoken and in this way it will help to address the impacts of climate change thereby bringing indirect beneficial effects to all communities.</p>
SE25	Local Community	Request for further communication with the local community to alleviate concern about lowering house prices.	<p>The Applicant has committed to establishing a Local Liaison Committee, information on which is provided within the Outline Community Benefit Strategy (Volume 7.14). This will provide a means by which the Applicant can work with representatives of the local community to provide the information they require as the project progresses.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) includes the following proposals:</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>As part of the assessment undertaken in ES Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2), the Applicant reviewed the local housing market. The review shows that house prices within the Study Area have been increasing. The review shows that house prices within the Study Area are lower than the county and national averages.</p> <p>House prices are driven by a range of factors and it is considered generally that the Proposed Development would not by itself decrease house prices. For a limited number of properties that may be affected by physical factors (such as noise) during the operation of the Proposed Development, and such factors results in a diminution in value, a claim for compensation can be made under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973.</p>
SE26	Local Community	Request for more information on improvements that would benefit local business in terms of energy provision and reopening of the rail link.	<p>The agricultural environment surrounding Wisbech has led to the development of a food manufacturing industry within the town, including national and international companies. To process the food there is a high demand for energy and the Proposed Development could supply this, therefore reduce reliance of fossil fuels by providing decentralised low carbon energy.</p> <p>Secured under the DCO, the Applicant will implement an action plan to review and where possible expand the CHP supply network to local businesses. Further details of the potential CHP network and action plan are reported in the Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6).</p> <p>The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech Railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local businesses. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has identified land within</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE27	Local Community	Suggestion that the Proposed Development could further education regarding household waste sorting.	<p>the EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential road bridge embankment and a waste unloading area.</p> <p>The Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can co-exist. Protective provisions will be agreed with Network Rail to ensure that any works within proximity of any future live rail infrastructure comply with Network Rail's health and safety procedures.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and <p>Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.</p> <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE28	Local Community	Suggestion that this could present an opportunity to invest in upskilling the local community to help enhance health and wellbeing.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and <p>Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.</p> <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE29	Local Community	Support for Proposed Development to improve the area.	Comment acknowledged.
SE30	Local Community	Support for the Proposed Development due to its pioneering innovation which could give pride to the community.	



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE31	Local Community	Support for the Proposed Development due to provision of employment.	
SE32	Local Community	Support for the Proposed Development due to energy savings for local business.	
SE33	Local Community	Support for the Proposed Development due to its contribution to a greener future.	
SE34	Local Community	Suggestion that if the building was innovative and a tourist attraction in its own right then perceptions might change.	<p>The Applicant has considered the appearance of the building and function of the Administration building. The intention with the EfW CHP Facility is that it could incorporate kinetic panels which could be used to create a potentially, locally distinctive image. The detailed design of the scheme will be approved by a DCO Requirement.</p> <p>The Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) includes the Applicant's commitment to organise and hold guided site tours at the EfW CHP Facility. The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE35	Local Community	Suggestion that if the proposed facility hosted and promoted educational and inspirational events/facilities then perceptions might change.	<p>MVV has a track record in running educational activities at its existing facilities. The Applicant proposes to employ a Community Liaison Officer to deliver an educational programme, including outreach events to local educational establishments and STEM support. Within the Administration building there will be a visitor area to accommodate visiting contractors and suppliers and technical workshops. This visitor area will be designed so that it can also accommodate school and community groups for the delivery of workshops and events. These commitments are reported in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) and the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14).</p>
SE36	MJ Acoustics	Concern that the Proposed Development will affect retail and tourism in Wisbech.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) has assessed the levels of traffic generated by the Proposed Development at both construction and operation. It has concluded that the local highway network can accommodate the development without giving rise to congestion or to other traffic-related</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
	Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council Local Community		environmental effects. As such the Applicant considers it unlikely that the Proposed Development will affect tourism and retail in this way. Wider socio-economic effects upon tourism are considered within the ES Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) . This has assessed the potential for visitors to be dissuaded from visiting local tourist facilities as a result of the Proposed Development. It has concluded that the nature of the local tourist facilities and of the visits to them is such that the construction and operation of the Proposed Development would not give rise to significant effects.
SE37	Steve Barclay MP	The findings of the Residential Amenity Assessment have not been provided during consultation, denying residents of Wisbech, and further afield, the opportunity to comment on the potential impacts on their homes and community.	The Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) was published at Statutory Consultation as Appendix 9F to Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual (and was cross-referred to in the main chapter provided for consultation). The RVAA accompanying the DCO submission can be found in ES Appendix 9K: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (Volume 6.4) .
SE38	PIL	Request for information relating to compensation for works required on land allocated for residential development.	During statutory consultation, options for the location of the Grid Connection were being considered and included an overhead line across private land to Walpole substation. Since Statutory Consultation, this option has been dropped by the Applicant. ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the proposed Grid Connection, confirming it is an unground connection within the adopted highway or within the verge of the A47. Therefore, the Applicant does not propose to undertake any of the Grid Connection works on land allocated for residential development.
SE39	Local Community	Concern about the impact of the Proposed Development on the local character of Wisbech.	The Landscape and Visual Assessment and the Historic Environment Assessment are both reported in the ES as Chapters 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) and 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) respectively. They assess the potential for significant effects upon receptors



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			including the town centre of Wisbech and conclude that these would not be significant.
SE40	Local Community	Support for the identified community benefits of the proposed development.	Comment acknowledged. The Applicant is proposing to provide a Community Benefits Strategy and the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) accompanies the DCO submission.
SE41	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV should pledge investments into tree planting, street cleaning, education, and road repairs.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including improvements to the local environment and education. These commitments are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE42	Crown Packaging	Concern about a reduction in the environmental quality of working conditions for staff at companies in proximity to the Proposed Development, specifically the Crown Packaging Manufacturing Factory, due to the prevailing south westerly wind.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local businesses or residents, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). Noise effects are assessed in Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration and odour in Chapter 8: Air Quality (both Volume 6.2). ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) also assesses impacts on local businesses and concludes, there will be not significant effects. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust, and travel management) • Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) • Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) • Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7) <p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms it is the intention for the Proposed Development to provide alternative low carbon sources of heat and power to local businesses, thereby provide an attractive alternative option for power supplies that does not rely on fossil fuels. This could benefit existing (and future) manufacturing businesses within the local area making it attractive in comparison to other areas.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) assess the potential for impacts upon human health and concludes that these would not be significant.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE43	PIL	Concern that the Proposed Development will impact on other development proposals in the immediate vicinity.	<p>During the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development, local goods and services are required, therefore attract new businesses to the area. Overall, the Proposed Development could contribute to the local economy and businesses. Further details of the goods and services required by the Proposed Development are reported in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8).</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local businesses, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit.</p> <p>The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local businesses. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening and should it, the type of rail connection that would be developed, the Applicant has identified land within the EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential road bridge embankment and a waste unloading area.</p> <p>The Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another.</p> <p>In addition, the cumulative impacts of other developments within the area of the Proposed Development have been assessed and no significant impacts identified. Further Details can be found in ES Chapter 18: Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2).</p>
SE44	Local Community	Concern that the proposed new facility will result in residents relocating away from Wisbech.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect residents, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE45	Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development will result in increased deprivation and socioeconomic issues in the local area.	<p>6.1). Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit. In addition to the above document, the Applicant has undertaken a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment of properties in close proximity to the Proposed Development. The assessment has concluded that whilst there would be some significant visual effects to occupiers of a small number of properties closets to the EfW CHP Facility Site, no property would be affected to the extent that it would become an unsatisfactory place to live. The RVAA accompanying the DCO submission can be found in ES Appendix 9K: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>ES Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) provides information on the number of people that the Proposed Development will employ during its construction and operation such that it should support economic development in the area. ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the potential effects arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development upon health. It also concludes that with mitigation measures in place, significant effects would not occur.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE46	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	Objection to the Proposed Development due to impacts on the fabric of the local community.	<p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development. Furthermore, there will be opportunities for existing and potentially new local businesses to source low carbon heat and power.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local businesses or residents, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). ES Chapter 15: Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) assesses impacts on local businesses and concludes, there will be not significant effects and that the creation of jobs during the construction of the Proposed Development for example will give rise to locally significant effects in terms of the employment opportunities created. ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the health effects potentially arising from the Proposed development and concludes that with mitigation in place these would not be significant.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE47	Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development will bring limited supply chain benefits due to the lack of relevant businesses in the local area.	<p>In addition to measures design to mitigate environmental effects the Applicant has prepared an Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>ES Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) confirms that the Applicant will commit to supporting local suppliers. This will include support for existing businesses to enable them to benefit from local supply chain opportunities provided by the Proposed Development. These commitments are secured in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>Although not an exhaustive list, examples of the types of goods and services that the Applicant will require during construction and operation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete supplies; • Mechanical and Electrical services; • Welding and fitting; • Scaffolding; • Mobile plant hire; • Crane and lifting equipment hire; • Tool hire; • Accommodation (Hotel/B&B); • Painting; • cleaning; • catering; • Pest control; and • Landscape services.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE48	Local Community	Concern about the impact of the Proposed Development on neighbouring businesses and the potential to deter custom for those businesses.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local businesses or residents, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) . ES Chapter 15 Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) assesses impacts on local businesses and concludes, there will be not significant effects. Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit.
SE49	Local Community	Support for increased employment and apprenticeship opportunities arising from the proposed development.	Comments acknowledged and the Applicant's employment and skills commitments are provided in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which will be secured via a requirement of the DCO.
SE50	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV should provide support and funding for local community projects.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits. These commitments are discussed the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE51	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV should support the provision of business rate relief for local businesses.	The ability to provide business relief lies outside of the Applicant's control.
SE52	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV provide a playground area and equipment on Pickards Way.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits. These commitments are discussed the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE53	Fenland District Council	Concern about the effects of the Proposed Development on the economy and businesses of Wisbech.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is unlikely to have significant effects on local businesses. The ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes that access to the EfW CHP Facility Site for HGVs has been designed to reduce the potential for congestion whilst the potential for wider environmental effects has been minimised, where this is possible, with mitigation listed within the relevant ES topic chapters 6 to 17. The ability for local businesses to access renewable heat and power should be considered a positive benefit.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust, and travel management) Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4) Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7)
SE54	Wisbech, March and District	Concerns about the negative effects of the Proposed Development on the local cultural heritage of Wisbech and tourism.	The tourism and cultural offer of Wisbech is related directly to the historic core of the town. The socio-economic assessment report in ES Chapter 15: Socio



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
	Trades Union Council		economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) , concludes that there would be no significant effect upon tourism.
SE55	Local Community	Concern about the need for local worker accommodation during construction and whether this has been considered by the developer.	The Applicant does not consider that there will be a requirement for specific purpose-built worker accommodation during construction given that the majority of contractors will only be on site for a proportion of the 3 year construction period. The effects upon the local housing market are assessed within ES Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) which recognises the Applicant's commitment to maximise local employment via the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) . Maximising the local workforce would reduce demand for housing. The assessment concludes that effects upon the local housing market would not be significant.
SE56	Local Community	Suggestion that waste awareness and education is not needed as it is already provided by schools and colleges.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing waste awareness and education; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE57	Local Community	Concern that there is insufficient information in relation to the community benefits and job opportunities.	<p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE58	Local Community	Concern that the identified community benefits will not be delivered.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE59	Local Community	Request for more detailed information with regards to links with local schools, colleges, and universities to provide work experience, placement and apprenticeship opportunities and the level of help that MVV will provide and to whom.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE60	Local Community	Suggestion that MVA should provide support and funding for improvements to Wisbech Town Centre.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits, including improvements to the local environment. These commitments are discussed in the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14)</p> <p>In preparing the final Community Benefits Plan, feedback from Stakeholders will be used to ensure the proposals are suitable for the local community. The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE61	Local Community	Concern that there is insufficient information about the proposed community benefits that the Proposed Development will provide specifically in relation to educational and learning opportunities such as the visitor facilities for schools and community workshops.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE62	Local Community	Concern that the proposed Local Liaison Group would have little influence once the Proposed Development is consented.	<p>MVV have successfully established liaison committees at other facilities. They are an effective way to establish two-way constructive communication with the public. The Applicant has included an Outline Community Benefits Plan (Volume 7.14) within the DCO application. This reiterates the Applicant's commitment to the provision of a Local Liaison Committee (LLC), how it will be convened and how it will operate. During the Stage 2 Statutory Consultation the Applicant received a number of requests to join the LLC and will contact those who expressed an interest. The Applicant intends to convene the first meeting of the LLC once the DCO application has been accepted for Examination to enable local residents to engage closely with all stages of the Proposed Development from planning, through construction, commissioning, and the operational period. Local residents are invited to sign up for regular updates and meetings.</p>
SE63	Local Community	Concern that the impact of waste awareness and education would be limited due to the high	<p>MVV has substantial experience in educating and informing communities on the benefits of reduction, reuse and recycling at its existing EfW CHP facilities.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
		volume of non-recyclable products and packaging.	It is therefore of the opinion that there should be no barrier to similar and successful awareness raising at the Proposed Development.
SE64	Local Community	Concern about the effect of noise impacts from the Proposed Development on productivity and studying.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect residents, such as noise, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). The ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) considers the potential for noise effects, and it identifies those receptors where effects could be considered significant and not significant. Mitigation measures are proposed for the construction and operational phases of the development and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Volume 7.12); and • Operational Noise Management Plan (ES Appendix 7D: Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4)).
SE65	Local Community	Concern about the impact on the local economy of the Proposed Development preventing the reopening of the rail line in Wisbech.	<p>The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local businesses. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening but should it reopen, the type of rail connection that would be developed, the Applicant has identified land within the EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential road bridge embankment and a waste unloading area. ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) provides further details of the land identified above.</p> <p>The Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another.</p>
SE66	Local Community	Objection to the Proposed Development due to the need to use compulsory purchase orders to acquire land for the facility and associated infrastructure.	<p>The Applicant's preference is to acquire the land rights it requires for the Proposed Development via voluntary agreement. Nevertheless, it is essential to ensure the timely delivery of the Proposed Development and the Applicant is therefore seeking compulsory powers to deliver the Proposed Development, should voluntary agreement not be reached or ultimately not be effective. Further details on the justification for compulsory acquisition powers is set out in the Statement of Reasons.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE67	Local Community	Concern that the Proposed Development will result in increased insurance premiums for residents and businesses in the local area.	The Applicant does not have information available to it to enable it to comment on whether or not insurance policies will increase as a result of the Proposed Development. It may be of relevance however that ES Chapter 17 Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2) does not identify any significant effects as a result of the Proposed Development, indeed the Planning Inspectorate was content that with mitigation in place, the consideration of such effects could be scoped out.
SE68	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development will adversely impact on the Fens National Character Area.	The ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) has concluded that there will be no significant impact upon this area.
SE69	CPRE	Concern that the Proposed Development will adversely impact on Landscape Character Types and Areas in Cambridgeshire, Peterborough, South Lincolnshire and West Norfolk.	ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) has undertaken an assessment of the construction and operational effects of the Proposed Development upon the landscape character types and areas and has concluded they would not be significant.
SE70	South Holland District Council	Support for the employment of local people as an important community benefit of the proposed development.	The Applicant agrees that it is important to support local employment opportunities and as such has prepared an Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which includes commitments to support local employment.
SE71	South Holland District Council	Support for the use of local suppliers as an important community benefit of the proposed development.	The Applicant agrees that it is important to support local employment opportunities and as such has prepared an Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which includes measures to support local supply chains.
SE72	South Holland District Council	Support for skills development for staff and community as an important community benefit of the proposed development.	The Applicant agrees that it is important to support local employment opportunities and as such has prepared an Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) .
SE73	South Holland District Council	Support for working with local community groups as an important community benefit of the proposed development.	MVV have successfully established liaison committees at their other facilities. They are an effective way to establish two-way constructive communication with the public. The Local Liaison Committee for Medworth will include



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>representatives of the local community. Local residents invited to sign up for regular updates and meetings. Further information is provided within the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14). This strategy also includes and includes support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.</p> <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE74	South Holland District Council	Support for biodiversity and ecological enhancement as an important community benefit of the proposed development.	The Applicant agrees that this is important, and the proposed Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) will include for a range of options the selection and delivery of which will be undertaken in consultation with the local community.
SE75	Natural England	Support for the consideration of effects of the scheme on walkers, cyclists, and horse riders in PEIR Chapter 6.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) includes an Outline Operational Travel Plan (Appendix 6C Volume 6.4) to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport by staff to the EfW CHP Facility. There would be no direct effects upon users of public rights of way as they are not directly affected by the Proposed Development. Whilst Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) has concluded that some public rights of way and long distance footpaths and cycle routes would experience significant visual effects, Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) considers that the effects would not dissuade people from using them.</p>
SE76	Natural England	Concern that Appendix 6B does not put in place diversions for when footpaths are closed in periods of construction. Suggestion to provide alternative routes for non-road users.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) confirms that since Statutory Consultation the Proposed Development has been amended such that no PRoWs will be directly affected, although the Grid Connection will cross under a section of the A47 verge which marks a break in the Halfpenny Lane PRoW. Given the context of this location and given that works will be undertaken at night and reinstated by day the assessment reported in ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) considers it unnecessary to prepare a management plan for this one location.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE77	Natural England	Suggestion to reference the relevant Right of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) confirms that no public right of way will be directly affected by the Proposed Development, (Halfpenny Lane at the point it crosses the A47 is not a PRow). As the Grid Connection works will take place overnight it is not considered necessary to prepare a management strategy for this one location. However, improvements to the local footpath network could come forward as part of a community benefits package should this be the choice of the local community in consultation with the Applicant.</p>
SE78	Natural England	Suggestion to incorporate measures to encourage people to access the countryside for quiet enjoyment through measures such as reinstating existing footpaths and creating new footpaths etc.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) confirms that no public right of way will be directly affected by the Proposed Development(Halfpenny Lane is not PRow at the point it crosses the A47). However, improvements to the local footpath network could come forward as part of a Community Benefits Strategy should this be the choice of the local community in consultation with the Applicant.</p>
SE79	Natural England	Suggestion to incorporate relevant public access aspects of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) confirms that no public rights of way will not be affected by the Proposed Development. However, improvements to the local footpath network could come forward as part of a community benefits package should this be the choice of the local community in consultation with the Applicant.</p>
SE80	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concerns about the distress the proposal brings to the local residents.	<p>The Applicant takes any potential for its proposals to impact upon the welfare and wellbeing of local residents seriously.ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) includes for an assessment on mental as well as physical health. The scope and methodology for this assessment was agreed with the local authorities and with the former Public Health England and concludes that effects would not be significant.</p> <p>MVV have successfully established liaison committees at their other facilities. They are an effective way to establish two-way constructive communication with the public. The Local Liaison Committee for Medworth will include representatives of the local community. Local residents invited to sign up for regular updates and meetings. Further information is provided within the Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14). This strategy also</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE81	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Complaint as the employment benefits is outweighed by the potential negative impacts on the town, its economy and the lived environment.	<p>includes and includes support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.</p> <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to providing community benefits; these are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE82	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Recognition of the full time jobs to be created during operation and a recognition that there is a current shortage of skilled and unskilled operatives in the local food processing plants.	<p>ES topic Chapters 6 to 17 (Volume 6.2) identify the positive and negative effects of the Proposed Development, and this information is used in the Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) to consider the planning balance which finds that the planning balance weighs in favour of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Applicant is seeking to maximise the number of local jobs created during the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. It has worked with Norfolk County Council to develop an Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which would include support for apprenticeships, internships and education as well as engagement with local suppliers. The Applicant considers that the Proposed Development would have a beneficial effect upon local jobs and would be supportive of the types of skills training operated both by Norfolk and Cambridgeshire CCs.</p>
SE83	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Linked to the point raised above, that the same type of job vacancies which will be offered by the project will reflect those already vacant job positions in the local area.	<p>The Applicant is committed to developing a range of job opportunities both skilled and unskilled. The commitments are reported in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council. The Applicant is committed to supporting local people to take advantage of the job opportunities that will be on offer both during the construction and the operation phases. Measures to support training, along with measures to support the local economy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; and • Local employment during construction and operation; • Support for the local supply chain; <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p>
SE84	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Suggestion that the Wisbech Gateway project will provide greater and wider employment opportunities for the area than what the incinerator project offers.	<p>The Wisbech Gateway project would be located at the junction of the A47 with Cromwell Road. It is correct that in the operational phase the Gateway project is likely to employ more people than the Proposed Development. However, the Proposed Development is located to the north of the Gateway project and is separate to it. It should not prevent the implementation and operation of the Gateway project.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE85	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Objection towards the Proposed Development as it will likely deter visitors from visiting the historic town centre.	The ES includes an assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development upon the historic townscape at ES Chapter 10: Historic Environment (Volume 6.2) and has concluded that these are not significant. ES Chapter 15 Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) also assesses the potential effects upon local tourist attractions. This concludes that they would not be significant.
SE86	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern that the Proposed Development will deter the positive benefits from the Wisbech Gateway project.	The Wisbech Gateway project would be located at the junction of the A47 with Cromwell Road. It is correct that in the operational phase the Gateway project is likely to employ more people than the Proposed Development. However, the Proposed Development is located to the north of the Gateway project and is separate to it. It would not prevent the implementation and operation of the Wisbech Gateway project.
SE87	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern that the chimney and the facility will have a negative impact on the social, cultural and economic life of Wisbech.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including visual impacts and socioeconomic impacts of the Proposed Development have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1).</p> <p>The visual effects of the proposed chimneys have been assessed with the results presented within the ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2). The conclusion is that whilst there will be some significant effects arising from the EfW CHP Facility as a whole these would not extend to the town of Wisbech itself but to some individual properties, footpaths and community receptors in Begdale.</p> <p>The socio economic effects of the Proposed Development have been assessed in ES Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2). In relation to tourism it concludes that the Proposed Development would not dissuade visitors from attending the local tourism attractions in the town, some of which relate to its historic character.</p>
SE88	Wisbech, March and District	Opposed to the fact that the few jobs being created is outweighed by the threats the	The impacts of the Proposed Development have been examined in great detail and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2). The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) considers the outcome of the ES and assesses conformity with national



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
	Trades Union Council	facility brings to the wider economy of the town and area.	<p>and local planning policy. The planning balance for the Proposed Development concludes it is firmly in favour of the Proposed Development. Therefore, development consent should be granted. Ultimately a decision as to whether employment benefits outweigh potential negative benefits will be taken by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Regardless of the balance of effects, the Applicant is committed to delivering a community benefits package, an approach undertaken at MVV's other UK facilities. These benefits are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE89	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concerned that the incinerator project will undermine the benefits the Wisbech Gateway project will provide to the town economy.	<p>The Wisbech Gateway project would be located at the junction of the A47 with Cromwell Road. It is correct that in the operational phase the Gateway project is likely to employ more people than the Proposed Development. However, the Proposed Development is located to the north of the Gateway project and is separate to it. It would not prevent the implementation and operation of the Wisbech Gateway project.</p>
SE90	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Objection to the proposal as it will have a negative impact on the residents of Wisbech, affecting their human rights.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents, such as noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust, and travel management) • Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) • Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) • Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7) <p>The Applicant has undertaken a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment of the Proposed development. This is reported in ES Appendix 9K: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (Volume 6.4). The assessment considers effects upon residential properties in proximity to the Proposed Development and concludes that effects would not be so significant such that they would make properties unsatisfactory places to live.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE91	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Objection to the proposal as any minimal employment benefits will be outweighed by the potential negative impacts on the town.	<p>The impacts of the Proposed Development have been examined in great detail and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2). The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) considers the outcome of the ES and assesses conformity with national and local planning policy. The planning balance for the Proposed Development concludes it is firmly in favour of the Proposed Development. Therefore, development consent should be granted. Ultimately a decision as to whether employment benefits outweigh potential negative benefits will be taken by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust, and travel management) • Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) • Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) • Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9) • Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) • Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7)
SE92	Fenland District Council	Concern that the detrimental impact of the Proposed Development will outweigh any community benefits, such as a sizeable s106 contribution, generated.	<p>The impacts of the Proposed Development have been examined in great detail and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2). The Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) considers the outcome of the ES and assesses conformity with national and local planning policy. The planning balance for the Proposed Development concludes it is firmly in favour of the Proposed Development. Therefore, development consent should be granted. Ultimately a decision as to whether employment benefits outweigh potential negative benefits will be taken by the Secretary of State.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>Regardless of the balance of effects, the Applicant is committed to delivering a community benefits package, an approach undertaken at MVV's other UK facilities. These benefits are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The Outline Community Benefits Plan (Volume 7.14) is not relied on in the planning balance, however the final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE93	Fenland District Council	Concern that employment opportunities would not benefit the local community as the number of jobs created are minimal.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development(Volume 6.2) states, during construction, around 700 jobs will be created and once operational the Proposed Development will create up to 40 FTE new skilled jobs including waste acceptance personnel, operational engineers and facility-</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE94	Fenland District Council	Concern about traffic disruption arising from the Proposed Development impacting on the operations of local businesses, including transporting good and employee access to workplaces.	<p>based support staff. The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy will be in place to support local people to respond to these opportunities.</p> <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. <p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1). Alternative means of accessing the Proposed Development were initially considered and are reported within Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2). The use of Algores Way for all HGV deliveries was considered to be inappropriate and contrary to national policy which suggests that an appropriate location is one as close as possible to the main, trunk, road network. In this case the A47. The use of New Bridge Lane via Cromwell Road ensures that HGV traffic is removed from the local highway network at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) has assessed the potential for congestion caused by the Proposed Development and it concludes this will not be significant. To manage traffic impacts during construction and operations the Applicant will implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan (ES Appendix 6A (Volume 6.3)) and Outline Operational Travel Plan (ES Appendix 6C (Volume 6.3))</p> <p>The operational management plans relevant to traffic include will be secured by a DCO Requirement.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			The Applicant has explained within ES Chapter 2: Alternatives (Volume 6.2) how it considered the use of Weasenham Lane/Algores Way for all construction and operational traffic but that it concluded on the basis of planning policy and potential environmental effects that the use of a reopened New Bridge Lane would be preferable.
SE95	Fenland District Council	Concern that the adverse visual impact of the Proposed Development will deter tourists from visiting Wisbech.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including visual and socioeconomic impacts of the Proposed Development have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) and Chapter 15: Socio-economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) respectively.</p> <p>Concerning visual impacts, the ES concludes that whilst there will be some significant effects arising from the EFW CHP Facility, as a whole these would not extend to the town of Wisbech itself but to some individual properties, footpaths and community receptors in Begdale.</p> <p>Concerning tourism, the ES concludes that effects upon tourism will not be significant.</p>
SE96	Fenland District Council	Concern that the perceived risk to health of the Proposed Development will deter tourists from visiting Wisbech.	The ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) considers the potential for effects upon health and concludes that these will not be significant.
SE97	BC of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that pollution of agricultural soil as a result of the Proposed Development could cause the loss of organic accreditation and associated revenue for farmers.	The ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) details the dispersion modelling carried out. Effects on nearby designated ecological sites have been considered. Pollutant concentrations and deposition levels are provided and these are likely to be comparable to nearby agricultural areas and are not significant. Organic accreditation is not expected to be affected by the Proposed Development.
SE98	Steve MP	Concern that the Proposed Development only produces detrimental impact on the environmental and local community without delivering local or national benefits.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect the local community, such as traffic, noise and odour, have been assessed and reported in the ES and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Volume 6.1) . Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans will be secured by either a DCO Requirement or by the Environmental Permit and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) (includes a range of mitigation measures to control e.g., noise, dust, and travel management)• Outline Operational Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11)• Outline Operational Noise Management Plan (Volume 6.4)• Outline Operational Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10)• Outline Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9)• Outline Operational Workers Travel Plan (Volume 6.4)• Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7) <p>The Project Benefits (Volume 7.4) highlights the local and national benefits of the Proposed Development and includes, displacing landfilling of residual waste thereby reduce net Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions and compliance with local and national energy and waste policies to deliver decentralised low carbon energy in accordance with the waste hierarchy;</p> <p>Regardless of the balance of effects, the Applicant is committed to delivering a community benefits package, an approach undertaken at MVV's other UK facilities. These benefits are set out in the following documents.</p> <p>Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support;• Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements;• Local employment during construction and operation; and• Support the local supply chain.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
			<p>The Outline Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by a DCO requirement.</p> <p>Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) and includes the following proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of a local liaison committee; • Employment of a Community Liaison Manager; • Guided site tours and a visitor area within the administration building; • Establishment of a community fund and a sponsorship fund; and • Support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area. <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
SE99	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the proposal needs to support local people to secure employment opportunities in both the construction and operational stages.	<p>The Applicant is committed to providing local employment and skills opportunities. These commitments, to be secured by a DCO Requirement, include the following and are discussed in further detail in the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/ placements; • Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain.
SE100	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that for MVV to close off a public right of way, a Traffic Regulation Order would be required under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, rather than Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 as stated in Paragraph 3.3.11 of the Traffic and Transport Appendices of the PEIR.	<p>ES Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) confirms that having amended the Proposed Development since the Statutory Consultation, there is no longer a requirement to temporarily or permanently close a public right of way.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	Response from Applicant
SE101	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request for information on the impacts of a 30% non-local workforce on air quality, congestion, school places, and early years services.	The potential impact of workers upon emissions is included within ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) and Chapter 14: Climate (Volume 6.2) . Effects upon local community services are covered in ES Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) . In each case effects are not considered to be significant.
SE102	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that opportunities to improve the local PRoW be considered as part of wider responsibility to the local community due to PRoW links with mental health.	<p>The Applicant has now prepared an Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) which will be submitted with the application. An objective of the Outline Community Benefits Strategy is support for local initiatives that improve wellbeing and environmental improvements in the local area.</p> <p>In finalising the Community Benefits Plan, consultation will be undertaken with the local community in order to decide how and where this should be used.</p> <p>The final Community Benefits Plan will be published by the Applicant prior to commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>



The Applicant's response to issues raised regarding traffic and transport

The issues raised by consultees are summarised in **Table 11.1 Issues raised regarding traffic and transport** below and are accompanied by an indication of which group of consultees raised the issue as well as the Applicant's response.

Table 11.11 Issues raised regarding traffic and transport

ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT01	Local Community Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the number of HGVs needed to access the site daily.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including HGV traffic associated with construction and operations, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4). Between these documents daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing point. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP); • Operational Travel Plan; and • Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP).



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT02	Local Community Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School	Concern about how dangerous roads such as the A47, A1/A1M and A1101 will become, given they are already dangerous.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road junction analysis, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) , accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . The TA includes a link and junction highways safety assessment, identifying accident hot spots and how the increases in traffic at these locations as a result of the Proposed Development can be managed. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.
TT03	Local Community Commercial Safety Systems Ltd Emneth Parish Council English Brothers Ltd Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd Icon Engineering Ltd Kirk Coachworks Liz Truss MP	Concern that the road infrastructure cannot cope with an increase in HGV traffic and will cause gridlock.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing points. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	MJ Acoustics		
	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School		
	Nordelph Parish Council		
	PIL		
	Shampers Dog Grooming		
	The Sportsman Pub		
	Walsoken Parish Council		
TT04	Local Community	Concern that the proposed routes are unsuitable.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and routes, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). These documents identify the routes that would be used by construction and operational traffic. They conclude that the increase in traffic would not give rise to significant, residual effects. Improvements are proposed to New Bridge Lane and a CTMP and Travel Plan has been prepared to manage construction traffic and encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel during both the construction and operational phases.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT05	Local Community Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd Icon Engineering Ltd MJ Acoustics	Complaint that road infrastructure is not well maintained and is subject to damage and sinkholes.	The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT06	Local Community Department for Transport Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern that the proposals will prevent the rail network from being re-established.	The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another. The Applicant has set aside land within the EFW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and, should it be required, land for a road bridge embankment. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) provide further details.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT07	Local Community	Concern with the number of accidents/deaths on local roads and how this may be affected by increased traffic.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road junction analysis, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) The TA includes a link and junction highways safety assessment, identifying accident hot spots and how the increases in traffic at these locations as a result of the Proposed Development can be managed. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p>
TT08	Local Community	Complaint that the road infrastructure already cannot cope with the current traffic levels.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing points. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT09	Local Community	Concern that a new or improved road will not provide noticeable improvement.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including Access Improvements along New Bridge Lane and Algores Way, have been assessed</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT10	Local Community	Concern that the proposed unloading times are unrealistic and will lead to more traffic, queueing and pollution.	<p>and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>Rather the access the EfW CHP Facility via the existing entrance off Algores Way via Weasenham, all HGV traffic to and from the EfW CHP Facility Site will be directed onto New Bridge Lane. New Bridge Lane will be widened and upgraded to accommodate HGVs. Further improvements include a new footway, pedestrian crossing point and street lighting. Only staff and visitors will access the EfW CHP Facility via a repositioned access point off Algores Way. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development with the Access Improvements in place, would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Based on MVV's experience, HGV traffic movements at EfW CHP facilities are not tied to the general 'rush-hour' periods and movements are spread over the working day.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including construction and operational hours of working, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). The TA concludes that queue lengths on the highway network would not be significantly extended as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT11	Local Community	Concern about the impact of increase traffic on elderly residents.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including pedestrian severance, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. Consideration is given to the impacts upon all users of local roads, footpaths and cycleways. The TA concludes that there would be no residual significant effects.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT12	Local Community Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concern that increase traffic will further damage local roads.	<p>The maintenance of the local and strategic road network is the responsibility of National Highways (NH), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.</p>
TT13	Local Community Kirk Coachworks Nene and Ramnoth School	Concern about the increase in traffic on the A47 and how it would affect daily life.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road junction analysis, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments have been undertaken for the A47 between Kings Lynn and the</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	<p>and Elm Road Primary School</p> <p>PIL</p> <p>Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council</p>		<p>A47 Guyhirn Roundabout and they assess all the links and junctions in this section of the A47. No significant effects have been identified.</p>
TT14	<p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern that as prohibiting access to Weasenham Lane and Algores Way would not be effective, as new road is not a solution.</p>	<p>Appendix 6A Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4) has been prepared to support the DCO which includes restrictions on the movements of HGVs during the Construction phase. During construction, HGVs will only access Algores Way from the Cromwell Road corridor. No HGVs will be permitted along the Elm High Road or Wisbech town centre.</p> <p>ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) confirms, to minimise potential impacts on the local community, the Applicant will not route HGVs through the town of Wisbech and from the A1101 Elm High Road. This route restriction was suggested by CCC during the consultation process and is an agreed approach. Route restrictions for any HGVs other than local collection RCVs would therefore be implemented in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A1101 north of A47 Elm Road roundabout; • Churchill Road (north of Elm High Road); and • Weasenham Lane (between Algores Way and Elm High Road) <p>The routing restrictions set out above are included in an Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (Volume 7.15).</p>
TT15	<p>Local Community</p>	<p>Concern that nothing can mitigate the increase in large vehicle traffic.</p>	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing points. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT16	Local Community	Complaint that the proposals appear to not understand the current road infrastructure.	The DCO is supported by a detailed Transport Assessment in addition to an updated EIA Traffic and Transport Assessment. Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments provide a very detailed breakdown of the local and strategic road network including reporting of traffic data from late 2021 to establish a clear understanding of the current operation of the highways network.
TT17	Local Community	Concern that modifying the A47 would be too expensive as it is on a river embankment.	ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) has concluded that improvements to the A47 are not required.
TT18	Local Community	Concern about the effect of increased traffic on commuting time.	Based on MVV's experience, HGV traffic movements at EfW CHP facilities are not tied to the general 'rush-hour' periods and movements are spread over the working day.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT19	Local Community	Concern about the increase in traffic on the Weasenham Lane and how it would affect daily life.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including construction and operational hours of working, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments have not identified any locations where significant residual effects would occur and it is therefore considered unlikely that there will be significant effects upon existing commuter times.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP. <p>Based on MVV's experience, HGV traffic movements at EfW CHP facilities are not tied to the general 'rush-hour' periods and movements are spread over the working day.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including construction and operational hours of working, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments consider Weasenham Lane in detail and the three key junctions on this road (Cromwell Road, Algores Way and Elm High Road).</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT20	Local Community WEP Fabrications Ltd	Concern about the increase in traffic on the Algores Way and how it would affect daily life.	<p>Based on MVV's experience, HGV traffic movements at EfW CHP facilities are not tied to the general 'rush-hour' periods and movements are spread over the working day.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including construction and operational hours of working, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Algores Way is an existing industrial estate road which will experience an increase in traffic as a result of the development. The Transport Assessment and EIA Traffic and Transport Assessment conclude that effects will not be significant.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT21	Local Community	Concern about the increase in traffic in the area and its effects.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Peterborough City Council PIL		<p>Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing points. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT22	Local Community	Suggestion to re-establish the rail links.	<p>The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another. The Applicant has set aside land within the EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and, should it be required, land for a road bridge embankment. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) provide further details.</p>
TT23	Local Community	Suggestion to locate the facility along a dual carriageway such as the A1.	<p>The location of the Proposed Development meets the Applicant's essential and preferable site selection criteria. Further details are provided in ES Chapter 2 Alternatives (Volume 6.2)</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT24	Local Community	Complaint that the community is being told different things about the proposed access.	At statutory consultation two HGV access alternatives were assessed. These were the Applicant's favoured choice of using a reopened New Bridge Lane and a second option to use Weasenham Lane/Algores Way. ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) confirms It is proposed that both accesses are used in the construction and operational phases. However, in the operational phase, HGVs will only route to the EfW CHP Facility via the New Bridge Lane, whilst staff and visitors will use the Algores Way access. .
TT25	Local Community Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the increase in traffic on Cromwell Road and how it would affect daily life.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments consider Cromwell Road as a key access route to the site and conclude that it would not be significantly affected.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT26	Local Community	Suggestion to provide a dual carriageway.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the highway network



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT27	Local Community Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School PIL WEP Fabrications Ltd	Concern about increased traffic causing more pollution/noise.	<p>can accommodate the Proposed Development subject to improvements to New Bridge Lane.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents, such as, noise and pollution from traffic, have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) assesses the impacts on noise from traffic generated by the Proposed Development. Changes in traffic noise level due to vehicle flows associated with the construction and operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed in accordance with best practice and national guidance. Beyond localised impacts at two dwellings on New Bridge Lane, for which the Applicant is undertaking mitigation to remove/reduce the effects, no significant effects are predicted.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2) concludes, there will not be significant effects as a result of an increase in vehicle emissions.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT28	Local Community	Concern that the lorry access proposals are moving the problem elsewhere.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) describes the proposed Access Improvements to New Bridge Lane to accommodate HGV traffic.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the Access Improvements to new Bridge Lane, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). These assessments set out how the impacts arising from HGVs have been assessed and conclude that there will be no significant residual effects.
TT29	Local Community PIL	Concern that improving New Bridge Lane will not help solve any issues.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) describes the proposed Access Improvements to New Bridge Lane to accommodate HGV traffic.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the Access Improvements to new Bridge Lane, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). These assessments set out how the impacts arising from HGVs have been assessed and conclude that there will be no significant residual effects.</p>
TT30	Local Community	Concern that the lorry access proposals will not prevent traffic coming from the North.	<p>Outline proposals for vehicle routing restrictions, including preventing HGV movements through Wisbech town and surrounding villages during construction and operations are stated in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), Further details of the construction traffic management proposals are set out in the Outline CTMP (Appendix 6B)</p> <p>To be secured by DCO Requirements, the Applicant shall prepare a detailed CTMP and OTMP.</p>
TT31	Local Community	Concern that increase in traffic would further delay ambulances/emergency services.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the Access Improvements to new Bridge Lane, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the highway network can accommodate the Proposed Development subject to Access Improvements to New Bridge Lane and that the construction and operation of the Proposed Development will not lead to delays on the network.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT32	Local Community	Concern that the proposed improvements to local roads will not solve traffic issues.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the Access Improvements to new Bridge Lane and Algores Way, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) , accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . These assessments conclude Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic on local roads.
TT33	Local Community Kirk Coachworks	Concern about the increase in traffic on New Bridge Lane and how it would affect daily life.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the Access Improvements to new Bridge Lane, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) , accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments consider New Bridge Lane as a key access route to the EfW CHP Facility Site and conclude that it would not be significantly affected.
TT34	Local Community	Support for the proposed infrastructure improvements.	Noted.
TT35	Local Community	Suggestion to make the A47 a dual carriageway for its entire length.	The Applicant notes the point raised but is unable to consider the dualling of the A47 as the assessments which it has undertaken confirm that it would not be required to facilitate the Proposed Development. Further details are provided in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) , accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) .
TT36	Local Community	Suggestion that no traffic should access the site from the A17 via the A1101 or any roads east of the A16.	Outline proposals for vehicle routing restrictions, including preventing HGV movements through Wisbech town and surrounding villages during construction and operations are stated in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) , Further details of the construction traffic management proposals are set out in the Outline CTMP (Appendix 6B)



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			To be secured by DCO Requirements, the Applicant shall prepare a detailed CTMP and OTMP.
TT37	Local Community	Suggestion to transport waste via rail.	The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another. The Applicant has set aside land within the EFW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and, should it be required, land for a road bridge embankment. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) provide further details.
TT38	Local Community	Concern that when roads need work it is unclear how lorries would access the site and that during this, traffic would increase further.	Like all road users, the Applicant would follow the Highways Authority route diversion(s).
TT39	Local Community Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School WEP Fabrications Ltd	Concern that MVV cannot guarantee that lorry drivers will use the agreed routes.	Outline proposals for vehicle routing restrictions, including preventing HGTV movements through Wisbech town and surrounding villages during construction and operations are stated in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) , Further details of the construction traffic management proposals are set out in the Outline CTMP (Appendix 6B) To be secured by DCO Requirements, the Applicant shall prepare a detailed CTMP and OTMP.
TT40	Local Community	Concern that the routes proposed will cause gridlock at certain times of the day.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the highway capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) , accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessments for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. Significant residual effects are not identified.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT41	Local Community	Suggestion to improve, widen and lengthen roads to reduce disruption.	<p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT41	Local Community	Suggestion to improve, widen and lengthen roads to reduce disruption.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the highway capacity and any consequential road improvements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Beyond the Applicant's proposed Access Improvements to New Bridge Lane and Algores Way, the assessments conclude no further road improvement works are required to satisfactorily accommodate the Proposed Development. Further details of the Access Improvements are provided in ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development and ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2)</p>
TT42	Local Community	Concern about the destruction of New Bridge Lane.	<p>The Applicant does not propose to destroy New Bridge Lane. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) explains what Access Improvements are proposed and includes improvements to New Bridge Lane. The improvements to New Bridge Lane include road widening, a footpath, pedestrian crossing point and street lighting.</p>
TT43	Local Community	Concern that lorries will be using a one-way road that is already congested.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) explains what Access Improvements are proposed and includes improvements to New Bridge Lane. The improvements to New Bridge Lane include road widening to accommodate two-way traffic to and from the EfW CHP Facility Site.</p>
TT44	Local Community	Concern about the lack of public transport in the area.	<p>ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4), identifies the availability</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT45	Local Community	Request to not put new lanes on roads.	<p>of public transport in the local area, which includes for bus routes along Cromwell Road and Weasenham Lane which would be within walking distance of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) explains what Access Improvements are proposed. Beyond road widening of New Bridge Lane the Applicant does not intend to put new lanes on existing roads.</p>
TT46	Local Community	Concern that the mitigation measures are insufficient.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including consideration of embedded mitigation, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The assessment concludes that with the mitigation measures in place the effects arising from increases in traffic will not be significant. The operational management plans that relate to traffic and transportation will be secured by a DCO Requirement and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT47	Local Community	Request to know whether New Bridge Lane will be opened all the way through to Begdale.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) explains what Access Improvements are proposed for New Bridge Lane. The road will still terminate at the A47 as in the existing situation and as such will not provided direct access to Begdale.</p>
TT48	Local Community	Request to know how traffic will be discouraged from bypassing through the smaller villages.	<p>Outline proposals for vehicle routing restrictions, including preventing HGTV movements through Wisbech town and surrounding villages during construction and operations are stated in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), Further details of the construction traffic management proposals are set out in the Outline CTMP (Appendix 6B)</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			To be secured by DCO Requirements, the Applicant shall prepare a detailed CTMP and Operational TMP.
TT49	Local Community	Request for information on the percentage increase in HGV traffic in the area.	ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) provides the percentage increase for HGVs during both the construction (Table 6.27) and operational (Table 6.32) phases of the Proposed Development.
TT50	Local Community	Support for the lorry access proposals.	Noted.
TT51	Local Community Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the increase in traffic on the A17 and how it would affect daily life.	Since the PEIR submission the junction of the A47 and A17 has been added to the assessments presented in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . These assessments do not indicate any significant traffic impacts to the A17.
TT52	Local Community PIL Shampers Dog Grooming	Complaint that the A47 is the only road in and out of Wisbech and is single-carriageway.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including highway capacity, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments consider the A47 as a key access route to the site and conclude that it would not be significantly affected.
TT53	Local Community	Concern that traffic and infrastructure issues cannot be solved as Wisbech has a large number of single-lane main roads.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including consideration of embedded mitigation, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>period as appropriate. These assessments consider the local highway network and conclude that it would not be significantly affected.</p>
TT54	Local Community	Concern that no Traffic Impact Assessment has been done.	<p>A TA accompanies the DCO application, see Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4)</p>
TT55	Local Community	Concern that HGV traffic and traffic from new residential developments will cause gridlock.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the highway capacity and growth factors, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessments for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. Significant residual effects are not identified.</p> <p>The approach to consider growth factors within the assessments was agreed with the local highway authority.</p>
TT56	Local Community	Concern that Weasenham Lane is often closed due to subsidence and that the proposed development would further exacerbate this.	<p>The maintenance of the local road network is the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, and unlike the current arrangements to the existing Waste Transfer Station (WTS), once operational, HGVs will access the EfW CHP Facility Site via New bridge Road only. Staff and visitors will access will be from Algores Way via Weasenham Lane.3 Description of the Proposed Development in the ES.</p>
TT57	Local Community	Suggestion that the siting of the proposed development is unsuitable due to the lack of	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including the highway capacity, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		dual carriageways or motorways in the local area.	<p>and Transport (Volume 6.2), accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments consider the A47 and the local highway network and conclude that it would not be significantly affected.</p>
TT58	<p>Local Community</p> <p>WEP Fabrications Ltd</p>	<p>Concern that increased HGV and traffic movements arising from the proposed development poses an increased safety risk, particularly for schoolchildren attending local schools.</p>	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road junction analysis, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) These documents conclude that the Proposed Development can be accessed satisfactorily and without undue significant negative effects upon pedestrians taking into account the provision of new pedestrian crossings on New Bridge Lane. The main route to the Proposed Development which is via New Bridge Lane does not pass by schools.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT59	<p>Local Community</p> <p>Commercial Safety Systems Ltd</p>	<p>Concern that traffic assessments and surveys undertaken are insufficient and have been carried out during periods of low traffic flow.</p>	<p>The traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) was undertaken after statutory consultation, so that it could better reflect traffic conditions (i.e., outside of any COVID pandemic lockdown). The date for the survey, October 2021, was agreed with the local highway authorities.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
	Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd Icon Engineering Ltd MJ Acoustics		
TT60	Local Community Engineering & Factory Supplies Ltd MJ Acoustics The Sportsman Pub	Concern that HGVs would need to re-route through unsuitable local roads during periods of congestion and road closures.	In the event of road closures, like all road users, the Applicant would follow the Highways Authority route diversion(s). ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) sets out the proposed traffic generation and this does not indicate any significant additional congestion issues as a result of the Proposed Development.
TT61	Local Community	Suggestion that HGV movements should be scheduled overnight to ease congestion on local roads during the daytime.	Based on MVV's experience, HGV traffic movements at EfW CHP facilities are not tied to the general 'rush-hour' periods and movements are spread over the working day. ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms the Applicant does not propose scheduled overnight HGV movements. The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including construction and operational hours of working, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT62	Local Community Icon Engineering Ltd	Request for clarification on whether MVV would fund road repairs and improvements needed due to the increased traffic movements brought about by the proposed development.	<p>period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that HGV movements can be accommodated within the daytime and without significantly affecting highway capacity.</p> <p>The maintenance of the local and strategic road network is the responsibility of National Highways (NH), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.</p>
TT63	Local Community	Concern about the impact of increased traffic and congestion on stress, health and wellbeing.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those that could affect local residents from traffic, such as, health and wellbeing, have been assessed and reported in the ES (Volume 6.2).</p> <p>ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.2) assesses the combination of impacts reported in the ES, to provide an indication of impacts on health and wellbeing. With mitigation in place, to be secured by either a DCO requirement or under the Environmental Permit, there are no residual significant impacts. Measures to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme; • The Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development; • Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EfW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards; • Various operational management plans to control, e.g., noise, dust, odour and fire prevention; and • A CTMP and operational route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT64	Local Community	Concern about the impact of increased HGV movements on the A1101 and the potential for existing subsidence issues to be exacerbated.	<p>The maintenance of the local and strategic road network is the responsibility of National Highways (NH), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment assesses New Bridge Lane as the primary access to the EfW CHP Facility Site, and the use of Algores Way (off Weasenham Lane) by staff and occasional light vehicles during operation. There will be minimal use of Weasenham Lane by HGVs during construction. The A1101 will only be used by staff vehicles in construction phase and as such this should not give rise to any existing subsidence issues. In the operational phase if there is a requirement for local waste vehicles (RCVs making rounds in Wisbech) they would need to route along the A1101 from Wisbech to the site, however other HGVs would not use this route. Further detail on the proposed routing for operational HGVs is provided in the Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (Volume 7.15).</p>
TT65	Local Community	Concern that waste will be transported for delivery to the proposed facility from further afield, including past existing energy-from-waste facilities.	<p>The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) has assessed the National and local need for the Proposed Development. The WFAA concludes, there is sufficient residual waste currently being disposed of to landfill or exported abroad that could otherwise be diverted to the EfW CHP Facility. It is possible that waste could travel past existing EfW facilities.</p> <p>By way of an example, the Applicant understands that residual was generated in Norfolk is currently transported by road to an EfW facility in Bedfordshire. Therefore, if the Proposed Development is granted a DCO, this waste could be diverted to the EfW CHP Facility and therefore reduce vehicle miles.</p>
TT66	Local Community	Concern that proposals are for lorries to access the site through New Bridge Lane, not to exit, so lorries will still have to travel through	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms HGVs will access and egress from New Bridge Lane in the Operational Scenario. No through HGV traffic will be permitted to leave via the staff and visitor Access at Algores Way.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT67	Local Community	Weasenham Lane and Algores Way and past Meadow gate School. Concern that accidents on the A47 will cause traffic to be diverted through nearby villages such as Guyhirn and Wisbech St Mary, or along roads such as Friday Bridge and Coldam, all of which are single-carriageway.	<p>Like all road users, the Applicant would follow the Highways Authority route diversion(s).</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the accident record of the local junctions and links, including on the A47 between Guyhirn Roundabout and the A17 has been undertaken in the ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and Transport Assessment (Appendix 6B Volume 6.4). No significant issues were noted on the A47 and as such the Proposed Development in itself should not give rise to a significant increase in accidents.</p> <p>Accidents involving third parties on the local and strategic highways network and any temporary diversions are outside of the control of the Applicant. If diversions are put on local roads during the construction or operational phases then traffic to the Proposed Development will need to divert with all other traffic as appropriate until roads reopen. The Applicant is aware of local residents concerns and would seek to communicate the presence of any reported accidents to hauliers ahead of their arrival.</p>
TT68	Local Community	Concern about the increase of traffic on single-carriageway roads.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road junction analysis, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network.</p>
TT69	Local Community	Concern about the impact of increased traffic movements created by the proposed development on delaying bus and taxi services.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road junction analysis, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network.
TT70	Local Community	Concern that during construction, lorries will be delivering machinery at night, as local roads are single-carriageway.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, it is not the Applicant's intention to delivery machinery at night unless this is with the prior agreement of the relevant local authority, for example, in the case of abnormal loads).
TT71	Local Community	Lorry access proposals will not help as they will still need to use the already congested A47 and A17.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including highway capacity, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . The assessments considered a number of different highways, the scope of which was agreed with the relevant highway authorities including National Highways. The assessments conclude that the Proposed Development should not lead to a significant effect upon the A17 or A47.
TT72	Local Community	Concern that increased traffic will cause problems for delivery lorries in the area.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including highway capacity, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network and as such should not delay delivery vehicles.
TT73	Local Community	Concern that the increased traffic will be even worse during holidays/summer.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including highway capacity, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			on the local highway network and will not delay existing public transport services.
TT74	Local Community	Concern that the Guyhirn roundabout could not support increased traffic.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including highway capacity, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment (including for the Guyhirn roundabout) for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network.
TT75	Local Community	Request to know if the lorries used to deliver materials and waste will be powered by electricity.	The Applicant has assumed for the purposes of the Air Quality assessment that the vehicles will have diesel engines. However, it is anticipated that over the lifetime of the Proposed Development low carbon forms of transportation are likely to be adopted.
TT76	Local Community	Concern that the whole infrastructure of the area would need to be replaced to accommodate the facility.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including highway capacity, infrastructure and including the Proposed Access Improvements on new Bridge Lane and Algores Way, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that no other infrastructure improvements are required.
TT77	Local Community	Request to know if the each of the 300 lorries will be inspected to see what is being burned every day.	The Applicant will ensure that a robust 'non-conforming deliveries' procedure is put in place which aims to intercept any non-conforming waste at the point of delivery. This has proven effective at MVV's existing UK facilities where such procedures are implemented; an Environmental Permit Requirement.
TT78	Local Community	Complaint that MVV have not tried to re-establish the rail line, which they stated they supported.	The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT79	Local Community	Suggestion to move access to a backroad that is currently not used.	<p>Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another. The Applicant has set aside land within the EFW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and, should it be required, land for a road bridge embankment. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) provide further details.</p>
TT80	Local Community	Request to know where the 300 lorries are coming from.	<p>The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) to comply with national policy, the DCO application must demonstrate that there is a need for the proposed waste management capacity and to do this requires defining a Study Area for the WFAA. Importantly though, the WFAA is a tool to illustrate that even within a restricted geographic catchment, the need for the waste management capacity offered by the Proposed Development is evident. This assessment is not a means of identifying that the Proposed Development should be tied to a specific catchment area. The spatial scope for the WFAA is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bedford (Unitary Authority); • Cambridgeshire County Council; • Central Bedfordshire (Unitary Authority); • City of Peterborough (Unitary Authority); • Essex County Council (including the Unitary Authorities of Southend on Sea and Thurrock); • Hertfordshire County Council; • Leicestershire County Council (including Leicester City); • Lincolnshire County Council; • Luton (Unitary Authority); • Milton Keynes (Unitary Authority) • Norfolk County Council;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT81	Local Community	Concern that workers at Hospice at Home will find it more difficult to get to the hospice and provide care for patients.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northamptonshire County Council (as of 1 April 2021, North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire Unitary Authorities); • Rutland (Unitary Authority); and • Suffolk County Council.
TT81	Local Community	Concern that workers at Hospice at Home will find it more difficult to get to the hospice and provide care for patients.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT82	Local Community	Request to know whether the proposed entrance will have an effect on the development of the retail park.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, the Applicant proposes to use New Bridge Lane for HGV access. This will mean that HGV traffic will not need to continue north along Cromwell Road and past the junction with the retail park.</p>
TT83	Local Community	Concern that construction traffic would still use Weasenham Lane/Algores Way.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, the use of Weasenham Lane and Algores Way will be required during the construction phase, but a majority of traffic will access the site via New Bridge Lane. There will also be a short period where the Weasenham Lane/Algores Way will need to be used when the New Bridge Lane access and associated highways improvement scheme will be constructed. Only one</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			section of Weasenham Lane from Cromwell Road will be used due to proposed route restrictions in the CTMP (Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4)). This section of road along with Algores Way runs through predominantly industrial estate type roads. The residential areas along Weasenham Lane to the east of Algores Way are not proposed to be used by HGVs in the construction phase.
TT84	Local Community	Complaint that the traffic survey/assessment did not take into account coastal caravan traffic, or traffic from schools and the two new housing estates.	The traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) was undertaken after statutory consultation, so that it could better reflect traffic conditions (i.e., outside of any COVID pandemic lockdown). The date for the survey, October 2021, was agreed with the local highway authorities Future growth resulting from new development to be factored into the TA model was agreed with CCC and NCC.
TT85	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV should maintain the nearby roads in order to ensure that they do not become damaged.	The maintenance of the local and strategic road network is the responsibility of National Highways (NH), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.
TT86	Local Community	Objection to the lorry access proposals.	Noted.
TT87	Local Community	Concern about where traffic would go after an accident cause gridlock.	In the event of road closures, like all road users, the Applicant would follow the Highways Authority route diversion(s).
TT88	Local Community	Suggestion for alternative arrangements for lorry access.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, after the Access Improvements to New Bridge Lane have been implemented and the EfW CHP Facility is operational, lorry access will be via New Bridge Lane.
TT89	Local Community	Suggestion that MVV use electric HGVs to serve the proposed development.	The Applicant has assumed for the purposes of the Air Quality assessment that the vehicles will have diesel engines. However, it is anticipated that over



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			the lifetime of the Proposed Development low carbon forms of transportation are likely to be adopted.
TT90	Local Community	Request to know if the lorry access proposals will take place before or after construction.	ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, Access Improvements to New Bridge Lane will take place during construction of the EfW CHP Facility.
TT91	Local Community	Concern how increased HGV traffic will affect traffic in the Autumn due to increase agricultural traffic.	The date of the traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) was agreed with CCC and NCC and took place in Autumn, during October 2021.
TT92	Local Community	Complaint that the Traffic Assessment was undertaken during the pandemic and is therefore not valid.	The traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) was undertaken after statutory consultation, so that it could better reflect traffic conditions (i.e., outside of any COVID pandemic lockdown). The date for the survey, October 2021, was agreed with the local highway authorities
TT93	Local Community	Suggestion that the roadblock preventing rat running on Newbridge Lane/New Drove be reinstated as part of the proposals.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, the Applicant has included for a chicane and removable bollard (if required) so that the residents of 10 New Bridge Lane can still route to the east whilst preventing HGV traffic and 'rat running'.
TT94	Local Community	Concern that New Bridge Lane is not suitable to be used.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including Access Improvements along New Bridge, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4).</p> <p>Rather the access the EfW CHP Facility via the existing entrance off Algores Way via Weasenham, all HGV traffic to and from the EfW CHP Facility Site will be directed onto New Bridge Lane. New Bridge Lane will be widened and upgraded to accommodate HGVs. Further improvements include a new footway, pedestrian crossing point and street lighting. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development with the Access Improvements in place, would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT95	Local Community	Concern about increased vibration from more HGV traffic.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including those associated with traffic and vibration during construction and operation, have been assessed and reported in the ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) . Potential effects due to vehicle induced vibration would be limited to Receptors on New Bridge Lane. On all other road links there are more significant baseline flows of HGVs and, as such, the additional HGV movements would be unlikely to give rise to any significant increase in levels of vehicle induced vibration.
TT96	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School	Complaint the MVV documents do not describe what lorries that arrive early or late will do.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, there may be some occasions when waste deliveries are accepted outside the normal opening hours; for example, in the case of an emergency or to accommodate the delivery of waste where vehicles have been unavoidably delayed, or in other similar circumstances. It is therefore proposed that the EfW CHP Facility be able to accept waste outside the operating hours stated above in these circumstances. The type of lorries would be the same type as those accepted during normal operating hours, such as, walking floor HGVs, refuse collection vehicles and tankers.
TT97	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School	Complaint the MVV documents do not give assurance that the times of 07:00 to 20:00 will be adhered to.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, operational hours for the acceptance of waste would be limited to 07:00 to 20:00. Outside of these hours, to ensure the EfW CHP Facility's continued operation, and for security purposes, a shift team would be present. There may be some occasions when waste deliveries are accepted outside the normal opening hours; for example, in the case of an emergency or to accommodate the delivery of waste where vehicles have been unavoidably delayed, or in other similar circumstances. It is therefore proposed that the EfW CHP Facility be able to accept waste outside the operating hours stated above in these circumstances.
TT98	Icon Engineering Ltd PIL	Concern that increased HGV and traffic movements arising from the proposed development will result in delays for traffic serving other local businesses.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . Within these



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network and should not affect local businesses. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT99	Nene and Ramnoth School and Elm Road Primary School	Concern about the smell and waste residue of the waste lorries.	The Applicant expects its waste suppliers to follow their procedures and for the safe transport of waste to the EfW CHP Facility. All waste vehicles will follow the relevant measures and restrictions for how waste should be transported and delivered. Waste transport in England is transported consistent with Waste Duty of Care requirements enforced by the Environment Agency and all waste vehicles will adhere to these requirements.
TT100	National Grid	Suggestion that construction should only cross gas pipelines at previously agreed locations where existing roads cannot be used.	The Proposed Development will include within the DCO protective provisions to be agreed with the pipeline operator to ensure that the network is protected.
TT101	Environment Agency	Suggestion that access roads be set according to 0.1% Annual Exceedance Probability to maintain access in the event of a flood breach.	No land raising is proposed for the wider access roads to the EfW CHP Facility. As recommended in our consultation meeting dated 19 October 2021, this was later discussed and agreed with the LLFA subject to the preparation of the Flood Emergency Management Plan.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT102	Highways England	Concern about the impact of the proposal on the A47.	<p>During the design event the EfW CHP Facility and access roads are dry, the EfW CHP Facility remains operational and there is safe access and egress to and from the site. For the residual risk event (i.e. involving the breach or overtopping of flood defences along the River Nene) the proposed minimum FFLs would ensure the EfW CHP Facility remains dry whilst the surrounding area would be flooded, including wider access roads (modelled flood depth 0.1 to 0.6m). In the case of the residual flooding event the EfW CHP Facility would continue to be operated by the on-shift personnel whilst waste feedstock and consumables already on site are available, and sufficient storage capacity for residues is present (approximately 11 days). Should flooding persist for longer than this, a routine site shutdown would be carried out (in line with the Flood Emergency Management Plan). In this event it is expected that there would be resilience in the system provided by National Grid to continue to supply energy to consumers.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and the A47, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate.</p> <p>The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network, including the A47.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT103	Highways England	Objection to the proposal, as the access of the site being is located off the A47, which would be contrary to policy set out in the Department for Transport's 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development'.	It is not proposed to access the site directly from the A47 in line with the advise contained within 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development'
TT104	Highways England	Suggestion to complete a Transport Assessment at a suitable point after the lifting of Covid-19 restrictions.	The traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) was undertaken after statutory consultation, so that it could better reflect traffic conditions (i.e., outside of any COVID pandemic lockdown). The date for the survey, October 2021, was agreed with the local highway authorities
TT105	Highways England	Suggestion to undertake the Transport Assessment in accordance with the Department for Transport's 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development', and be informed by a Walking Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment Report.	A WCHAR is only needed if any changes to the Strategic Road Network are required. This threshold is not met as a result of the Proposed Development. Appendix 6B TA (Volume 6.4) has been prepared to the standards set out in the DfT guidance documents and the CCC Transport Assessment guidelines as set out in the Policy Section of the Transport Assessment.
TT106	Highways England	Suggestion for the junctions of the Strategic Road Network within the study areas to be assessed based on the predicted flows in the construction and operational phases, as provided.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including predicted flows at junctions on the Strategic Road Network during construction and operation phases, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) .
TT107	Network Rail	Concerns that the proposed development may conflict with future transport uses for the rail alignment.	The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another. The Applicant has set aside land within the EFW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and, should it be required, land for a road bridge embankment . To date the Business Clearance with Network Rail has been approved and the Applicant is currently in discussions about Technical



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT108	Royal Mail	Concern that the proposed development could disrupt services to the Wisbech Delivery Office due to traffic impacts on the surrounding road network.	<p>Clearance process. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) provide further details.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and the A47, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network.</p>
TT109	Royal Mail	Concern about the impact that increased traffic on local roads, such as the A47 and those adjacent, may have on Royal Mail's operations and ability to perform statutory duties and Universal Service Obligations.	<p>Within Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments conclude that the Proposed Development can be accommodated on the local highway network and should not affect Royal Mail's service obligations.</p>
TT110	Royal Mail	Complaint that the PEIR and CEMP did not include content on advance notification of major road users, such as Royal Mail, of works, traffic, or events that may affect the highways network.	<p>The requirement for advanced notification to Royal Mail has been included within Outline CTMP Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4).</p>
TT111	Royal Mail	Support for the plan to produce a Construction Traffic Management Plan in advance of construction and for it to be agreed with the relevant planning and highway authorities.	<p>The final CTMP will need to be agreed by the relevant local planning authority before development can commence.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT112	Royal Mail	Request for wording to be added to the draft CTMP to secure Royal Mail's desired mitigations.	The Outline CTMP Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4) includes Royal Mail's request.
TT113	Royal Mail	Request for the final CTMP to include a mechanism for Medworth CMP Ltd or its contractors to inform Royal Mail about works affecting local highways, particularly in regard to access to and from the Wisbech Delivery Office PE14 0RA.	The Outline CTMP Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4) includes Royal Mail's request.
TT114	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Concern that increased traffic movements resulting from the proposed development will adversely impact on local water level and flood risk management systems due to the nature of the weak soil at the site and along the traffic route.	It is understood that the comment relates to the potential for soil compaction by vehicles during the construction phase and implications for surface run-off. The Applicant has prepared an Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) which includes a number of outline management plans as appendices. These will ensure that soil is treated in a sustainable manner and that surface water run-off is controlled to existing rates of flow.
TT115	Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board	Suggestion that road structures, highway drainage systems and culverts be strengthened and upgrade to mitigate the impact of increased traffic movements on local water and flood management systems.	ES Chapter 3 Description of Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, the Applicant's Access Improvements to New Bridge Lane include for the replacement of the existing culvert with a new structure.
TT116	Norfolk County Council Highways	Suggestion to conduct a joint site survey in order to identify and assess the impact of the access for the grid connection on the key sensitive receptors, such as School Road, West Walton.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken DNO Substation. It is this option which is part of the DCO and therefore no longer effects many NCC roads identified at statutory consultation. Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.
TT117	Norfolk County Council Highways	Suggestion to be mindful of local area access issues and to engage in early consultation with the effected properties to ensure the impact is minimized/mitigated.	The Applicant is very mindful of the impacts arising from the Proposed Development and has undertaken two rounds of consultation (non-statutory phase 1a and 1b and statutory). It has also sought to discuss these with the owners of local properties.
TT118	Norfolk County Council Highways	Suggestion that a pre-condition survey is required for the access strategy.	Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.
TT119	Norfolk County Council Highways	Suggestion to undertake a video survey of highway conditions and indicate its completion in the CTMP.	Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.
TT120	Fenland District Council	Concern about increased traffic movements on routes with existing high volumes of traffic.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing points. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT121	Fenland District Council	Concern about the impacts of increased HGV movements on New Bridge Lane, Elm High Road, Churchill Road, and the A47 during the construction period.	<p>The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT122	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan and up-to-date traffic surveys are needed to understand the full impacts during construction and operational phases.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity during construction, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing points. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP. <p>The following documents accompany the ES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan • Outline Operational Travel Plan (Appendix 6C)



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			The traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) was undertaken after statutory consultation, so that it could better reflect traffic conditions (i.e., outside of any COVID pandemic lockdown). The date for the survey, October 2021, was agreed with the local highway authorities
TT123	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that the Transport Assessment includes a more detailed assessment of the impact of the proposed development on Cromwell Road and the entrance to New Bridge Lane.	ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) . considers the potential effects upon Cromwell Road and New Bridge Lane.
TT124	Norfolk County Council	Concern about the increase in traffic on the A47, as it is already congested.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and the A47, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network, including the A47.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT125	Norfolk County Council	Concern about the impact of increased HGV traffic on top of traffic impacts from new	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and the A47, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>housing estates and how that might affect traffic on the A47/A1101 roundabout.</p>	<p>Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments include for future baseline conditions, i.e., growth factors and local committed developments. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network, including the A47.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
<p>TT126</p>	<p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>Concern about increased traffic and how it will affect the residents of Marshland South division and those travelling into the country.</p>	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT127	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concerned about the increase in traffic movements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OTMP. <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT128	Fenland and West Norfolk Friends of the Earth	Concerns regarding the wear and tear on the fen roads.	<p>The maintenance of the local and strategic road network is the responsibility of National Highways (NH), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition. Due to the proposed access routes to the site, it is not anticipated that there will be any impacts from HGVs on the fen roads.</p>
TT129	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern about the impact of projected daily HGV movements on the surrounding road network, which is currently experiencing congestion.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT130	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern that the suggested use of alternate routes is unrealistic as some could add more than two hours to the return journey.	<p>assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP. <p>The impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT131	Wisbech, March and District Trades Union Council	Concern that additional lorry traffic will make traffic congestions on the A17 and A47, especially at already identified pressure points.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT132	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that both the New Bridge Lane and Algores Way HGV access route options be assessed in more detail to fully understand impacts.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, both Algores Way and New Bridge Lane will be used to facilitate the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Once operational, staff and visitors will access to the EfW CHP Site from Algores, whilst HGV access is via New Bridge Lane.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including HGV access routes for construction and operation, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT133	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that upgrades would be needed should New Bridge Lane be selected as the preferred HGV access route option.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, the Proposed Development includes for the upgrade of New Bridge Lane. The general arrangements of the works are described in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and illustrated in Figure 6.18 (Volume 6.3).
TT134	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that a detailed assessment be undertaken to clarify the impacts of potential upgrades to New Bridge Lane and whether they would be suitable to accommodate the proposed traffic volumes.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, New Bridge Lane will be used to facilitate the construction and operational phase of the Proposed Development. The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including Access Improvements along New Bridge Lane have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). The results of the assessments have informed the general arrangements design for New Bridge Lane.
TT135	Fenland District Council	Concern that the installation of CHP infrastructure along the Wisbech to March rail line will prevent the potential re-opening of the line.	The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another. The Applicant has set aside land within the EFW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and, should it be required, land for a road bridge embankment. To date the Business Clearance with Network Rail has been approved and the Applicant is currently in discussions about Technical Clearance process. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 (Volume 6.2) provide further details.
TT136	Fenland District Council	Concern that site access onto New Bridge Lane is limited by the width of the highway and the closed level crossing adjacent to the site entrance.	The Proposed Development includes Access Improvements along New Bridge Lane. These improvements include for the widening and upgrade of New Bridge Lane. Further details of the general arrangements are described in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and illustrated in Figure 6.18 (Volume 6.3).



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT137	Fenland District Council	Suggestion that the proposed development should have direct connections onto a major A road, rather than via the local road network.	<p>During the pre-application process, NH were consulted by the Applicant on the possibility of a new connection to the A47. NH rejected this option.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including network capacity, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). The assessments undertaken by the Applicant demonstrate that the local highway network can accommodate the Proposed Development.</p>
TT138	Fenland District Council	Concern that the road infrastructure surrounding the proposed development is not fit for purpose and additional HGVs would cause significant disruption.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath and pedestrian crossing points. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT139	Fenland District Council	Concern about the cumulative impact of additional HGV movements arising from the proposed development and	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		<p>commuter/domestic traffic in damaging existing roads in the local area.</p>	<p>Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Between these documents, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The assessment concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP. <p>The maintenance of the local and strategic road network is the responsibility of National Highways (NH), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.</p>
TT140	Fenland District Council	<p>Concern that the proposed site access is from Algores Way which at the location shown in Figure 6.21 of PEIR Chapter 6, is a private roadway owned by Fenland District Council who do not intend to include the land in the scheme.</p>	<p>Where necessary, compulsory acquisition of land, including interests in land, rights in, under and over land (including subsoil only), imposition of restrictions, powers to override, suspend or extinguish rights and powers for the temporary use of land are sought for the Proposed Development.</p>
TT141	Wisbech Town Council	<p>Complaint that the NTS requires the reader to refer to the PEIR to understand what the</p>	<p>The purpose of an NTS is to make key issues and findings of an environmental assessment accessible and easily understood by the general public. Often a</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
		assessment of the construction phases for the four access scenarios are.	fine balance, sometime cross referencing is required to guide the reviewer to where further information about detailed matters can be found.
TT142	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the NTS does not include baseline traffic information so readers are not able to understand the likely impact of the increased HGV traffic.	The purpose of an NTS is to make key issues and findings of an environmental assessment accessible and easily understood by the general public. Often a fine balance, sometime cross referencing is required to guide the reviewer to where further information about detailed matters can be found.
TT143	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the NTS is not clear about whether the additional 362 HGV trips would be spread throughout the day or whether it would be a peak in HGV traffic.	The purpose of an NTS is to make key issues and findings of an environmental assessment accessible and easily understood by the general public. Often a fine balance, sometime cross referencing is required to guide the reviewer to where further information about detailed matters can be found.
TT144	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the information on the primary access to the site is not clear about whether it consists of direct access from the A47.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, both Algores Way and New Bridge Lane will be used to facilitate the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Once operational, staff and visitors will access to the EfW CHP Site from Algores, whilst HGV access is via New Bridge Lane. There is no direct access to/from the A47.
TT145	Wisbech Council	Town Concern that Wisbech already has traffic capacity issues and that increased traffic from the proposal will exacerbate this.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan;



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT146	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the proposal is premature, as the traffic and transport studies for the emerging local plan for the area are not complete so the issues for Wisbech and the surrounding area are not fully understood.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including future baseline conditions, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). The scope of the future baseline conditions were agreed with the relevant highways authority.</p> <p>The emerging Fenland Local Plan is at an early stage in the local development framework process, with consultation on the Draft Local Plan due June/July 2022.</p>
TT147	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that the conclusions reached in Section 4.4 of the NTS are reached without undertaking traffic surveys due to Covid-19 and that it is not clear what evidence supports the conclusions.	<p>The traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) was undertaken after statutory consultation, so that it could better reflect traffic conditions (i.e., outside of any COVID pandemic lockdown). The date for the survey, October 2021, was agreed with the local highway authorities.</p>
TT148	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that no information is provided on congestions so it is not possible to determine whether the information described in Table 6.24 of Chapter 6 of the PEIR is correct, based on the information given in Table 6.23.	<p>The traffic survey that informs ES, Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) has addressed this issue.</p>
TT149	Wisbech Council	Town Complaint that there is no information on the likely magnitude of effects on traffic within the NTS, so readers without understanding or expertise on transport are unable to give meaningful consultation on this aspect of the proposal.	<p>The purpose of an NTS is to make key issues and findings of an environmental assessment accessible and easily understood by the general public. Often a fine balance, sometime cross referencing is required to guide the reviewer to where further information about detailed matters can be found.</p>
TT150	Wisbech Council	Town Concern that the proposals will prevent the rail network from being re-established.	<p>The Applicant supports the reopening of the March to Wisbech railway and the wider benefits this would bring to local community. Whilst there are currently</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT151	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the impact of site construction traffic on West Norfolk residents along Elm High Road.	<p>no firm plans for its reopening, the Applicant has been in discussion with Network Rail to ensure both the Proposed Development and reopening of the railway can proceed without compromising one another. The Applicant has set aside land within the EFW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and, should it be required, land for a road bridge embankment. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 (Volume 6.2) provide further details.</p>
			<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity during construction, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Between these documents, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for the construction period as appropriate. The assessment concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development, including the construction phase. Management plans that relate to traffic and transportation will be secured by a DCO Requirement and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; and • CTMP.
TT152	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the impact of high-voltage link construction traffic on West Norfolk residents near the build route.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant has chosen to place the Grid Connection underground and in the western verge of the A47 up to Walsoken DNO Substation via Broadend Road. It is this option which is part of the DCO and therefore no longer effects many NCC roads identified at statutory consultation. The impacts arising from traffic related to the installation of the cable within the A47 and Broadend Road have been assessed in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) The assessment concludes there will not be significant impacts upon residents of West Norfolk.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT153	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Suggestion that the impact of additional HGV movements during construction and operation will require consideration, and that a Traffic Assessment and Travel Plan must be included in the final Environmental Statement.	<p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development, including the construction phase. Management plans that relate to traffic and transportation will be secured by a DCO Requirement and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; and • CTMP.
TT154	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about existing levels of traffic and congestion on roads surrounding the proposed development, particularly the Elm High Road/A47 junction.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including network capacity during construction and operations, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 6A Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Volume 6.4); • Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4); • Appendix 6C Outline Operational Travel Plan (Volume 6.4); • Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (Volume 7.15); and • Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Volume 7.12) includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan. <p>The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network, including the Elm High Road/A47 junction, therefore the increase in traffic will not be significant</p>
TT155	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern about the impact of the proposals on increasing traffic volumes in the local area during the construction and operational phases.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including network capacity during construction and operations, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) Within these</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			<p>assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided, including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT156	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that the information provided on the proposed modifications to the highway network associated with the development may not be accurate.	The Applicant has updated the information presented at PEIR and supplemented it with traffic survey data. The Applicant is satisfied with the data used to prepare the ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanying Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) .
TT157	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Request for clarification on whether the traffic movement figures include members of staff at the proposed facility.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including traffic movements associated with operational staff, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) .
TT158	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Request for clarification on the average one-way HGV distance as it was understood the average distance was much lower.	The PEIR used the average distance of 48.9 km travelled by HGV vehicles to a landfill obtained from the DfT dataset on domestic road freight transport by commodity and length of haul, which includes statistics on waste. Travel distances for landfill have been updated for the GHG assessment (ES Chapter 14 Climate Change (Volume 6.2)) to 46.9 km based on the 2021 DfT data. This has been calculated as the average distance for a haul length up to 150 km (approximately the two-hour drive time) by dividing the goods moved (million tonne km) data by the goods lifted (million tonne) data for waste related products.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT159	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Concern that HGV movements transporting waste from Lincolnshire will frequently pass the Pullover Roundabout, a known accident spot.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including road capacity and HGV movements, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4). Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.</p>
TT160	Cambridgeshire County Council	<p>Concern that the additional HGV movements arising from the proposed development will put significant strain on the local road network, particularly the A47 which is already congested. That the preference for access via new bridge Lane is understood but use will be dependant on agreement with network Rail to re-open the crossing.</p>	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including network capacity on the A47, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided, including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network, including the A47.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP. <p>The Applicant has undertaken regular discussions with Network Rail with a view to agreeing the form of crossing on New Bridge Lane should the railway line be reopened in the future. To date the Business Clearance with Network Rail has been approved and the Applicant is currently in discussions about Technical Clearance process.</p>



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT161	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the significant increase in HGV movements arising from the proposed development along a number routes deemed higher risk for collisions.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including network capacity highway safety, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided, including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. These assessments include for an accident assessment which concludes that the Proposed Development should not give rise to a significant increase in accident risk.
TT162	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority are consulted on considerations for mass freight movements along the disused March-Wisbech rail line.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) confirms, the reopening of the disused March to Wisbech Railway is a proposal being explored by CPCA. Although there are currently no confirmed and funded plans, the layout of the EfW CHP Facility Site has been designed so that the Proposed Development would not prevent the reopening of the March to Wisbech Railway and includes land within the EfW CHP Facility Site for a potential rail unloading area and road bridge embankment. Discussions with Stakeholders is ongoing and includes CPCA. ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 (Volume 6.2) provide further details.
TT163	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about severe disruption to the local highway network from engineering, utilities and highways works during the construction phase.	Works to the local highway network will be limited to Algores Way, New Bridge Lane and the route of the Grid Connection. The Applicant will undertake the works in consultation with the relevant highway authorities in order to minimise disruption.
TT164	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern that the proposed mitigation measures for HGV movements are insufficient.	Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT165	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the impact of additional HGV movements arising from the proposed development on road quality, congestion and road safety.	<p>The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including junction capacity and highway safety, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided, including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate.</p> <p>The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network, including the A47.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT166	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that highway condition surveys be undertaken by independent consultants to remove the possibility of bias.	<p>Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
TT167	Cambridgeshire County Council	Support for the highway condition surveys as they enable stakeholders to see all the damage would be remedied prior to progressing through construction and operations.	Noted.
TT168	Steve Barclay MP	Objection to the claims that it is only waste originating from 2 hours' drive from the facility that will be treated there. It is estimated that it	<p>The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) highlights, the DCO application must demonstrate that there is a need for the proposed waste management capacity and to do this requires defining a Study Area for the WFAA. Importantly though, the WFAA is a tool to illustrate that even within</p>



ID	Respondent		Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			is not possible to cover the distance in 2 hours in a HGV.	a restricted geographic catchment, the need for the waste management capacity offered by the Proposed Development is evident. This assessment is not a means of identifying that the Proposed Development should be tied to a specific catchment area. Consequently, the methodology adopted in the WFAA considers but does not exclusively rely on a 2-hour travel time to determine the spatial scope of the Study Area.
TT169	Steve MP	Barclay	Objection to treating waste from areas distanced 160 miles from the facility as it should be treated locally.	<p>The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) has assessed the National and local need for the Proposed Development. The WFAA concludes, there is sufficient residual waste currently being disposed of to landfill or exported abroad that could otherwise be diverted to the EfW CHP Facility.</p> <p>This residual waste is being transported on the road network. By way of an example, the Applicant understands that residual was generated in Norfolk is currently transported by road along the A47 and past the proposed EfW CHP Facility Site to an EfW facility in Bedfordshire. Therefore, if the Proposed Development is granted a DCO, this waste could be diverted to the EfW CHP Facility and therefore reduce vehicle miles and treat this closer to its source.</p>
TT170	Steve MP	Barclay	Concern that the condition of the highway is acknowledged, but not addressed.	The maintenance of the local and strategic road network is the responsibility of National Highways (NH), Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Norfolk County Council (NCC). Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) confirms the Applicant will appoint an independent contractor to undertake a highway condition survey of before and after construction of the Proposed Development. Any damage caused by the construction activities can be repaired by the Applicant and the road returned to the previous condition.
TT171	Steve MP	Barclay	Concern that the 2-hour travel time metric has not been consistently applied.	The Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) highlights, the DCO application must demonstrate that there is a need for the proposed waste management capacity and to do this requires defining a Study Area for the WFAA. Importantly though, the WFAA is a tool to illustrate that even within a restricted geographic catchment, the need for the waste management capacity offered by the Proposed Development is evident. This assessment is



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
			not a means of identifying that the Proposed Development should be tied to a specific catchment area. Consequently, the methodology adopted in the WFAA considers but does not exclusively rely on a 2-hour travel time to determine the spatial scope of the Study Area.
TT172	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that a rigorous assessment of traffic impacts has not been provided in the PEIR.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including an assessment of traffic impacts, has been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily and peak hourly assessments are provided, including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network.
TT173	Steve Barclay MP	Concern that HGV traffic distribution data is inaccurate or unreliable due to the flawed assumptions of the draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment.	Based on the Applicant's understanding of the waste market and consideration of the WFAA, the ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanying Transport Assessment (Appendix 6B) presents reasonable traffic distribution estimates for the Proposed Development.
TT174	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to adopt Cambridgeshire County Council's wording within the Traffic and Transport Chapter of the PEIR in order to correct the two present errors.	These wording suggestions have been adopted in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) .
TT175	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern in respect of the traffic movement calculations, amount and calculation of available residual waste per annum over the duration of the EfW operational phase and the identified catchment area for the waste.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) and ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) confirms, A worst-case assessment has been made; a residual waste throughput, of 625,000 tonnes per annum. This approach is considered to be a robust assessment for the purpose of the ES.
TT176	Cambridgeshire County Council	Complaint that the Traffic and Transport Report does not go into detail on the impact of traffic in terms of link and junction capacity or highway safety.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including junction capacity and highway safety, have been assessed and reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) and accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) Within these assessments, daily



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT177	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the Transport Assessment to take into consideration the previous comments made by Cambridgeshire's Transport Assessment Team, as well as the council's 'Transport Assessment Requirements 2019'.	<p>and peak hourly assessments are provided, including detailed link and junction assessment for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The assessment considers highways safety and accident hot spots. The TA concludes that traffic generated by the Proposed Development would be within the current capacity of the local and strategic road network, including the A47.</p> <p>Where necessary, embedded mitigation is included within the design of the Proposed Development and ongoing operational management plans will ensure that the EfW CHP Facility will continue to be operated appropriately. The operational management plans related to traffic and transportation will be secured by DCO Requirements and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEMP, includes a requirement for a Construction Staff Travel Plan; • CTMP; • Operational Travel Plan; and • OTMP.
TT178	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that data from paragraph 6.4.10 and table 6.4 from Chapter 6 of the PEIR should be sourced from the Local Authority rather than 'Crashmap'.	The Applicant has obtained the data from CCC and NCC.
TT179	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the use of data from 2004 in paragraph 6.5.30 in chapter 6 of the PEIR.	The traffic and accident data reported in ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) has been updated.
TT180	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to use data from the Local Authority rather than Crashmap for the information in paragraph 6.5.38 in chapter 6 of the PEIR.	The Applicant has obtained the data from CCC and NCC.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT181	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request for a more detailed analysis of accidents involving vulnerable road users to be included in the Transport Assessment, as it is currently not evident in the PEIR.	The Applicant has undertaken an analysis of accidents, and this is reported in the TA (Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4)).
TT182	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request that the source of the TEMPro figures should be submitted.	As requested, ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) the TEMPro source data has been included.
TT183	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion for the Transport Assessment to consider any changes in traffic flows as a result of any committed schemes.	CCC has provided information to the Applicant on the committed schemes it wishes to see included. These have been taken into account in the TA (Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4)).
TT184	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that the sources of the data used in chapter 6 of the PEIR in paragraph 6.6.145 as well as between paragraphs 6.6.35 and 6.6.19 in the appendices of the Transport Assessment in order for Cambridge County Council to carry out verification.	ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) has been updated to include the data sources.
TT185	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide mitigation measures for additional Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) and HGV traffic within the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	The Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) includes the mitigation measures which the Applicant considers to be appropriate given the levels of effect identified.
TT186	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to encourage active travel for those filling the 40 full time positions that are expected to be created by the proposal.	The Outline Operational Travel Plan (Appendix 6C (Volume 6.4)) submitted with the application encourages active travel.
TT187	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to appropriately address the expected significant impact on Peterborough's highways network.	The Applicant's TA (Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4)), including the Study Area, has been agreed in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council. Peterborough's highway network is scoped out of the assessment.



ID	Respondent	Issue Raised	The Applicant's response
TT188	Cambridgeshire County Council	Request for Cambridgeshire County Council Public Rights of Way Officer to be part of the pre and post inspection regime for the proposals of inspection and maintenance mentions in section 3.3 of the Traffic and Transport Appendices of the PEIR.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant, rather than connecting to Walpole Substation, has chosen Walsoken DNO Substation as the point of connection. Consequently, PRoW will not be directly affected, and proposed inspection regime is not considered necessary.
TT189	Cambridgeshire County Council	Concern about the narrowness and the surface of Byway Open to All Traffic No.21, Wisbech (Halfpenny Lane) due to proximity to drains and therefore concern about its ability to accommodate heavy construction traffic and public access.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant will place the cables within the verge of the A47, including adjacent Halfpenny Lane. Construction access for the Grid Connection will be secured via the A47 (at night-time), therefore no longer requires access along Halfpenny Lane.
TT190	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to consult the drainage board for any proposals to strengthen the Halfpenny Lane byway due to its proximity to water courses.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant will place the cables within the verge of the A47, including adjacent Halfpenny Lane. Construction access for the Grid Connection will be secured via the A47 (at night-time), therefore no longer requires access along Halfpenny Lane. Consequently, there are not proposals to strengthen Halfpenny Lane.
TT191	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion to provide more detail on the intended use of the Halfpenny Lane byway for construction access, including greater detail on the type of construction traffic using the route and how regularly the route will be accessed in order for the impact on public access and safety can be assessed.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant will place the cables within the verge of the A47, including adjacent Halfpenny Lane. Construction access for the Grid Connection will be secured via the A47 (at night-time), therefore no longer requires access along Halfpenny Lane.
TT192	Cambridgeshire County Council	Suggestion that mitigation and safety measures for Halfpenny Lane byway will need to accommodate all non-motorised users including, walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.	ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) describes the route of the Grid Connection and confirms that the Applicant will place the cables within the verge of the A47, including adjacent Halfpenny Lane. Construction access for the Grid Connection will be secured via the A47 (at night-time), therefore no longer require access along Halfpenny Lane.