Medworth Energy from Waste
Combined Heat and Power Facility

PINS ref. EN010110
Document Reference: 9.2
Revision: 0.0
Deadline: 1
March 2023

Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations – Part 1 Local Authorities and 3(a) Statutory Parties

We inspire with energy.

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1.1 The Applicant (Medworth CHP Limited) submitted an application for development consent to the Secretary of State on 7 July 2022. The Application was accepted for examination on 2 August 2022. The Examination of the Application commenced on 21 February 2023.

1.1.2 During the pre-examination phase of the Application process, persons were invited to register as an Interested Party and provide a relevant representation. The registration period ran from 4 October 2022 to 15 November 2022. The deadline was extended to 30 November 2022 for a single person with an interest in land, as their original notification of the relevant representation period was undelivered.

1.1.3 A total of 666 relevant representations were received by the end of the relevant representation period [**RR-001 – RR-666**]. Three additional submissions [**AS-011** – **AS-013**] were accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority (ExA) on 23 January 2023. The Applicant has also commented on these additional submissions as part of their comments on the relevant representations which have been submitted at Examination Deadline 1 (10 March 2023).

1.1.4 The Applicant's comments are provided in the following volumes:

- **Volume 9.2 Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations – Part 1 Local Authorities and 3(a) Statutory Parties**; comprising of comments on the relevant representations from local authorities and statutory parties defined under Regulation 3(a) of the Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015 (as amended);
- **Volume 9.2 Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations - Other Interested Parties and 3(b) Statutory Parties**; comprising of comments on the relevant representations from persons with an interest in land (defined in Regulation 3(b) of the of the Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015), wider stakeholders, members of the public and businesses and community groups, split into the following parts:
    - **Part 2: Representations RR-001 – RR-099;**
    - **Part 3: Representations RR-100 – RR-199;**
    - **Part 4: Representations RR-200 – RR-299;**
    - **Part 5: Representations RR-300 – RR-399;**
    - **Part 6: Representations RR-400 – RR-499;**
    - **Part 7: Representations RR-500 – RR-599;**
    - **Part 8: Representations RR-600 – RR-666 and additional submissions;** and

- **Volume 9.2 Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations – Part 9 Appendices;** comprising of documents produced to support the Applicant's comments on the relevant representations.

1.1.1 This document **Volume 9.2 Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations – Part 3 Other Interested Parties and 3(b) Statutory Parties** presents the Applicant's comments in a tabular format for each relevant representation received.

1.1.2 The comments are supported by the following Appendices presented in **Volume 9.2 Applicant's Comments on the Relevant Representations – Part 9 Appendices:**

- **Appendix 9.2A**: Technical Meeting Note Traffic and Transport – Algores Way;
- **Appendix 9.2B**: Landscape ZTVs and Cross Sections;
- **Appendix 9.2C**: Technical Note – Climate Change – Response to CCC Comments;
- **Appendix 9.2D**: Technical Note Response to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations; and
- **Appendix 9.2E**: Interested Party: Fountain Frozen Limited – Relevant Representation APP-015.

2. Local Authorities

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Relevant representations were received from the four host local authorities. No other local authorities submitted a relevant representation.

2.1.2 The Applicant's comments on the points raised within the relevant representations from the local authorities are provided below:

- **Table 2.1: Applicant's Comments on the Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) / Fenland District Council (FDC) Joint Relevant Representation** [**RR-002** and **RR-003**];
- **Table 2.2: Applicant's Comments on the Norfolk County Council (NCC) Relevant Representation [RR-004]**; and
- **Table 2.3: Applicant's Comments on the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk (BCKLWN) Relevant Representation [RR-001]**.

Table 2.1 Applicant's Comments on the BCKLWN Relevant Representation [RR-001]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	3.6 Air Quality To help understand background air quality and monitor changes in traffic we have already established diffusion tube (NO2) monitoring points in the area. As confirmed at the earlier scoping opinion PINS had recommended that all air quality monitoring locations should be identified on a plan. There is also Dept. of Transport traffic survey points along parts of the network that show actual daily movements.	Figure 8.1 of **ES Chapter 8 Air Quality Figures (Volume 6.3) [APP-052]** illustrates the air quality survey monitoring locations and Figure 8.2 illustrates the Local Authority monitoring locations .
Air Quality	In terms of impacts during the operational period the emissions have been modelled based on an opening year of 2027 against its respective baseline with emissions from traffic and the stack combined. As noted within our Technical Queries that are outstanding there are numerous minus traffic input values that have been used for the air quality modelling which does not appear to be possible.	Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Section 5: traffic emissions methodology details that the 2024 scenario is a with construction scenario. The 2027 scenario is a with development scenario which means this is the scenario containing operational traffic.
Air Quality	The EfW plant will be supported by an emergency back-up generator, which has been modelled based on emergency use of up to 2 hours per month and no more than 60-hours annually. Operational periods in excess of these periods can potentially be a matter for the Environmental Permit with conditions for their control. Modelling of routine generator testing however appears to be missing from the modelling.	Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Paragraph 4.2.22 details the methodology adopted in assessing the impacts from an emergency diesel generator. Results for the human receptor experiencing the maximum process contribution in this emergency scenario are reported in Table 8B6.13 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Air Quality	Abnormal events will be detected by an automatic monitoring system for pollutants with an averaging period of 1-hour as set out in Chapter 8, triggering an interlock to prevent further	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	waste being charged. For other pollutants during these events emission rates have been calculated. This is designed to ensure compliance with the EA permit and Article 46(6) of the IED. Abnormal events include failure of a filter bag with a potential impact on PM / Metals, lime dosing (acid gases) or the urea dosing (an impact NOx).	
Air Quality	In terms of cumulative impacts from other point sources, especially larger Part A1 permitted processes in Wisbech that are regulated by the EA, the applicant has explained previously and as documented in Appendix 8A that these installations operating prior to 2020 were below reporting thresholds and at a level considered insignificant. As these emissions are incorporated within Defra's background these emissions have therefore been assessed indirectly.	Comment noted.
Air Quality	In terms of the changes in concentrations as a result of this development they are presented within Appendix 8B Annex H against each receptor and by parameter (Table H1 for the construction and Tables H2-H29 for operational period).	Comment noted
Air Quality	3.6.3 Construction phase It is understood that HGV movements will be precluded from accessing the site via Elm High Rd i.e. within this Council's area, so the track out of dusts appears outside of scope. Impacts from the construction period relate more to the extent of LDV and the measures to prevent HGV from accessing Elm High Rd.	Comment noted.
Air Quality	All of the relevant road links that were assessed as part of the air quality study are shown in Figure 5.1 within Appendix 8B. As exposure to air quality pollutants occurs daily, so the significance of traffic movements is similarly based on changes occurring daily than necessarily just from peak movements.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	Model verification / bias adjustment: Modelling is based on verification using a bias adjustment of 0.69 and which is much lower than the national factors derived from longer and potentially more representative period. As the bias adjustment factor is used as part of verification it causes a potential significant underestimate of the results. We would like to know why a higher factor was not used.	The model verification has been updated within Rev 2 of the Air Quality Technical Report (**ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. The latest national bias adjustment factor has been used and the monitored results adjusted with this national bias adjustment factor are reported within Table 8B5.1.
	Bias was calculated based on a triplicate co-location study for a period of only 4-months against a reference analyser employed for c. 6-months at Thomas Clarkson Academy from June 2021 i.e. 55% PM10 data capture in 2021 (as shown in Table B2). As an example comparison of Medworth site 11 and this Council's site 101 (placed in similar locations over same timescale); BCKLWN Site 101 NO2 bias adjusted (0.84; from 32 studies) annual mean 25.9 µg/m3 Medworth Site 11 NO2 bias adjusted (0.69; from 4 months) annual mean 21.5 µg/m3 It should also be noted that there appears a typo in the preparation method for the NO2 diffusion tubes i.e. using 50% TEA preparation in water. The method employed by Gradko involves acetone not water.	The model verification has been updated within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1**.** The latest national bias adjustment factor has been used and the monitored results adjusted with this national bias adjustment factor are reported within Table 8B5.1. The annual mean results for Medworth site 11 now reports at 25.6 mg/m3 **Annex B: Monitoring survey** reports the correct preparation method.
Air Quality	Meteorological Data (point source): Careful consideration needs to be given to the selection of meteorological data. This is recognised to be especially important for modelling of point sources. Data selected has to be representative of the area under study. For point sources this typically this means referring to 5-years of data and selecting worse case. In this instance the dispersion modelling has been based on Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) data from 2015 to 2019 and selecting worse case as 2015. However, the statutory guidance (LAQM TG224) explains that when using	Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 where a model sensitivity test has been added to Annex F to compare NO2 concentrations predicted using NWP data and from the Marham meteorological station.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	NWP data that it should be compared to results from standard meteorological observation data (OBS). No such comparison or sensitivity analysis has been performed (to be agreed).	
Air Quality	Baseline Predicted Environmental Concentrations (PEC): We could not locate PEC data within Tables 8B6.1 or 8.26. This is necessary to confirm impacts.	Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 where baseline concentrations are reported within Table 8B6.1
Air Quality	Cumulative Impacts: To ensure emissions are assessed as worse case there can be instances where the impacts are combined. Routine testing of the diesel back-up generator appeared to be missing from the modelling and underestimating the combined NO2 result. We also found errors when combining emissions for example PM10 and PM2.5 annual means as traffic contributions were higher than PC. Combined results should be checked.	Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Paragraph 4.2.22 details the methodology adopted in assessing the impacts from an emergency diesel generator. Results for the human receptor experiencing the maximum process contribution in this emergency scenario are reported in Table 8B6.13 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Results within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 have been updated accordingly to address any reporting errors with PM10 and PM2.5.
Air Quality		
Air Quality	IAQM's methodology is based on calculating mass and comparing this to the health damage costs based either on low-medium-high degree of sensitivity5. These health damage costs can be compared to any residual risks after taking into account the standard or 'embedded' mitigation being proposed. When comparing the standard mitigation proposed (as listed below) there is a significant residual risk that is not specified such as the new duty on	It is noted that there are damage costs. Consultation has been undertaken to review this requirement. The air quality assessment of the development is primarily concerned with chimney emissions. there are adequate abatement measures included within the BAT assessment. Therefore, any damage cost associated with the chimney emissions are offset by the BAT measures including Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) (NOx abatement). These are presented in detail in the BAT assessment submitted for the Environmental Permit application.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	both Councils of preparing air quality strategies as set out with LAQM PG-226 with measures that facilitate an improvement in air quality. A contribution towards this work is therefore sought.	
	Standard or 'embedded' mitigation explained in the ES includes: [] Abatement: This is specified as Selective Non-Catalytic emission reduction which involves selective reduction of nitrogen oxides with ammonia / urea without a catalyst. The technique is based on the reduction of NOX to nitrogen by reaction with ammonia / urea at a high temperature. In a general this results in NOx reduction rate of between 30-50%. However, a catalyst-based system is not proposed within Chapter 8. This can achieve much higher NOx reduction (by 80-95%4) and whilst a matter for the permit, a discussion on the technology is missing from the report.	Noted. The Air Quality Technical Report **(ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4) [APP-078]** has been updated following a review of the BAT assessment included in the Environmental Permit submissions. Please see paragraph 4.2.5 of Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Air Quality	Electric Vehicle Charging: Whilst the parking is within FDC we would welcome a condition to secure EV charging especially due to limitations within Approved Document S (AD-S) of the Building Regulations. There appears to be 5 electric vehicle charging spaces shown in Figure 6.2 (Plan for the site). EV charging is considered an important part of the mitigation and to help future proof the scheme but is not mentioned within Chapter 8 or 19. AD-S will only require slow charging (<7kW) and furthermore sections 6.2 to 6.12 (Standards) are all optional. A condition is necessary to ensure the charging is safe, accessible and convenient in accordance with section 112(e) of the NPPF, AQAP, emerging local policy LP14/18 and NCC's revised parking standards (July 2022). To be agreed.	Noted. Electrical vehicle charging points form part of the Proposed Development and are permitted under Works No. 2B(d), Schedule 1 Authorised Development, see **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** The **Outline Operational Travel Plan (Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6C) [APP-074]** states at paragraph 4.3.7 that EV charging points will be incorporated into the EfW CHP Facility parking facilities and is secured by Requirement 15 (Operation travel plan), Schedule 2 (Requirements), **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013**].

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality		The Community Liaison Manager will deliver the Community Benefits Strategy and Employment and Skills Strategy. Part of their role will be waste education and awareness, including organising the community liaison meetings, site tours and educational events and to answer questions about the process/emissions etc. The DCO Application is accompanied by the: • **Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) [APP-099]**; and • **Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) [APP-105].** The Community liaison manager position is secured under Requirement 22 (Community liaison manager), Schedule 2 (Requirements), **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013**]. The Employment and Skills Strategy is secured under Requirement 21 (Employment and Skills Strategy), Schedule 2 (Requirements), **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
	Appointment of a Community Liaison Manager; unclear on remit of role (to be agreed). This was not set out within Chapter 8.	Section 3.1.2 of the **Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) [APP-105]** confirms that the final Community Benefits Strategy will be published by the Applicant prior to the commencement of the construction of the Proposed Development.
	Air Quality Monitoring: Mitigation is set out in Table 8.25 in Chapter 6 includes option for real time air quality monitoring scheme. The real time AQ monitoring is to be agreed but noted as suggested only for particulate matter emissions. Recommend indicative real-time analyser(s) for NO2 and PM. We would be happy to agree the terms of this condition and agree location for monitoring equipment.	Noted. The Applicant is willing to commit to undertaking regular monitoring for air quality at locations to be agreed with the Environmental Health Officers of Fenland and Kings Lynn Councils. The Applicant has prepared an Outline Local Air Quality Monitoring Strategy which is submitted at Deadline 1. The requirement for a detailed strategy to be submitted to and agreed by the relevant local authorities and implemented has been secured via a new requirement to the Draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1.
Air Quality	Dust effects are explained from sections 8.9.18 to 8.9.58 with dust buffers shown in Figure 8.4. Track out of dust is	Noted. The Applicant is willing to commit to undertaking regular monitoring for air quality at locations to be agreed with the Environmental Health

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	assessed for example for 350m from site access in Algores Rd so buffers do not extend along Elm High Rd. HGV's loads to be covered as standard mitigation etc. To agree a suitable condition in conjunction with Fenland DC for suitable real time AQ monitoring scheme prior to construction with provision for remote interrogation and downloading.	Officers of Fenland and Kings Lynn Councils. The Applicant has prepared an **Outline Local Air Quality Monitoring** Strategy (Volume 9.21) which is submitted at Deadline 1. The requirement for a detailed strategy to be submitted to and agreed by the relevant local authorities and implemented has been secured via a new requirement to the Draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1.
Air Quality	Environmental Quality update following the Air Quality Technical Meeting: An air quality technical meeting with Medworth CHP Ltd was held on the 31st of October 2022. This summary report provides a brief update of the discussions underway. Ahead of the meeting we were invited to submit technical queries. Background information to these queries is listed within Appendix 3 of BCKLWN Draft Relevant Representations. The focus of our queries primarily concerns emissions from traffic due to concerns with transport data and that these emissions are combined with those from the stack and reported cumulatively.	Noted the comment relating to combining the stack emissions and the road traffic emissions. The Air Quality Technical Report **(ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)[APP-078]** has been updated and Rev 2 submitted at Deadline 1. Results tables 8B6.1-6.3 have been updated to clearly report the results from the chimney emissions and then separately from the road traffic emissions and finally the total contribution - the PEC. The results from the traffic emission assessment for each of the discrete receptors are reported within Annex H: Modelling Results. Table 8B.H1 reports the results for the construction phase road traffic assessment. Table 8B.H2 reports the annual mean NO2 results from the 2027 baseline and 2027 with development scenarios. Table 8B.H3 reports the 1-hour mean NO2 results. Results for both PM10 and PM2.5 are reported in Table 8B.H4 and Table 8B.H5 respectively. Annual mean and daily mean NH3 results are reported in Table 8B.H6 and Table 8B.H7 respectively. The road traffic impact is reported as 'PC traffic' in each of these results tables.
Air Quality	Stack emissions will be primarily controlled through the Environment Permit (EP), and we were informed that this application has been submitted to the Environment Agency. Other concerns related to some of the assumptions with the air quality assessment plus clarification on the extent of mitigation being proposed.	The Applicant can confirm that the Environmental Permit application was submitted to the Environment Agency in August 2022. Progress on the determination of the permit will be reported to the ExA and interested parties as the examination progresses.
Air Quality	Transport: In terms of the transport related matters we have not agreed with the negative traffic input values used, as this does not appear to be consistent with Chapter 6. A spreadsheet with the negative values was provided to help explain extent.	Noted. Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 has been updated to take this into account.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	Queries were also raised regarding appropriate emission factors used and properly taking into account relative vehicle proportions through appropriate construction traffic management plan. Air quality information is dependent on raw transport data, and which has been agreed to be checked. Where any amendments are required, these can be included within an Air Quality Technical Addendum to the ES.	Noted. The **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4) [APP-078]** has been updated following discussions during the technical officer meeting that took place on the 31/10/22 and submitted at Deadline 1. Please see paragraph 5.1.6 of Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 for information relating to the emission factors used in the road traffic assessment. Please also see Annex D, which has been updated to include more detail around the vehicle splits considering in the road traffic assessment, and the respective flows of each vehicle type.
Air Quality	Controls relating to management of construction traffic as set out within the outline CTMP can be revised that also take account other technical meetings.	Comment noted.
Air Quality	Air quality modelling / assessment: In relation to the air quality modelling it was agreed the Air Quality Addendum will consider: Correction factor; Meteorological data; and Other input parameters (benzene, baseline PEC's etc.).	The model verification has been updated within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report** (**ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1**.** The latest national bias adjustment factor has been used and the monitored results adjusted with this national bias adjustment factor are reported within Table 8B5.1. The new benzene short term EAL has now been taken into consideration in the assessment and this update is now reflected within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1**.** Table 8B2.4 reports the EALs for each pollutant assessed and Table 8B6.1 presents the results of the receptor experiencing the maximum PC expected from the short term VOC as benzene emissions, of which have been assessed against this new short term EAL for Benzene. Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 where a model sensitivity test has been added to Annex F to compare NO2 concentrations predicted using NWP data and from the Marham

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		meteorological station. Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 where baseline concentrations are reported within Table 8B6.1.
Air Quality	Quantifying extent of mitigation being proposed by comparison to health damage costs was noted as not raised at earlier consultations (PIER). The concern however is from residual risks that may not have been considered.	Noted. The residual risk discussed was that of the new duty placed on the local authorities to prepare air quality strategies. LAQM-22 was published after the submission of the original ES Chapter 8 submitted with the DCO application; therefore the Applicant was not in a position to take this new duty into consideration.
Air Quality	We also requested additional information regarding abatement technology. Medworth explained that this additional information is likely to form part of the Best Available Technology (BAT) information in support of application to EA for EP.	Noted. Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 has been updated following a review of the BAT assessment included in the Environmental Permit submissions. Please see paragraph 4.2.5.
Air Quality	In terms of electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure it was noted that this is to be secured under Schedule 1 of Draft DCO. Concern was raised regarding future provision EV for waste vehicles.	Noted. Electrical vehicle charging points form part of the Proposed Development and are permitted under Works No. 2B(d), Schedule 1 Authorised Development, see **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** The **Outline Operational Travel Plan (Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6C) [APP-074]** states at paragraph 4.3.7 that EV charging points will be incorporated into the EfW CHP Facility parking facilities and is secured by Requirement 15 (Operation travel plan), Schedule 2 (Requirements), **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013**]. With regard to the use of EV HGVs. The use of electrical power for HGVs is still in its infancy and that technologies such as hydrogen as an alternative source of power are also under consideration by the haulage industry. The Applicant is committed to an operating fleet that is using low emission vehicles where this is practicable. All HGV will be Euro V or above (2008 or better) and this is specified in Rev 2 of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** submitted at Deadline 1 and secured via Requirement 10 of **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Air Quality	Workplace Travel Plan: We have received a response which explains that this forms part of DCO Requirement 15 with	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	objectives and targets set out within Outline Operational Travel Plan.	
	Community Liaison Manager: unclear on role / remit. We have a received a response explaining the position and how this will be secured.	Comment noted.
Air Quality	Air Quality Monitoring; Additional air quality monitoring is agreed to be discussed further.	Comment noted.
Air Quality	3.17 Odour/Nuisance The main emission source during the operational phase will come from the stack, with modelling identifying receptor R107 (Northeast of the site, in Wisbech/Fenland). The prevailing wind for this district is South Westerly. Best practice has been followed with the Air Dispersion Modelling undertaken and the accompanying results. The area of study was a 15km zone from the location of the chimney emissions. Receptor locations in the villages of West Walton, Walton Highway, Elm and Emneth have been screened out. A negligible impact from the stack emissions is noted for receptors R67 in Elm and R76 in Emneth. Odour emissions would be controlled via the EA permit. At this time, based on the submitted information, we have no concerns regarding odour impacts.	Comment noted.
Air Quality	Has any consideration be given that within 1 mile there are several schools. The Thomas Clarkson Academy, Meadowgate Academy, Elm road Primary School, Ramnoth Road Junior, Wisbech Grammar School, Peckover Primary School Orchard Church of England School. That is where the majority of the children of Wisbech are educated.	As per Paragraph 8.6.7 of the **ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.3) [APP-035]**, local schools have been considered as human receptors included in the Air Quality assessment. The schools noted in this response are included as human receptors in the air quality assessment. Please see **Figure 8.3: Modelled Receptors (Volume 6.3) [APP-052].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	All these schools are north of the proposed site and in the direction of the prevailing winds from the proposed site.	
Traffic and Transport	We would welcome a TP being adopted, but conscious of targets being emission based i.e. trip reduction and how this will be achieved and the transparency of this data. A condition to be agreed.	The Applicant has submitted an **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** and an **Outline Operational Travel Plan (Volume 6.4) [APP-074].** These documents seek to encourage trip reductions during the construction and operational phases. They are secured by requirements 11 and 15 of the draft **DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** which require final plans to be prepared in consultation with the highway authority and submitted to and agreed by the relevant planning authority.
Air Quality	The TA explains in Sections 6.5.57 to 6.5.61 that traffic growth factors are all positive and then provides breakdown of changes by HGV vehicle movements as a proportion of the total for all of the road links within the model shown by Figure 5.1 within the following tables: Table 6.6 (2021 Baseline) Table 6.27 (2024 Construction) and, Table 6.32 (2027 Operational) Some of the road links within the TA are shown with zero change where for example HGV movements are not proposed. The transport dataset was then supplied for the air quality assessment with input values presented in Appendix 8B Tables D1 and D2 for the 18 modelled road links as Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) to estimate the emissions. However, we have noted that a significant proportion of the HGV movements that have been used as input to the air quality model are shown as a negative change i.e. a betterment within Table D2 and at odds with explanation given within the TA. This does not appear to be possible given the local positive traffic growth factors. The concern is if significant negative traffic input values have	Noted. The **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4) [APP-078]** has been updated following discussions during the technical officer meeting that took place on the 31/10/22. The updated Report (Rev 2) has been submitted at Deadline 1. Please see paragraph 5.1.6 for information relating to the emission factors used in the road traffic assessment. Please also see Annex D of the Report, which has been updated to include more detail around the vehicle splits considering in the road traffic assessment, and the respective flows of each vehicle type. There are no negative HGV flows as a result of the Proposed Development and this is now evident in the data reported in Annex D of the Report.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	been used then the air quality impact could be a significant underestimate. It is noted for example that max. PC for NO2 as modelled was only 0.01µgm-3 when compared to stack contribution of 0.78 µgm-3. Examples include Road Link 3 (Cromwell Rd) that is the main route into the site shows minus 506 HGV vehicles per day when compared to the baseline. Similarly, Road Link 4 (Weasenham Lane) shows another betterment of minus 541 HGV per day.	
Air Quality	Similarly, as set out within the CTMP as mitigation, that all HGV will be Euro V or above (2008 or better) but is not clear how this will be achieved or enforced. A condition can be agreed.	This is specified in Rev 2 of the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** submitted at Deadline 1 and secured via Requirement 10 of **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Air Quality	Furthermore, as can be seen within the traffic input data as presented within Tables D1 whilst vehicle splits (% of cars, LGV, HGV, Buses / Coaches and Motorcycles) is presented in Table D2, the proportion of LGV is excluded from the baseline (Table D1). This means that LDV can only be assumed based on difference between Total AADT and % HDV. Default vehicle splits have therefore been used. We have not agreed to this methodology. It is not clear whether additional controls as part of CTMP need to be agreed / conditioned for LDV movements.	Noted. The **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4) [APP-078]** has been updated following discussions during the technical officer meeting that took place on the 31/10/22. The updated Report (Rev 2) has been submitted at Deadline 1. Please also see Annex D of the Report, which has been updated to include more detail around the vehicle splits considering in the road traffic assessment, and the respective flows of each vehicle type.
Air Quality	We also observed that HDV % are only given in Table D1 (includes buses / coaches & HGV) but which have differing emission factors. This was picked up previously by CCC and therefore appears outstanding. Traffic (HGV) input values need to be reflective of the TA and to use appropriate emission factors.	Noted. The **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)[APP-078]** has been updated following discussions during the technical officer meeting that took place on the 31/10/22. The updated Report (Rev 2) has been submitted at Deadline 1. Please also see Annex D of the Report, which has been updated to include more detail around the vehicle splits considering in the road traffic assessment, and the respective flows of each vehicle type.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	There is also the matter of slippage in timescales during construction and ensuring worse case construction traffic is used in the air quality model especially as the TA shows HGV's as >100vpd between months 8 and 23 i.e. for greater than a year with peak predicted to occur in month 14 (187 HGV and 456 LDV). Given the extent of minus values used as input it is unclear whether worse case inputs have been utilised.	There are no minus values with traffic flows. Please see Annex D of Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** which has been submitted at Deadline 1. The construction year utilised in the roads traffic assessment, followed that of the transport assessment. The roads traffic assessment considers annual averages
Air Quality	More generally, as Elm High Rd (A1101) forms a continuum with Churchill Rd in Fenland DC where the AQMA commences and links to a large secondary school (Thomas Clarkson School) we would like additional clarification as to whether proposed mitigation (signage) is sufficient to prevent this cut-through being used.	The Applicant has proposed routing restrictions to control HGV movements during the construction and operational phases. These restriction are to prevent HGVs from access the Proposed Development through the town of Wisbech, passing the Thomas Clarkson Academy and restrict arrival and departures to the A47/Cromwell Road/ new Bridge Lane or Weasenham Road/Algores Way highways. **The Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** and **the Outline OTMP (Volume 7.15) [APP-106]** have been updated for Deadline 1 to provide additional clarity. These management plans are secured in requirements 11 and 12 respectively of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Air Quality	Meteorological Data (traffic): We could not locate explanation relating to the choice of meteorological data for the modelling of traffic emissions.	NWP 2021 data was used. Please see **The Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4) Rev2** where a model sensitivity test has been added to Annex F to compare NO2 concentrations predicted using NWP data and from the Marham meteorological station.
Alternatives	Next have alternative sites been considered by the applicant. Based on the lack of need for the site in Wisbech, has the applicant considered sites where there is a local need for incinerating waste. Has the applicant considered any sites where the demand for the steam generated by the plant is high either now or in the future?	Sections 2.3.1 to 2.3.3 **ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 (Volume 6.2) [APP-029]** summarise the site selection criteria used by the Applicant to identify a suitable site for an EfW CHP facility. The essential and preferable criteria included: • a need for additional residual waste treatment in the area; • that a site is in close proximity to existing businesses 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

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		• a site free of environmental designations. The site proposed for the EfW CHP Facility fulfils these requirements.
Biodiversity	3.9 Biodiversity NCC are leading on this for Norfolk and will be commenting separately.	Comment noted.
Climate	3.12 Climate Change NCC will be commenting separately. This is clearly a key topic that will be discussed in some detail at the Examination. It is noted that Cambridgeshire County Council and their consultants have raised some very detailed and specific queries that will need to be fully considered and addressed at Examination.	Noted. See Table 2.1 of **Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) (Appendix 9.2C of this document**).
Cumulative	3.16 Cumulative Impacts No further comments from a BCKLWN view, other than set out in the individual topic chapters.	Comment noted.
General	Councillor Rust I am very much opposed to the application to locate an incinerator in Wisbech. An incinerator would have a detrimental impact on the health and well being of the people in that area in in West Norfolk. There would be increased traffic which would negatively impact on the air quality which would worsen the health of the residents in both Wisbech and West Norfolk. There are areas in our borough which house the most disadvantaged people in the vicinity and the placement of an incinerator would worsen their already deprived lives.	To inform the Environmental Statement (ES), the Applicant consulted Public Health England (PHE) (now UK Health Security Agency). 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. 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..."*

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		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). ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** 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: • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP**).** Includes a range of mitigation measures including a requirement for community liaison and to register the Proposed Development with the Considerate Contractors Scheme – secured by Requirement 10, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • For the operational phase of the Proposed Development, the Applicant will employ a Community Liaison Manager to engage and raise awareness within the community of the Proposed Development – secured by **Requirement 22, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Odour Management Plan – secured by Requirement 16, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Fire Prevention Plan – secured by Requirement 17, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Construction Staff Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 10, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) – secured by Requirement 11, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) including route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. – secured by Requirement 12, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Operational Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 15, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** and • Securing an Environmental Permit to ensure the EfW CHP Facility operates safely and emissions are monitored to industry standards.
	Appendix 2 - Report to Planning Committee - 7 November 2022.	This Report is noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	Appendix 3 - BCKLWM - Draft Relevant Representations	The Applicant has responded to the Relevant Representation submitted to the Secretary of State which represent the Council's stated position.
	Appendix 2 - Planning Committee 7 November 2022 - Summary of additional correspondence received since the publication of the agenda and errata.	The Applicant has responded to the Relevant Representations submitted to the Secretary of State which represent the Council's stated position.
Geology	The approach for environmental assessment is in line with current best practice guidance, particularly the use of Land Condition Risk Management (LCRM) and both the construction and operational phase are considered. A suitable method is proposed for assessing significance of effects of contamination on relevant receptors. Based on the information provided I can agree that, providing the environmental measures, including further investigation (as set out in the Table 13.24 summary of environmental measures) are followed, the risks will be acceptable and no significant effects from land contamination are anticipated.	Comment noted.
Health	3.14 Health Public health at NCC will be commenting separately on this.	Comment noted.
Health	National health and technical guidance on Energy from Waste plants and emissions will be provided by the UK Health & Safety Agency (formerly Public Health England). They have been consulted as part of this process.	Comment noted.
Historic Environment	3.8 Historic Environment The only listed buildings within the area included on the plan: 'Figure 10.1 Designated heritage assets within a 2km study area', are a good distance away from any of the pipeline works which I understand will be largely underground. The plant will mainly impact upon the setting of heritage assets within Wisbech (and FDC/CCC will comment on that aspect), and will not significantly impact upon the setting of	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	heritage assets in West Norfolk. Therefore, there will be no significant impact on the setting of these heritage assets within this Borough.	
Historic Environment	NCC will comment separately with respect to archaeology	Comment noted.
Hydrology	3.10 Hydrology There are no drainage impacts likely from the grid connection and infrastructure at Walsoken substation. As the operational plant lies outside this district, in Wisbech, we have no concerns over site drainage. Surface water drainage of the site compound, which could contain contaminants, as well as foul water drainage, will be covered by the EA permitting regime, and full details will need to be submitted for the appropriate assessment and agreement in advance of the proposal being completed and operational.	The proposed embedded measures to prevent surface water pollution are set out in **ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2) [APP-039].** These include implementation of a water quality monitoring programme in consultation with the Environment Agency and secured via the permitting regime.
Hydrology	In west Norfolk the flood risk issues at the grid connection point will need to be addressed. This should include an appropriate flood emergency plan during both the construction phase and also the running phases.	The Walsoken Substation is mapped in the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning as being at risk to tidal flooding due to its location in Flood Zone 2, however, this zone does not account for the presence of flood defences in the River Nene. The Environment Agency's Nene Tidal Hazard mapping (included in the Flood Risk Assessment) shows that the substation will remain entirely dry during the design flood event associated with tidal overtopping of the flood defences (1 in 200yr plus climate change to 2115) and also during the 1 in 1000yr plus climate change event in 2115. The substation is also not at residual tidal flood risk during breach of the flood defences in both the 1 in 200yr event (present day) and 1 in 1000yr plus climate change event in 2115. The EA's Surface Water Flood Risk Map also shows limited/very low risk of flooding from surface water run-on across the substation. On the basis that the substation is not a risk of tidal (up to 1 in 1000yr plus climate change event) or surface water flooding and the substation design would be resilient to flooding (compliant with the Energy Networks Association's ETR138 Resilience to Flooding of Grid and Primary Substations), there is no requirement to manage flood risk through an appropriate Flood Emergency Management Plan.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	NCC will be commenting separately on the proposal.	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	3.7 Landscape and Visual NCC are leading on this for Norfolk and will be commenting separately.	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	No objections to the Arboricultural Method Statement approach as outlined in the Outline CEMP. The retention of as many mature/important trees is key, and any mitigation/replacement planting should be in keeping with the wider landscape. Full details of landscaping should be secured via condition.	The CEMP is secured in Requirement 10 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** which will be updated at Deadline 1**,** and the need to agree a landscape and ecology management plan, substantially in accordance with the outline L**andscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 7.7) [APP-098]** is set out in Requirement 5.
Landscape and Visual	Lighting The operational site lies outside this district and lighting is to be positioned such that it should not impact off-site. We have no concerns, but we would support Fenland DC and recommend full details are required via condition, when appropriate	The need to agree and adopt a lighting strategy is secured in Requirement 18 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. The lighting strategy would need to be substantially in accordance with the outline Lighting Strategy (**Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development Appendix 3B Outline Lighting Strategy) [APP-071].**
Major Accidents	3.15 Major Accidents and Disasters NCC will lead on this for Norfolk and will be commenting separately.	Comment noted.
Major Accidents	Additionally, it is recommended comments are sought from Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service, Norfolk Constabulary and Eastern Region Special Operation's Unit.	Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service have provided comments as part of the NCC relevant representation **[RR-004**]. A response to these comments has been provided. At non-statutory and statutory consultation, the Applicant consulted the Relevant Police Authority; including the Police and Crime Commissioner at Norfolk Constabulary. The Applicant has not received a representation from this organisation, however, will contact them again to understand if Norfolk Constabulary and/or the Eastern Region Special Operation's Unit wish to comment of the Proposed Development. Full details of those organisation consulted can be found in the **Consultation Report (Volume 5.1) [APP-018].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Noise and Vibration	3.5 Vibrations Further assessment in terms of vibration impacts on residential properties during the connection to grid at Walsoken substation is welcomed at any later stage/s, given the information provided at this stage. Any mitigation required could be incorporated into the CEMP for the grid connection phase.	Should any construction techniques requiring significant sources of construction vibration be required, these will be assessed, and vibration emissions controlled appropriately, in accordance with the CEMP. The process for this is set out in the **Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) [APP-103],** and updated version of which will be submitted at Deadline 1. The requirement to further assess potential construction noise and vibration impacts, and control them as appropriate, is secured in the CEMP. Paragraph 1.3.3 **of Appendix F Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** states: *"...Precise requirements for mitigation measures will be confirmed following appointment of a Engineering, Procurement and Construction Contractor(s) (EPC Contractor) and when a detailed construction programme is available."*
Planning	References within the reviewed documentation refer to documents submitted in support of the application, specifically the Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (OCEMP), and it is clear that this is 'outline'. Site specific measures are to be further specified in the full document secured via the planning process as pre-commencement documents. These should be in accordance with the relevant legislation and technical guidance and should include easy to understand, yet detailed, explanation of the measures which will be implemented to address each identified impact and evidence/calculations/supporting statements to verify the predicated impact outcome of the implementation of each mitigation measure at each receptor).	Noted. The final CEMP approved via Requirement 10 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** will include this information.
Alternatives	Firstly, why this site on the edge of Wisbech.	The **Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (Volume 7.3) [App-094]** demonstrates that there is sufficient waste to support the operation of a 625,600 tpa EFW CHP Facility. The site proposed for the EfW CHP Facility met the essential and preferable site selection criteria applied by the Applicant. These are set out in Sections 2.3.1 to 2.3.3 **ES Chapter 2 Alternatives [APP-029]** and **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030] and in summary, the selection criteria included that there is a need for additional residual waste treatment in the area, that a site is in close proximity to existing businesses 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.
Alternatives	On the first point, by the need to transport several lorry loads of waste to the site every day, there is clearly not enough waste generated locally to need the site in Wisbech. Therefore, look for sites where sufficient waste is generated to feed the demand now and in the future.	The **Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** demonstrates that there is sufficient waste to support the operation of a 625,600 tpa EfW CHP Facility at a local and national level. An updated WFAA will be submitted at Deadline 2.
Socio-economics	3.13 Socio-economics, tourism and land use There are no specific comments on tourism. The underground cabling would be located within the highway verge. Given the cabling would be underground it is not envisaged it would affect the existing land uses. NCC are leading on this for Norfolk and will be commenting separately.	Comment noted.
Traffic and Transport	3.1 Traffic and Transport NCC are leading on this for Norfolk and will be commenting separately.	Comment noted.
Traffic and Transport	Requiring the new access route via the Cromwell Road link as early as possible in the development scheme would greatly reduce the impact on West Norfolk (and Fenland residents) as the route is almost completely through commercial land, passing approximately four dwellings. This would be welcomed as a condition.	Noted. The Applicant's construction programme is provided within **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030] Graphic 3.23: Construction Programme Summary** which identifies the opening of access via New Bridge Lane as occurring in Month 7 of the 36 month construction programme.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Traffic and Transport	At the construction stage a new access route via New Bridge Lane is planned to open from weeks 5-25 of the construction (civils) project. Once opened it is proposed (Section 6.6.68 to 70) that 65% of the construction vehicles (mostly HGV's) would enter / exit from this road with a wheel wash located at the exit.	The Applicant's construction programme is provided within **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030] Graphic 3.23: Construction Programme Summary** which identifies the opening of access via New Bridge Lane as occurring in Month 7 of the 36 month construction programme. Week 25 sits within Month 7. The percentage split quoted by BKLWN is accurately recorded from **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033].**
Traffic and Transport	The TA adds that some construction traffic will still need to access the site via the existing Algores Way i.e. the northern approach but these HGV vehicles be routed via Cromwell Rd – Weasenham Lane – Algores Way and therefore negating construction HGV movements within this Council's area along Elm High Rd. According to the Chapter 6 Transport Assessment (TA; Section 6.5.106) restrictions will however only apply to prevent movements along (Elm High Rd) once the site is operational.	**ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033]** 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 Cambridgeshire County Council during the consultation process and is an agreed approach. Route restrictions for any HGVs other than local RCVs would therefore be implemented in relation to: • A1101 north of A47 Elm Road roundabout; • Churchill Road (north of Elm High Road); and • Weasenham Lane (between Algores Way/Elm High Road). Accompanying the DCO Application is the Applicant's **Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) (Volume 7.15) [APP-106]**. Figure 2.1 of the Outline OTMP displays the proposed operational route restrictions that are described above. The final OTMP is secured by **Requirement 12, Schedule 2, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. The **Outline CTMP (Vol 6.4)** submitted with the application has been updated with a new section 4.9 added to introduce routing restrictions for HGV construction traffic. This revised document is submitted at Deadline 1 and will be secured by **Requirement 11, Schedule 2, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**.
Traffic and Transport	The fact that the A47 that will be used to bring waste to the site is currently heavily congested seems have been ignored. When travelling north the traffic on the stretch of the A47 from the Tesco roundabout to the Elme House roundabout is regularly at a complete standstill.	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), [APP-033] accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073].** Between these documents daily and peak hourly assessments are provided including detailed link and junction assessment

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	This the main southern entrance into Norfolk from the Midlands. It is a route for business traffic and visitors supporting the economy of Norfolk.	for both the operational and construction period as appropriate. The junction assessment includes a 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 Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath, pedestrian crossing points and reducing the road speed from the national speed limit to 30mph. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.
Traffic and Transport	Councillor Squire As a local councillor living less than 5 miles from the proposed site, it is an area I know extremely well. Traffic going in and out of the Medworth site will not just affect the traffic on the A47 in the immediate vicinity, but issues will extend along the A1101 on both sides of the Elm Hall Roundabout on the A47.	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), [APP-033] accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073].** 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 junction assessment includes a 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 Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath, pedestrian crossing points and reducing the road speed from the national speed limit to 30mph. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.
Traffic and Transport	Currently, at certain times of the day, traffic will be backed up for at least a mile along the A1101 with drivers trying to reach the Elm Hall Roundabout. The A47 from the Cromwell Road junction can be at a virtual standstill when travelling to the Elm Hall Roundabout.	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), [APP-033] accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073].** 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 junction assessment includes for consideration of the A47/Cromwell Road junction and concludes that effects upon congestion would not be significant. The junction of the A1101 and Elm Hall Roundabout was not assessed as the HGV traffic generated by the Proposed Development will not use this route to access the EfW CHP Facility (unless it is the existing

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		refuse vehicles which serve Wisbech and secured a future contract to deliver local waste to the facility). A 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 Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath, pedestrian crossing points and reducing the road speed from the national speed limit to 30mph. With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.
Traffic and Transport	It will often take me more than half an hour to get the few miles from where I live to that A47 roundabout, along the A1101, due to sheer volume of traffic. This is not unusual, it is an every day occurrence and it is worse in summer when the A47 is the main route for holiday traffic heading towards the coast. At present this means that the small village roads are often used as a rat run for drivers trying to avoid sitting in stationary traffic around the area of the roundabout.	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), [APP-033] accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073].** 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 junction assessment includes for the modelling of the A47/Cromwell Road junction and concludes the effects arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development would not be significant whilst the predicted number of vehicles that might use the junction of the A47 with the A1101 was low and fell below the number which would generate the need to undertake a capacity assessment (the threshold for which had been agreed with CCC and NCC). The Applicant will enforce route restrictions for HGVs during both the construction and operational periods. These restrictions are set out in the **Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) Appendix 6.4) [APP-072]** and **Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (Volume 7.15) [APP-106].**
Traffic and Transport	Any extra traffic coming in and out along that section of the A47 is going to make the matter even worse and that is even assuming queuing drivers will even let the vehicles out. The road system is not fit for purpose as it is, without any additional stresses on it.	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), [APP-033] accompanied by Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073].** With these improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste Need	If I was considering an Energy from waste site, I would consider firstly is their sufficient waste to feed the plant, located close to the proposed site. Secondly is their sufficient demand to use the Energy being generated.	**Section 2.3.1 to 2.3.3 ES Chapter 2 Alternatives and ES Chapter 3 (Volume 6.2) [APP-029]** explains the Applicant's reason for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied and suitably meet. In summary, the selection criteria included that there is a need for additional residual waste treatment in the area, that a site is in close proximity to existing businesses 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. The site proposed for the EfW CHP Facility fulfils these requirements. In addition to this, the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** 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.
	On the second point is their enough demand locally for the energy generated either steam or power. This area has a limited demand for the steam to be used in local factories and the power generated will be fed into the National Grid and be used anywhere the need arises. Therefore, there is no real reason why the plant needs to be built here, build it where the demand for steam is high	The Applicant has prepared a **Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Volume 7.6) [APP-097]** which assesses the potential for heat demand locally. The evidence contained within this document is supplemented by work undertaken by BEIS, a government department which has prepared UK CHP Development Map. This shows that Wisbech has potentially some of the highest demand for CHP in the East of England with only Norwich having the equivalent number of large heat loads located in the town.
	Finally, I think we should be looking at methods that encourage solutions that reduce the production of waste and encourage the use of renewables and therefore reduce the need for such a plant to be built.	The Proposed Development will not compromise recycling rates. It uses residual waste as fuel. This is the waste which cannot be recycled. With regard to waste reduction, the Applicant's **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** considers the amount of residual waste potentially available within the Study Area. It factors into its calculation Government targets for reduction

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		(and recycling) and concludes that there would still be excess waste generated requiring treatment.
Waste Policy	Waste Policy Matters Waste policy matters, including waste availability and composition, net self-sufficiency, and site selection, have been covered in the relevant representations of Cambridgeshire County Council, as the specialist waste planning authority for the area. This will be the subject of a Local Impact Report and will be covered in detail at the Examination. Any waste policy issues affecting Norfolk, will be covered by NCC, as the specialist waste planning authority for our area.	Comment noted.

Table 2.2 Applicant's Comments on the CCC / FDC Joint Relevant Representation [RR-002 and RR-003]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	Cambridgeshire County Council Air Quality Consultant 5.1 Cambridgeshire County Council employed an Air Quality Consultant to provide specialist comments on the Medworth CHP Limited DCO application and their comments have been summarised in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.24 below to just highlight the major issues, with further detail of a number of other issues to follow in the Local Impact Report (LIR). A critical review was carried out on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) to ensure that the conclusions to be presented in the Local Impact Report are robust, the review covers: whether the scope of the assessment submitted by the applicant is sufficient; whether the air quality chapter of the ES and supporting documents are based on an appropriate methodology (i.e. is it 'fit for purpose'); the identification of any errors or omissions; whether the assessment of the overall significance of the proposed development is appropriate, and whether appropriate criteria have been adopted; and whether the mitigation measures proposed are appropriate.	Comment noted.
Air Quality	5.2 Where errors or omissions were identified, they were categorised as either a Minor, Moderate or Major Issue. The Minor issues, which in isolation would be unlikely to affect the conclusions of the assessment will be included in the LIR because there is the potential for multiple minor issues to combine to invalidate the reported conclusions. The Moderate issues are weaknesses that have been identified which, individually, may or may not affect the conclusions, and therefore details of these will be included in the LIR. The Major issues are set out in full in the following paragraphs because any one individual failing would be highly likely to invalidate the reported conclusions.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	Major Issues 5.3 In Paragraph 8.4.14 and Annex 8B of the ES it states: "A four-month co-location study was undertaken with a triplicate diffusion tube location (site 14) installed alongside the automatic monitor from August to November 2021. This co-location study was used to determine a diffusion tube adjustment factor of 0.69." Many of the factors which cause diffusion tube bias vary by season (and so the bias in one part of the year will be different from that for the annual mean). In these circumstances, where monitoring was carried out for an 11 month period in a calendar year (January to November 2021), it would have been more appropriate to have applied a bias adjustment factor derived from monitoring carried out throughout 2021 rather than a short 4-month period. The National Diffusion Tube Bias adjustment spreadsheet v 06/22 contains 34 studies using diffusion tubes prepared using 20% TEA in water and 16 studies using 50% TEA in acetone. The factors derived using these studies are 0.84 and 0.82. Applying these factors would have resulted in higher measured concentrations presented in Table 8.8 and model verification factors, which would have resulted in higher modelled annual mean NO2 concentrations and greater impacts as a result of the development. This has therefore led to an underrepresentation of the impacts of the Proposed Development.	Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 has been updated to report the results from the traffic emissions assessment adjusted using the model verification factor derived from the use of monitored results adjusted with the national adjustment factor. It has also been updated to report the results from the road traffic assessment as per comment. The model verification section of section 5 of **Appendix 8B** has been updated which reports the monitoring data adjusted with the national adjustment factor in Table 8B5.1. All proceeding tables associated with model verification have subsequently been updated. Results tables 8B6.1-6.3 have been updated to clearly report the results from the chimney emissions and then separately from the road traffic emissions and finally the total contribution - the PEC. The results from the traffic emission assessment for each of the discrete receptors are reported within Annex H: Modelling Results. Table 8B.H1 reports the results for the construction phase road traffic assessment. Table 8B.H2 reports the annual mean NO2 results from the 2027 baseline and 2027 with development scenarios. Table 8B.H3 reports the 1-hour mean NO2 results. Results for both PM10 and PM2.5 are reported in Table 8B.H4 and Table 8B.H5 respectively. Annual mean and daily mean NH3 results are reported in Table 8B.H6 and Table 8B.H7 respectively. The road traffic impact is reported as 'PC traffic' in each of these results tables.
Air Quality	5.4 In Table 8.26 and 8.27 and Appendix 8B, no consideration has been given to the new benzene 24-hr Environmental Assessment Level of 30 µg/m3.	The new EAL for Benzene has been taken into account in Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 Please see Table 8B2.4 and Table 8B6.1 of Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 where relevant updates have been made to account for the new EAL for Benzene.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	5.5 In Table 8.31, it states the maximum daily HF concentration occurs at E1. Table 8B.H27 indicates that a higher concentration is modelled at E8. The impacts have therefore been underrepresented in Table 8.31.	The impacts to air quality at internationally designated sites and local wildlife sites have been separated in the main chapter. The impacts to air quality at internationally designated sites are presented in table 8.30 of **ES Chapter 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2) [APP-035].** The impacts to air quality at local wildlife sites are presented in Table 8.31. Table 8B.H27 presents the results for the impacts to air quality at **all** ecological receptors. This means that E8 is the ecological receptor that reports the highest concentration compared to all ecological receptors considered in the assessment. However, if looking at local wildlife sites in isolation, then it is E1 that reports the highest concentration
Air Quality	5.6 In Table 8B4.3 Odour concentration 3,000 OUe/m3, the source of this assumption should be provided.	The Air Quality Technical Report (**ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4) [APP-078]** has been updated accordingly, please see Section 4.2.21 and tables 8B4.3 and 8B4.4 of the updated version submitted at Deadline 1. The odour assessment considers building air being vented through a carbon filter. Based on professional judgement, a carbon filter normally keeps an odour concentration below 1000 OUe/m3. Professional judgement of undertaking various odour assessments using carbon filters is used here, where a design concentration is incorporated into the odour model. Using an odour concentration of 3000 OuE/m3 is considered worst case. Results are now also shown using an odour extraction concentration of 1000 OuE/m3 from the carbon filter. These results show that the maximum odour concentration is compliant using this odour extraction concentration of 1000 OuE/m3.
Air Quality	5.7 With reference to Table 8B4.3 Odour release rate 133,333 OUe/m3, based on the other parameters stated in this table, the odour release rate appears to be incorrect.	Please see Table 8B4.3 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 where the emissions data relating to the odour assessment have been updated. A diameter of 2m and efflux velocity of 15.4 m/s provides a volumetric flow of 48.27 m3/s and therefore with a concentration of 3000 OuE/m3, a release rate of 144,818 OuE/s

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		Results are now also shown using an odour extraction concentration of 1000 OuE/m3 using the carbon filter since 3000 OuE/m3 is worse case for the use of a carbon filter.
Air Quality	In Paragraph 4.2.21 Diesel generator emissions, no consideration is given to the impact of generator testing, which is required regularly throughout the year in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.	Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 now includes CO and PM2.5 as part of the diesel generator assessment as requested during the host authority air quality meeting held on 31/10/2022. A justification on why long term impacts have not been assessed has also been provided in the updated report.
Air Quality	5.9 Paragraph 4.3.5 identifies that NWP data for the period 2015-2019 has been used in the chimney model. The roads model is verified against monitoring data from 2021 and therefore the meteorological data should also be taken from the same year. The met data year used for the traffic model does not appear to be stated anywhere in the documentation	NWP data for 2021 were used. Section 5 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)[APP-078]** has been updated accordingly in the Rev 2 version submitted at Deadline 1. Please see paragraph 5.1.6.
Air Quality	5.10 In Paragraph 4.10.2, it states "As emissions of relevant pollutants associated with chimney discharges from the EfW CHP Facility are below reporting thresholds for other Part A(1) installations in the local area, it is not proposed to specifically include their emissions in the dispersion model. However, as all Part A(1) installations are included in Defra's national mapped estimates of background concentrations which were used as part of the assessment, such emissions were considered indirectly." Depending on the dispersion characteristics and location of nearby sensitive receptors, point sources can have a locally significant impact when emissions are below the EA reporting thresholds. For example, the specific source associated with the nearby AQMA designation for SO2 and PM10 is not identified. Figures 8.5 and 8.6 indicate that the impacts of the proposed development could overlap with the AQMA and therefore the potential for combined impacts with this and any other point sources should be considered further.	The use of the Defra's national mapped estimates of background concentrations is considered sufficient in considering emissions from existing nearby installations. If any present point sources were modelled, the Defra maps would have been adjusted to remove their contribution to background concentrations used in the assessment. The assessment has considered receptors within the AQMAs, declared for SO2 and PM10, located more than 1 km away from the proposed development stack. The adopted approach follows best practice and is considered sufficiently robust.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	5.11 In Graphic 8B5.1 Modelled Road Links, there is no justification for the area included/not included in the modelled road links. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether a suitable study area has been selected.	Section 5 of Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes further clarity and justification of the modelled road links. Please also see graphics 8B5.1-5.3. The transport routes outlined by the transport assessment have influenced the modelled road links and therefore the modelled road network which makes up the study area for the roads traffic assessment. Sensitive ecological sites have also influenced modelled road links which were added adjacent to these sites
Air Quality	5.12 In Graphic 8B5.1 Modelled Road Links, the modelled road links do not extend to roads adjacent to the SACs and therefore the combined influence upon designated ecological sites of emissions from additional traffic generated by the development and the stack does not appear to have been adequately taken into consideration in the assessment. Additional traffic on roads such as the A47 and A141 directly adjacent to Nene Washes, and the A1122 adjacent to Ouse Washes have not been considered.	The road traffic assessment has been updated to include the road traffic impacts along road's adjacent to Nene Washes SAC and Ouse Washes SAC. See Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Graphic 8B5.2 and 5.3 presents the road links that have been added adjacent to the two sites. Table 8B.H22 reports the annual NOx concentrations expected at each ecological receptor. This table reports the road traffic emission contribution separately.
Air Quality	5.13 With reference to Graphic 8B5.1 Modelled Road Links, as mentioned in the review of the PEIR, all roads within 200m of receptors should be included in the road traffic model to ensure that total predicted environmental concentrations are representative of actual conditions. The road network shown does not include all road links within 200m of receptors and therefore the Predicted Environmental Concentrations will have been underestimated at these locations.	A review of the traffic road links and receptor locations within the traffic model has been undertaken, roads have been extended to ensure all roads within 200m of receptors are included in the traffic model. Please see graphic 8B5.1 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. A rational for the road network modelled has been provided in Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 following feedback received in the host authority air quality meeting on 31/10/2022. Please see Section 5.1.2 - 5.1.4.
Air Quality	5.14 In Table 8B5.4 % (Modelled-Monitored)/Monitored, there appear to be some errors in this table as the percentages presented do not correspond with the modelled and monitored values in the table.	Noted. Table 8B5.4 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes this information.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	5.15 In Table 8B6.1 PM10 24-hr max PC as % of AQAL = 0%, based on the values presented, this value is incorrect .	Noted. Table 8B6.1 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes this information.
Air Quality	5.16 In Table 8B6.1 PEC, the lack of baseline concentrations in these tables makes it impossible to determine whether the PECs have been calculated correctly.	Noted. Table 8B6.1 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 now includes baseline values.
Air Quality	5.17 In Table 8B6.1 and others, Concentrations of metals, PAH and PCB. The concentrations are presented at an insufficient number of significant figures to allow meaningful comparison with the EAL. For example the Chromium VI EAL is 0.0002 µg/m3 but the PC is stated as <0.01 µg/m3, which is 5,000% of the EAL.	Noted. Table 8B6.1 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes this information.
Air Quality	5.18 In Table 8B6.2 Annual mean PC (traffic) at R96 PM10 = <0.01 µg/m3, PM2.5 = 0.05 µg/m3, there appear to be some errors in this table because the PM10 PC from traffic should be greater than the PM2.5 PC.	Noted. Table 8B6.2 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes this information.
Air Quality	5.19 In Table 8B6.2 Annual mean PC (traffic) ammonia annual = 0.01 µg/m3 and 1-hr = 0.01 µg/m3, there appear to be some errors in this table because the annual mean and 1-hr contributions should be different values.	Noted. Table 8B6.2 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes this information.
Air Quality	5.20 In Table 8B6.5 Annual NOx PC 0.34 µg/m3 = 1.0% of the Critical Level, this is incorrect, 0.34 µg/m3 is actually 1.1% of the Critical Level.	Noted. Table 8B6.5 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes this information.
Air Quality	5.21 In Table 8B6.10 Maximum predicted odour concentration at human receptors during abnormal operation, a figure should be provided showing concentration contours to determine whether there are any locations where short-term exposure could occur at higher concentrations.	Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes a contour figure of the 9th percentile 1-hour mean odour concentration. Please see graphic 8B6.3 and 6.4
Air Quality	Conclusion 5.22 The methodology outlined in the ES is generally	Comment noted. The Applicant has addressed these concerns in the responses set out above and Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	acceptable, although a number of clarifications and errors are identified in this review that need to be addressed before any conclusions on the likely significance of air quality effects can be determined. The apparent errors in the reporting of the results highlights the need for rigorous Quality Assurance and checking of all model inputs and results presented in the ES. There may be additional errors that have not been highlighted in this review and therefore a full review of all inputs and results should be completed by the applicant prior to submission of updated documentation.	**(ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Air Quality	5.23 The issues identified above have been discussed with the applicant and their consultants. They have agreed to provide an updated version of the Air Quality Technical Report (Appendix 8B of the Environmental Statement), which will aim to address these issues. Based on the discussions to date, it is not anticipated that any of the changes are likely to alter the conclusions of the assessment.	Comment noted. Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** has been submitted at Deadline 1
Air Quality	5.24 Some of the issues highlighted should lead to alterations in the calculated concentrations and deposition fluxes of pollutants at designated ecological sites. Therefore once the updated Air Quality Technical Report has been produced, the Ecology chapter may need to be updated and any changes reviewed. More information will be included in the Local Impact Report if these amendments are received in time.	Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** was submitted at Deadline 1. The updated air quality predicted pollutant concentrations at internationally and locally designated sites within the zone if influence of the Proposed Development are within the long-term and short-term critical load limits, such that effects can be screened as insignificant using the Environment Agency screening criteria and do not require further consideration.
Air Quality	Fenland District Council (FDC) Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) 5.25 FDC's EHOs agree with the points and conclusion raised above by the Air Quality Consultant's (AQC) review of Chapter 8 of the ES and the associated figures and appendices. 5.26 In addition to the observations made in the AQC report,	Table 8.6 of Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 references FDC's 2020 Annual Status Report rather than an Air Quality Screening Review. The 2020 ASR was used within the ES submission. A review of the 2021 ASR has now been undertaken. The review has concluded that monitoring results reported for 2020 are lower than monitoring results from 2019. The baseline data within the air quality assessment has not been updated

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	FDC's EHOs make the following comments on behalf of FDC. 5.27 Table 8.6 references the 2020 Annual Screening Review. The 2021 Air Quality Screening Review was published online at www.fenland.gov.uk/airquality. 5.28 In the 2021 Annual Screen Review for this location, a bias adjustment of 0.76 was made to diffusion tube results. This assessment has used a level of 0.69. The monitoring used to derive this bias adjustment does not have a representative monitoring period for there to be confidence that this bias should be used over the DEFRA published bias adjustment factor. It is considered that the bias adjustment used will underrepresent the annual NO2 levels.	and the air quality assessment has continued to utilise 2019 monitoring data from the Fenland 2020 ASR. This is since this data is thought to represent baseline air quality data without impacts from COVID-19 and a worse case. The Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 utilises the latest applicable national bias adjustment factor. Please see the **model verification** section of section 5 of Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Air Quality	5.29 Within paragraph 8.5.5 of the ES it states that Fenland operate two continuous monitors. This is incorrect. Two continuous monitors are operated by Forterra Brick Works as part of the Environment Agency (EA) Environmental Permit to demonstrate compliance with the AQMA. FDC do not control or have continuous access to this data or monitoring. FDC would like the report to note the AQMA in Whittlesey. 5.30 To note the report mentions Whittlesea, this has been taken to be the town of Whittlesey.	Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. The Whittlesey AQMA is now reported within section 3: Current Baseline. Paragraph 3.1.5 has been updated to reflect the correct operation of the automatic monitors.
Air Quality	5.31 Paragraph 8.5.25 of the ES advises that that the long-term objectives for No2 and Nox will not be exceeded. For FDC to consider if they agree with this statement the objectives should be referenced to avoid ambiguity.	Noted. This paragraph is now superseded by the Current Baseline, **Section 3** of the Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. All respective Air Quality Objectives are reported within Table 8B2.4.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	5.32 It is deemed that short term exceedance may occur in emergency situations. Paragraph 8.6.31 of the ES refers to Island Mode Operation (Operating independently from the national grid). In further development of the Air Quality Management Plan it should be clearly detailed how these occasions with be monitored and what control measures will be put in place to ensure these incidents do not occur regularly enough to create an exceedance of the national air quality objectives.	The Air Quality Assessment has not deemed that there will be exceedances of the short term objective in emergency situations. The Air Quality Assessment has considered the short term emissions from the diesel generator during an emergency scenario as a **likely effect.** Results for the human receptor experiencing the maximum process contribution in this emergency scenario are reported in Table 8B6.13 within Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Air Quality	5.33 Paragraph 8.6.40 and 8.6.51 of the ES refers to the odour management during periods of abnormal operation. It is noted that a system of odour abatement has not been confirmed and the odour management plan is still in the outline stage.	The **Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) [APP-107]** is secured in Requirement 16 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. This requires that a final Odour Management Plan be submitted to the relevant planning authority prior to the commissioning of any part of Work No.1. It is understood that the relevant planning authority will consult with FDC regarding the final details of this plan.
Air Quality	5.34 Paragraph 8.6.48 of the ES discusses non-road mobile machinery (NRMM), although it is agreed that it is not in scope of the air quality impact assessment and would appropriately be part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan, it is currently absent from the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP), and therefore further revisions of the CEMP should include this and be agreed with the LA pre-commencement of any use of NRMM on site.	Measures to control emissions from NRMM have been included in the updated outline CEMP submitted at Deadline 1. This is secured in Requirement 10 of **the Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Air Quality	5.35 Paragraph 8.6.50 of the ES in addition to all handling and storage of incinerator bottom ash (IBA) and air pollution control residues (APCr) being within an enclosed building, the transportation of IBA and APCr should also be enclosed or transported in a state to mitigate releases of particulates. Dust mitigation measures should be in place to prevent the escape of airborne IBA from all storage and handling buildings and this should be included in the sites Air Quality Environmental Management Plan in line with their Environmental Permit.	Noted. Dust mitigation measures are included within the **Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12).** An updated Outline CEMP has been submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	5.36 Paragraph 8.8.10 of the ES states the transport aspect of this development is a substantial part of its operation. It should not be assumed that the short-term impacts to emissions be zero, but quantify what they are, to demonstrate their impact against current levels measured against a representative period.	Noted. Short term impacts such as daily NOx concentrations from road traffic have been considered and are reported within Table 8B.H23 of **ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4) [APP-078]**.
Air Quality	5.37 Outline Odour Management Plan (OMP) This report is currently in its outline stages. The document identified that there will be controls in place although due to ambiguity of what these controls will be at this stage it is requested an updated OMP to be submitted for approval by the relevant consultees (including but not necessarily limited to FDC) prior to the operation of the installation on the site if granted permission – which: · Is drawn up with the relevant legislation and technical guidance, and contains all associated content · Is presented in a logical format, to enable ease of interpretation · Includes a table which provides a high-level summary of the determined significance of odour sources at each receptor including the impact when the site is operational, anormal operational, and emergency operational · Includes detailed explanation of the measures which will be implemented to address each identified impact as necessary for each measure, a statement and/or other evidence/calculations as necessary – to verify the eradicated impact outcome of the implementation of each mitigation measure at each receptor.	The **Outline Odour Management Plan (Volume 7.11) [APP-107]** is secured via Requirement 16 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** This requires that a final Odour Management Plan be submitted to the relevant planning authority prior to the commissioning of any part of Work No.1. It is understood that the relevant planning authority will consult with FDC regarding the final details of this plan.
Air Quality	Cambridgeshire County Council Education Capital comments and wider educational concerns raised in relation	The Applicant has been in discussion with both FDC and BKLWN Environmental Health Officers (EHO) in advance of the application

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	to the Cambian Education Foundation Learning Centre (CEFLC) and the Riverside Meadows Academy (RMA) by Fenland District Council (FDC). 5.38 In terms of odour and dust, specific reference has been made to an automatic monitoring station being installed at the TCA. However, it is unclear from the submission who will monitor this and how the result of monitoring will be reported to the TCA. Based upon the information provided, without the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed development could cause unacceptable adverse effects in respect of odour and dust on the TCA and the proposed Free School site, in addition to the CEFLC and RMA school sites. While enhanced mitigation and monitoring should be a requirement, the implementation of any proposed mitigation measures and monitoring of their performance will be essential for all the school sites.	submission to discuss appropriate monitoring locations. This discussion has continued post application submission and has resulted in the Applicant preparing an **Outline Local Air Quality Monitoring Strategy (Volume 9.21).** This strategy is submitted at Deadline 1. The strategy includes for the monitoring locations which have been suggested by the relevant EHOs and includes for passive and automatic continuous monitoring at the Thomas Clarkson Academy.
Biodiversity	8.1 Overall, the ecological assessment is comprehensive and well presented. We agree with the applicant's assessment that there will be no significant impact on wildlife sites. However, we are concerned about the following: · Net loss in biodiversity value; · incomplete protected species surveys (water vole and great crested newt); · lack of compensation and enhancement for protected species (water vole); · more details required for assessment of habitats (priority habitats & those of county importance); · lack of priority habitat within the scheme appropriate for the location or to off-set losses (open mosaic habitat / hedgerows); · wording of DCO requirement(s).	Noted. Specific points are addressed in relation to the detailed comments below.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	Net loss in biodiversity value 8.2 Our main concern is that the scheme will result in a net loss in biodiversity value, with a loss of approx. -10% area-based habitats, -22% linear based habitats (hedgerows) and -12% river-based habitats (hedgerows). This includes loss in biodiversity value for priority habitat (hedgerows), local BAP habitat (ditches) and scrub (see BNG assessment). This does not accord with the policy 20 of Minerals and Waste Local Plan which requires development to deliver biodiversity net gain in habitats / species that is proportionate to the scale of the development.	The Applicant is committed to delivering biodiversity net gain through the Proposed Development, as set out in the **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [AS-009]**. The potential for BNG has been maximised for on-site land under the Applicant's control. **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M** sets out the requirement for off-site habitat enhancements/creation to achieve the target of 10% BNG and provides examples of appropriate habitat enhancement and creation options which would meet this target. Habitat types included in the proposals are aligned to local priorities identified on the Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Partnership Habitat Opportunity Mapping. **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M** describes that the BNG calculation for the Proposed Development will be updated at appropriate junctures (e.g., at the 'as-designed' and 'as-constructed' stages) and the Applicant is exploring options with local stakeholders for delivering any necessary off-site habitat enhancements/creation. Requirement 6 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** requires a biodiversity net gain strategy to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the Proposed Development.
Biodiversity	8.3 We are pleased that the scheme has committed to addressing this issue through off-site compensation, but no information is provided about how this will be delivered. The applicant has proposed a Biodiversity Net Gain requirement (6) within the draft DCO, but this only requires the production of a BNG strategy. We seek that this is reworded to capture the requirement for off-site compensation for loss of biodiversity value (particularly priority habitats and those of local importance), along with the implementation of the scheme and management/ monitoring until habitats have reached their target condition. The BNG requirement should also monitor whether or not the expected on-site BNG targets will be met, at both the detailed design stage, construction and operational stage.	Noted. The Applicant is currently exploring options for delivering off-site BNG. **Requirement 6 of the Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** will secure the production of an appropriate BNG strategy. It is the Applicant's intention that the strategy will include the BGN calculation for the Proposed Development using the Natural England biodiversity metric; detail the mechanisms for delivering BNG habitat measures; and detail the associated on-going management and monitoring of habitat measures that would be undertaken. Requirement 6 makes provision for the BNG strategy to be approved by the relevant planning authority, in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body; affording opportunity for the relevant parties to agree on the content and requirements of the strategy.
Biodiversity	8.4 We also believe it would be helpful if the applicant explored options for off-site compensation during the Examination period, so that we have more confidence that a scheme will be delivered. We would suggest a meeting with local authority ecologists and key NGOs (RSPB, Wildlife	Noted. The Applicant is exploring options for off-site BNG habitat compensation during the Examination period and will organise a meeting with the named parties to identify potential opportunities.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	Trust) in the area that are involved within BNG or might know about potential sites.	
Biodiversity	Priority habitats 8.5 There will be a loss in value of priority habitats – hedgerow (as mentioned above) which needs to be compensated.	Noted. **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [AS-009]** calculates the loss of hedgerow priority habitat in terms of biodiversity units. The loss of hedgerow habitat would be compensated through the Biodiversity Net Gain provision for the Proposed Development which would deliver a net gain in hedgerow habitat.
Biodiversity	8.6 Clarification is sought as to why ephemeral habitats identified along the disused railway line are not identified as priority habitat - open mosaic habitat on previously developed land.	The habitat along the disused railway was assessed against the priority habitat criteria for open mosaic habitat. It does not meet the priority habitat criteria of either the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (as amended) Section 41 Habitat of Principal Importance or the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough County Wildlife Site habitat definitions.
Biodiversity	Habitat of county importance 8.7 The applicant should confirm whether or not the habitats within the scheme have been assessed against the County Wildlife Site criteria. For example, scrub (criteria 1b) or habitat mosaic along the disused railway.	The habitats present were assessed against the priority habitat criteria for the appropriate habitat types. The habitats do not meet the priority habitat criteria of either the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (as amended) Section 41 Habitat of Principal Importance or the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough County Wildlife Site habitat definitions.
Biodiversity	Water Vole 8.8 Water Vole will be adversely affected by the scheme as a result of habitat loss due to culverting of D24 within the EfW and we are disappointed that the scheme fails to incorporate any compensatory measures to address this loss in habitat and isolation of potential water vole burrow. We therefore seek inclusion of enhancement to ditch D24 (affected to ditch) and ditch D26 and support of water vole as part of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy. Both of these ditches are suboptimal due to maintenance and effluent. We would expect the scheme to address this issue, particularly any runoff etc., as part of the scheme design.	The loss of on-site ditch habitat has been minimised by retaining open sections where possible and culvert design will allow mammal passage. Surface water runoff will be managed by interceptors before discharge, and discharge will be to green-field run-off rates. The Applicant has explored the potential for positive management of the existing ditches on-site. The ditches are under the management control of the Internal Drainage Board, and thus the Applicant is precluded from undertaking enhancement of ditch habitat. The Proposed Development includes creation of other on-site habitat intended to buffer the existing ditches and provide beneficial habitat for water vole as shown on **Figure 3.14 Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** (which is secured by **Requirement 5 of the Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**), including attenuation swales and pond, wet grassland and wet woodland habitats. Well-connected ditch habitat will remain adjoining the EfW CHP Facility Site, and loss of ditch habitat will be compensated off-site.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	8.9 In addition, we are concerned that not all ditches have been surveyed. We are currently within the survey season for water vole and therefore, consider it reasonable to seek that the applicant undertake the outstanding WV surveys ASAP, so that the full impact of the scheme on Water Vole can be determined.	All ditches which would be directly affected by the Proposed Development have been surveyed for water vole. A number of ditches along the A47 corridor (which would not be directly affected) were not subject to surveys in part due to health and safety risks of working close to a busy road. These ditches are likely to be suboptimal due to surface water run-off from the road, litter from road users, and elevated levels of noise/vibration due to vehicle movements. The Proposed Development along the A47 would predominantly be restricted to the immediate road verge, where each section of cabling works would be completed in a single night thus minimising the risk of disturbance to water voles. In the unlikely event that water vole occur within these ditches, their presence would be detected during pre-works checks and ecological supervision of work activities (as detailed in the **Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** (which is secured by **Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**) which would inform appropriate avoidance/mitigation. Embedded environmental measures such as protection of watercourses include stand-off distances from ditches which are adequate to avoid damage/disturbance to water voles and their burrows. Additional survey work at the pre-consent stage would therefore not materially alter the assessment of effects on water vole or the embedded environmental measures/mitigation.
Biodiversity	8.10 We have not been able to find a lighting plan for the scheme. The applicant should confirm whether or not dark corridors will be retained along the ditches that support water vole (e.g. D24 and D26 on the EfW site). It would be helpful to have a plan showing the dark corridors as part of the outline lighting strategy to confirm that there will be no illumination of these features.	An **Outline Operational Lighting Strategy** (**Appendix 3B Outline Lighting Strategy (Volume 6.4) [APP-071] (secured in Requirement 18 of the draft DCO)**) has been prepared for the Proposed Development, which sets out that lighting design will follow the principles of Bat Conservation Trust/Institute for Lighting Professionals joint guidance. Lighting would be minimised/screened to avoid illuminating adjacent habitats, and there would be no lighting of ditches as non-operational areas of the site. Dark corridors will be identified in the final Operational Lighting Strategy at the detailed design phase post consent.
Biodiversity	Great Crested Newt 8.11 Some of the ditches that will be affected by the proposals have not been surveyed for the presence of Great Crested Newt (GCN) and therefore the full impact on this protected species cannot be determined. The applicant has proposed to undertake pre-commencement surveys,	All ditches which would be directly affected by the Proposed Development have been surveyed for great crested newt (GCN). All suitable ponds (optimal habitat) within the survey area and sample of suitable ditches were surveyed, which confirmed absence of GCN in all surveyed waterbodies. The desk study identified no records of GCN within <500m of the Proposed Development at waterbodies with habitat connectivity to

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	however, we are concerned about what will happen is GCN are found because it is unlikely that any impacts can be addressed within the habitat currently proposed within the red-line boundary. We are also concerned that off-site compensation through the Cambridgeshire GCN District Level Licensing (DLL)scheme is unlikely, given it only deals with loss of ponds and there is limited capacity within Fenland. We seek that the applicant undertake GCN surveys of these ditches, so that the full impact of the scheme on GCN can be determined. In addition, we seek clarification on how the current scheme will be able to mitigate loss of GCN habitat.	the Proposed Development. A number of ditches along the A47 corridor (which would not be directly affected) were not subject to surveys in part due to health and safety risks of working close to a busy road. These ditches are likely to be unsuitable or unfavourable for GCN due to factors such as flowing water and poor water quality due to road run-off. The Proposed Development along the A47 would predominantly be restricted to the immediate road verge, where terrestrial habitat is unsuitable for GCN. Control measures detailed in the **Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** (secured via Requirement 10 of the **Draft DCO [APP-013]**) such as pre-works checks and ecological supervision of work activities would protect GCN in the unlikely event that they occur in these ditches and would inform appropriate avoidance/mitigation. Additional survey work at the pre-consent stage would therefore not materially alter the assessment effects on GCN or the embedded environmental measures/mitigation.
Biodiversity	Bats 8.12 We have not been able to find a lighting plan for the scheme. The applicant needs to confirm whether or not dark corridors will be retained along the CHP corridor, as well as the ditches located within and at the boundaries to the EfW site. It would be helpful to have a plan showing the dark corridors as part of the outline lighting strategy, so that it can be confirmed these features will not be illuminated.	An **Outline Operational Lighting Strategy** (**Appendix 3B Outline Lighting Strategy (Volume 6.4) [APP-071] (secured in Requirement 18 of the draft DCO)**) has been prepared for the Proposed Development, which sets out that lighting design will follow the principles of Bat Conservation Trust/Institute for Lighting Professionals joint guidance. The CHP Corridor would be unlit. Lighting would be minimised/screened to avoid illuminating adjacent habitats, and there would be no lighting of ditches as non-operational areas of the site. Dark corridors will be identified in the final Operational Lighting Strategy at the detailed design phase post consent.
	Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy 8.13 We seek clarification as to why brownfield habitat has not been promoted for adjacent to the railway corridor because it could help to address the loss of ephemeral habitat, which include a number of interesting plants. In addition, the applicant has not included compensation for loss of water vole habitat and ditches identified to support / potentially support water vole have not been identified or been enhanced as part of the scheme which would provide	Habitats included within **Figure 3.14 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** (secured via requirement 5 of the **Draft DCO [APP-013]**) were selected based on local priorities identified on the Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Partnership Habitat Opportunity Mapping (a series of mapping that identifies target habitat types and locations for habitat creation opportunities), which identifies land within the EfW CHP Facility Site for grassland creation opportunities. Brown roofs are proposed for two buildings, reflecting the site's local context with respect to brownfield habitats. The Applicant is unable to enhance on-site ditch habitat for water voles as ditches are under the

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	opportunities to improve water quality and/or improve foraging opportunities / plant diversity.	control of the Internal Drainage Board management regime. The Proposed Development includes creation of other on-site habitat intended to buffer the existing ditches and provide beneficial habitat for water vole as shown on the **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**, including attenuation swales and pond, wet grassland and wet woodland habitats. Loss of ditch habitat will be compensated off-site through the provision of 10% biodiversity net gain for the Proposed Development.
Climate	County Council Climate Change and Energy Services 10.1 Embodied carbon from construction of the proposed plant is a large source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, estimated by the applicant at over 48,000 tonnes CO2e. Consideration should be given to minimising use of high-carbon materials such as concrete, steel etc, and use of low carbon construction methods and materials, such as more use of recycled/reclaimed materials, electrical plant/tools and locally sourced items.	A meeting was held with CCC on 20 October 2022 to discuss their comments on the climate change assessment raised in their draft relevant representation. A Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) was produced to record the discussions and respond to the points raised by CCC. A copy of this note is provided in **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9)** of this document. See summary issue 'Embedded measures – construction mitigation' in Table 2.1 of this Technical Note.
Climate	10.2 GHG emissions from operation of the plant are very high, estimated by the applicant at over 280,000 tonnes CO2e per year, or over 11 million tonnes CO2e over the 40-year lifetime. The vast majority of these emissions are from burning the fossil carbon content of the waste (such as plastics). The actual emissions could vary a lot depending on the particular composition of the waste material.	See summary issue 'Waste composition' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.3 The figure for avoided GHG emissions from energy generation stated by the applicant is incorrect, as the figures provided by the applicant use a single constant carbon intensity of UK electricity to be offset over the 40-year period. This ignores the forecast gradual decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid over time (which is published by BEIS).	See summary issue 'Avoided emissions – grid mix decarbonisation' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9)**.
Climate	10.4 The baseline scenario set out by the applicant assumes that, without the development, all of the annual 625,000 tonnes of waste would go to landfill every year for the 40 years of operation. However, this seems very unlikely.	See summary issue 'Without development scenario – landfill' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	10.5 The vast majority of emissions in the applicant's 'without development' scenario are stated to be from methane from landfill. The calculation of these emissions is imprecise and actual emissions from landfill could vary enormously depending on the biogenic carbon content of the waste composition, and how the particular landfill sites are managed. This total should therefore be treated with caution and regarded as uncertain.	See summary issue 'Waste composition' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.6 The scale of emissions is huge, in both scenarios, with and without the proposal being built. The main source of emissions from either waste disposal method (landfill or incineration) are estimated by the applicant to be in the same ballpark of around 11 million tonnes CO2e over 40 years. The composition of the waste is the deciding factor as to which method is lower carbon. In general, fossil carbon waste (such as plastics) generate fewer emissions (actually none) if landfilled, but high emissions if burned. Whereas biogenic carbon waste (such as paper, food and garden waste) generate fewer emissions if burned (by converting methane to CO2) (although recycling/composting would be even better) but high emissions if landfilled. The assumptions made regarding the composition of the waste therefore can easily tip the balance as to which method is the lowest carbon. For that reason, it should be regarded as uncertain whether or not the proposed development will lead to lower carbon emissions than without the development.	See summary issue 'Waste composition' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.7 The magnitude of changes in GHG emissions as a result of the proposed development have been assessed by the applicant with reference to national policy and national emissions reductions. However, this methodology means that almost no project ever would be regarded as 'significant', since no site on its own would ever be likely to emit a high percentage of the whole UK's GHG emissions. The applicant's Environmental Statement refers to the latest IEMA guidance, which states that: "GHG emissions have a combined environmental effect that is approaching a	See summary issue 'IEMA guidance – definition of beneficial significance' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	scientifically defined environmental limit, as such any GHG emissions or reductions from a project might be considered to be significant… The crux of significance therefore is not whether a project emits GHG emissions, nor even the magnitude of GHG emissions alone, but whether it contributes to reducing GHG emissions relative to a comparable baseline consistent with a trajectory towards net zero by 2050". However, it is not clear how the proposed development could be consistent with a trajectory towards net zero by 2050 or a 1.5 degrees warming scenario.	
Climate	10.8 Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) has not been included in the proposal. CCS is probably necessary in order for the proposal to be compatible with a net zero pathway.	See summary issue 'Embedded measures – CCS' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.9 In any case, the significance of carbon emissions should not be decided by whether these are lower than an alternative landfill scenario, but by whether emissions align with a net zero trajectory. Council Officers do not agree with the conclusion that the Proposed Development will have a 'beneficial Significant effect'. The IEMA guidance states that "Only projects that actively reverse (rather than only reduce) the risk of severe climate change can be judged as having a beneficial effect."	See summary issue 'IEMA guidance – definition of beneficial significance' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	Environment consultants employed by Cambridgeshire County Council 10.10 With reference to paragraph 14.5.1, the change in GHG emissions between the proposed EfW CHP facility and the 'alternative baseline' of landfill should be contextualised against the UK carbon budgets, but that should not be it. No project on its own is large enough to appear 'significant' when compared to UK carbon budgets. This project should also be contextualised against local / regional carbon	See summary issue 'IEMA guidance – local contextualisation'' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	budgets, as well as the CCCs waste carbon trajectory which are more pertinent comparisons.	
Climate	10.11 In paragraph 14.6.1, Medworth CHP Limited are saying that 'the magnitude of changes in GHG emissions' will essentially determine whether this project impact the UK's ability to meet its 2050 net zero target. IEMA states that it's not just the magnitude that matters in determining significance, it is more about the trajectory of annual emissions from the proposed development, and whether these are in line with a 1.5-degree trajectory.	See summary issue 'IEMA guidance – definition of beneficial significance' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.12 Paragraph 14.6.1 mentions the Waste Planning Authorities (WPA). Do the regional WPAs have GHG aspirations/targets/goals that are net zero aligned? If not, aligning to these WPAs is not good enough as they lock in more GHG than is compatible with a net zero trajectory and Policies and Strategies can simply lag behind.	See summary issue 'IEMA guidance – local contextualisation'' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.13 There is no commitment to Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) at this stage, apart from land set aside for such technology if the applicant's research concludes that CCS is feasible. CCS is probably necessary in order for the proposal to be compatible with a net zero pathway.	See summary issue 'Embedded measures – CCS' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.14 Our Environment consultants disagree with the two statements in paragraph 14.8.25. Adverse effects are not based on the Proposed Development emitting more emissions than the 'without Proposed Development' scenario, it is to do with whether these emissions over the lifetime of the project reduce and align with the net zero trajectory. A beneficial effect is defined by IEMA as a project that sequesters emissions from the atmosphere i.e. CCS. This is not the case right now, unless there is a commitment from the developer to install CCS.	See summary issue 'IEMA guidance – definition of beneficial significance' and 'Embedded measures – CCS' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	10.15 In Table 14.23, construction transport emissions are reported in ktCO2e (carbon dioxide equivalents) however it is understood that the Defra Emissions Factors Toolkit used to estimate transport emissions only reports in carbon dioxide (CO2).	See summary issue 'Defra EFT – transport emissions' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.16 Paragraphs 14.9.37 to 39, this section compared the emissions of electricity generation between the proposed development and the UK Grid. Has the applicant considered if the UK Grid itself already incorporates EfW within the grid mix – hence the comparison might not be as black and white as suggested here.	See summary issue 'Avoided emissions – grid mix EfW/LFG inclusion' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.17 With reference to Table 14.31, it is not clear whether, in the carbon calculations for the 'without Proposed Development' and 'with Proposed Development' the gradual decarbonisation of the grid been taken into consideration.	See summary issue 'Avoided emissions – grid mix decarbonisation' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9)**.
Climate	10.18 Paragraphs 14.9.49 & 14.12.2 conclude that the Proposed Development will have a 'beneficial Significant effect'. However, the 2022 IEMA guidance that is quoted clearly explains that the only projects that can be viewed as 'beneficial' are projects result in avoided or removed GHG emissions (see page 25 in the guidance). This project does not substantially exceed net zero requirements and avoided emissions and removed/sequestered emissions should not be confused. The applicant did contextualise the Proposed Scheme's carbon emissions with the CCC national budgets, but IEMA suggests further comparisons as very few projects are ever going to anything but a small fraction on national carbon budgets. For example, the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research (2022) presented carbon budgets at a local authority level https://carbonbudget.manchester.ac.uk.	See summary issue 'IEMA guidance – definition of beneficial significance' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	10.19 With reference to the EIA scoping, Table 14.A.1, land use change should be scoped out as its unlikely that carbon emissions associated with excavation works and sequestration are likely to be very small / immaterial. However, the point made that land use change is usually calculated on a national level needs explanation.	See summary issue 'Land use change scoping' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Climate	10.20 Appendix 14B Assumptions and limitations table (page 34) "offsetting of electricity generation from landfill gas and from the EfW CHP facility": the assumption made here is that electricity from LFG would displace the UK of average grid electricity. Is this the case, is there a situation where the LFG generated electricity would instead be part of the grid electricity generation mix lowering the average (182g/kwh)?	See summary issue 'Avoided emissions – grid mix EfW/LFG inclusion' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
	10.21 In Appendix C Sensitivity Analysis, paragraph 1.1.4: footnote links to 65 and 56 are not correct and the source for the following is queried: CCGT 380tCO2/GWh; UK Grid 182tCO2/GWh; 2035 UK Grid 23tCO2/GWh; and 250 UK Grid 6tCO2/GWh.	See summary issue 'Avoided emissions – grid mix references clarification' in Table 2.1 of Technical Note Climate Change (Doc Ref: TNCC01) **Appendix 9.2c (Part 9).**
Waste need	Waste Incineration is not a truly renewable source of energy. Incinerator companies are marketing "waste-to-energy" as a source of renewable energy but unlike other renewables the fuel does not come from infinite natural processes. On the contrary, it is sourced from finite resources.	National Policy Statements (NPS) EN1 and EN3 regard EfW facilities with a capacity of more than 50MW as nationally significant renewable energy infrastructure. Energy from Waste is the generation of partly renewable electricity and/or usable heat from non-recyclable waste. 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 Proposed Development would recover useful energy in the form of electricity and steam from over half a million tonnes of non-recyclable (residual), non-hazardous municipal, commercial and industrial waste each year.
Waste need	The World is embracing Zero Waste, and Incineration should be seen as a backwards step. "Waste-to-energy" is often described as a good way to extract energy from resources, but if the waste burnt is capable of being recycled it works against the circular economy, and against the fundamental	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 Proposed Development would recover useful energy in the form of

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	principles of the waste hierarchy. For those that are concerned about Climate Change, this proposal could therefore contribute to Climate Change, both from the facility itself and the necessary road mileage required to source the necessary feedstock to run it – all at a time when this Council has declared a climate emergency.	electricity and steam from over half a million tonnes of non-recyclable (residual), non-hazardous municipal, commercial and industrial waste each year. Relative to the 'without Proposed Development' scenario (where waste is landfilled), the Proposed Development has lower GHG emissions which will support the UK Government in meeting its carbon budgets/targets.
Cumulative	15.1 The Cambridgeshire County Council Education Capital team has concerns regarding the Cumulative Effects Assessment (Chapter 18) of the Environmental Statement, which assesses the inter-related effects of other known potential projects in the area with the proposed development, whilst acknowledging that the methodology used to scope the interrelated effects has been agreed with the host authorities. The Fenland Education Campus (CCC/21/215/FUL) on Barton Road has been identified as one of the projects in the cumulative assessment. The site of the proposed Free School, which is significantly closer has not been assessed. Although this is understandable with the proposals still at feasibility stage and as such not in the public domain. If the Free School site were to be assessed, it should be assessed under the same considerations as the Fenland Education Campus in terms of hydrology, air, noise, landscape and visual, biodiversity, historic environment, socio-economics; land contamination, and construction traffic.	The list of long and short lists of projects to be included within the cumulative assessment **(ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects Assessment Volume 6.2 [App-045] and Appendix 18A Volume 6.4 [App-090])** was issued to each host authority on 25 February 2022. A cut off date up to the end of January 2022 for projects was proposed. In response CCC provided information on the Fenland Education Campus but did not reference the proposed Free School. The assessment therefore considered all relevant projects in line with the methodology consulted upon at PEIR. In its response to statutory consultation CCC concurred with the identified approach for the consideration of both inter-project and inter-related effects in the Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA).
Cumulative	15.2 The cumulative assessment factors in the other assessments on air quality, noise and vibration, traffic and transport, climate change, and health. No significant inter-related cumulative effects were identified subject to the implementation and robustness of the mitigation measures. It is considered that the cumulative assessment has considered the key issues, but concerns are raised with the traffic and transport and air quality assessments as they do not accurately assess the potential impact on the TCA or the proposed Free School site, alongside the wider school sites discussed in sections 3, 4 and 5 of this response.	**Appendix 6A Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **Outline CTMP** 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 and thus will not pass TCA. The final CTMP is secured by **Requirement 11, Schedule 2, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** Unlike the current arrangements to the existing operational Waste Transfer Station (WTS), **Section 3.4.105, ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030]** confirms, once operational, HGVs will access the

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		EfW CHP Facility Site via New Bridge Lane only, thereby avoid Weasenham Lane and as such, the TCA. Staff and visitors and occasional light good vehicles will access the EfW CHP Facility Site from Algores Way via Weasenham Lane. **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033]** confirms, to minimise potential impacts on the local community (which would include the TCA), the Applicant will not route HGVs through the town of Wisbech and from the A1101 Elm High Road. This route restriction was suggested by Cambridgeshire County Council during the consultation process and is an agreed approach. Route restrictions for any HGVs other than local RCVs would therefore be implemented in relation to: • A1101 north of A47 Elm Road roundabout; • Churchill Road (north of Elm High Road); and • Weasenham Lane (between Algores Way and Elm High Road Accompanying the DCO Application is the Applicant's **Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) (Volume 7.15) [APP-106].** Figure 2.1 of the Outline OTMP displays the proposed operational route restrictions that are described above. The final OTMP is secured by **Requirement 12, Schedule 2, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** An automatic monitor was installed at the Thomas Clarkson Academy in June 2021 to measure air quality. **ES Chapter 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2) [APP-035] Section 8.6** records TCA as one of three schools assessed as human receptor locations. The assessment of NO2, PM10, PM2.5, and NH3 at all human receptor locations considered a combination of chimney and traffic emissions and concluded that in no location would these be significant.
Development Consent Order	Comments regarding the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) Text in relation to Waste Policies matters [APP-013] 14.20 The Council welcomes and is content that the "relevant planning authority" is the Waste Planning Authority for the area (Cambridgeshire County Council). However, the Council has several concerns regarding the Draft DCO text. These are set out below:	Comment noted.
Development Consent Order	Schedule 2 – Requirement 23. Combined heat and power 14.22 The Council notes that this requirement relates to the	The Applicant's R1 calculation submitted with the Environmental Permit application confirms that the Proposed Development would achieve an R1

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	submission of a Combined Heat and Power Review within 18 months of commissioning of the facility. As above, it is queried whether the active use of heat is required for the facility to meet the required R1 status to be considered a 'recovery' operation. If it is, this requirement may not be adequate.	score of 0.81 based upon the generation of electricity alone. Therefore, it can be stated that CHP is not necessary to achieve this status. The Applicant considers that 18 months is a realistic timeframe to provide the review based upon the time it may take to conclude commercial negotiations. To confirm the Proposed Development is a 'recovery' operation, the Applicant's R1 calculation is reported in **Technical Note: R1 (Volume 9.24);** submitted at Deadline 1.
Development Consent Order	Schedule 2 - Requirement 22. Community liaison manager 14.23 It is requested that this requirement is altered to require a Community Liaison Manager be in post at the very latest prior to construction. This helps ensure that there is a single point of contact during the construction and operation of the facility and can maintain community relations through the entire life of the facility.	During the construction period a Community Liaison Manager is secured via the **Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]**, in Requirement 10 of **the Draft DCO [APP-013].**
Development Consent Order	Schedule 2 - Additional Requirement Requested (Operational Environmental Management Plan) 14.24 Presently, there are matters which are not covered by the existing Requirements and management plans that the Council believe could be accommodated through an additional requirement, the production of such a document would also aid in the future regulation of the plant.	The Applicant is of the opinion that the matters requested to be included within an Operational Environmental Management Plan are covered within other documents submitted and secured as part of the application or would fall to be controlled via the Environmental Permit. However, if CCC considers that there are measures which are not already included, or which would not be covered by the permit then the Applicant would not have an in-principle objection to the provision of an Operational Environmental Management Plan.
Development Consent Order	14.25 The Council is therefore requesting that an Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan is prepared which would include the requirement for the submission of a Final Operational Environmental Management Plan, prior to completion of commissioning. This document will: 1. Provide a summary of all the restrictions or conditions placed on the plant and signposting to the relevant management plan or other documents, where relevant.	The Applicant is of the opinion that the matters requested to be included within an Operational Environmental Management Plan are covered within other documents submitted and secured as part of the application or would fall l to be controlled via the Environmental Permit. However, if CCC considers that there are measures which are not already included, or which would not be covered by the permit then the Applicant would not have an in-principle objection to the provision of an Operational Environmental Management Plan.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	2. Address the following topics that are not otherwise covered within the documentation or proposed requirements: a. Operational procedures and measures undertaken by the site operator to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and operational procedures to ensure adaptation to future climate changes; b. Commitments to educational outreach and ensuring the facility can be visited for educational purposes related to climate change; and, c. Detail of the community benefit activities, procedures, monitoring arrangements and outcomes in line with the Outline Community Benefits Strategy. (The Outline Community Benefits Strategy is not presently referred to in the Draft Requirements.)	With regard to the request concerning the **Outline Community Benefits Strategy (Volume 7.14) [APP-105]** the Applicant's current position is that commitments contained within the document sit outside the DCO process, however, if the Council considers that they can be appropriately and lawfully secured as a DCO requirement then the Applicant would be willing to include this in a further draft of the DCO.
Development Consent Order	Schedule 12 – Procedure for the Discharge of requirements. 14.27 Section 2 (1) sets out the period of determination for applications made under the requirements and includes a list of start date triggers. It is requested that it is clarified in the text that whichever results in the latest date of determination (a), (b) or (c) is the relevant time for determination.	Noted. Schedule 12, Section 2(1) of the draft DCO has been amended accordingly in the version submitted at Deadline 1.
Development Consent Order	14.28 Section 3 (3), sets out the method and timescales under which further information can be requested by the relevant authority or a consultee. The Council is concerned regarding the inflexibility of these provisions, which could lead to applications being unnecessarily refused.	Section 3(4) states that in the event that the notification specified in sub-paragraph (3) is not given, the relevant authority is deemed to have sufficient information to consider the application. This therefore reduces the risk of applications being unnecessarily refused. The drafting in Schedule 12 is standard across multiple DCOs, including The Little Crow Solar Park Order 2022.
General	1.1 Throughout the pre-submission period Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) has worked closely with the other host local authorities: Norfolk County Council, Fenland	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	District Council and the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk. The four local authorities have to date submitted separate responses to the applicant's non-statutory and statutory consultations. To simplify matters for the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) (the examining body) and all parties, the four local authorities are in discussions around, if possible, submitting a joint Local Impact Report (LIR) at Deadline 1.	
General	1.2 We will also endeavour, where possible, to pool resources during the examination, with local authorities taking the lead on topics which relate to their functions or to expertise in their geographical area. These arrangements are for practical purposes to avoid undue duplication, and all local authorities reserve the right to express their views individually if they consider it necessary.	Comment noted.
General	1.3 Notwithstanding the above, Norfolk County Council and the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk are submitting their relevant representations on an individual basis to ensure that PINS is fully informed of the matters of concern to those authorities and the communities and interests that they represent. Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council have produced this document as a joint representation for this relevant representation.	Comment noted.
General	2.1 Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Fenland District Council (FDC) officers have engaged in pre-application discussions with Medworth CHP Limited to ensure that the final submission takes account of early concerns around the information and methodologies required to be able to fully assess their proposals. In the main this advice has been followed. However, as highlighted in the sections below, there are still some queries that need to be addressed to allow CCC and FDC to fully understand the impacts of the scheme and to form a view as to whether the mitigation measures proposed are sufficient.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	2.2 CCC and FDC seek these matters to be resolved ahead of any consent being given to the scheme.	
General	2.3 The technical comments set out below sit in the context of a motion approved by elected Members of CCC on Tuesday 21st July 2020 to oppose this development, which included a letter being sent to the then Secretary of State to make clear the Council's opposition to these plans (see Appendix 1 for a copy of this CCC correspondence). The strength of local feeling and concerns were further endorsed by FDC (as set out in paragraph 2.4 below) and the two Norfolk host authorities, where similar motions were approved. Members of the CCC Environment and Green Investment (E&GI) Committee felt strongly that it was essential for PINS to understand this background context when considering the technical concerns and key issues outlined below.	Comment noted.
General	2.4 A motion was approved by elected members of FDC on 20th February 2020 to oppose this development, which included a letter being sent to the then Secretary of State to make clear the Council's opposition to these plans (see Appendix 2 for a copy of this FDC correspondence). This further emphasises the strength of local feelings and concerns, across the whole of Cambridgeshire and Norfolk.	Comment noted.
General	2.5 The following chapters provide the key concerns identified by technical officers on behalf of CCC and FDC. 3 Traffic and Transport 4 Noise and Vibration 5 Air Quality 6 Landscape and Visual 7 Historic Environment 8 Biodiversity 9 Hydrology	The Applicants comments on the key concerns provided by CCC and FDC are set out in the relevant rows below.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	10 Climate Change 11 Socio-Economics 12 Health 13 Major Accidents and Disasters 14 Waste Policy including Waste Availability and Composition 15 Cumulative Impacts	
General	2.6 The remainder of this document gives further details of comments and key concerns raised on behalf of CCC and FDC. Additional detail will follow in the LIR.	Comment noted.
General	2.8 Whilst there is not a specific chapter in the applicant's ES to address potential impacts on Education, noting that Thomas Clarkson Academy is located nearby, officer's felt it was important to capture concerns from Education colleagues. Comments from colleagues in Education and wider concerns flagged up by FDC colleagues have therefore been included throughout these chapters, specifically in Sections 3 (Traffic and Transport), 4 (Noise and Vibration), 5 (Air Quality), 6 (Landscape and Visual) and 15 (Cumulative Impacts).	The Applicants comments on the key concerns raised by CCC's Education colleagues and FDC are set out in the relevant rows within this table.
General	16 Appendix Appendix 1 – CCC Chief Executive's Letter to Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy The National Infrastructure Planning team at the Planning Inspectorate has recently registered a proposal for an Energy from Waste scheme at Wisbech (MVV Medworth). Members of Cambridgeshire County Council fundamentally object to the principle of this scheme and on Tuesday 21 July 2020, passed a motion to that effect. In accordance with the agreed motion, I am writing to alert you to the views of Members of the Council on the project.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
General	The following motion was agreed on Tuesday 21 July 2020: *"In light of the current difficulties and restrictions due to Coronavirus it is difficult for the public to hear, to voice and to be heard when they have strong opinions on a subject that affects their lives. Therefore it is vital that we as a council act now to highlight our concerns, so that despite the impacts of Coronavirus the Public are aware that we still are actively opposing this proposal.* This Council understands that there is a proposal to build an Incinerator Facility in Wisbech.	Comment noted.
Health	12.1 The current advice on possible health effects from Energy from Waste Facilities as stated by the Health Protection Agency (now UK Health Security Agency) conclude that "Modern, well managed incinerators make only a small contribution to local concentrations of air pollutants. It is possible that such small additions could have an impact on health but such effects, if they exist are likely to be very small and not detectable." As the UK Health Security Agency (formally the Health Protection Agency) are the technical experts on this type of facility we would seek confirmation that they have been formally consulted on this application.	Noted. Public Health England was consulted on the application and its responses in relation to the EIA Scoping Report, Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) at statutory consultation and Technical Notes on the approach to the health chapter which supported ongoing technical engagement are provided at **Appendix 16A of the ES (Volume 6.4) [APP-089]**. In their response to the PEIR, PHE provided a link to a web page that includes the document referenced by CCC and a study on modern municipal waste incinerators. PHE said: *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 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.* The Applicant has subsequently discussed the project with the UK Health Security Agency at a meeting dated 21/11/2022 attended by CCC and FDC. This followed the Agency's submission of its relevant representation to the Planning Inspectorate on 15/11/22 which stated the following: *We can confirm that: With respect to Registration of Interest documentation,*

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		we are reassured that earlier comments raised by us on 17 August 2021 have been addressed. In addition, we acknowledge that the Environmental Statement (ES) has not identified any issues which could significantly affect public health. UKHSA/OHID is satisfied with the methodology used to undertake the environmental assessment. Following our review of the submitted documentation we are satisfied that the proposed development should not result in any significant adverse impact on public health. On that basis, we have no additional comments to make at this stage and can confirm that we have chosen NOT to register an interest with the Planning Inspectorate on this occasion.
	12.2 As part of the response to the EIA/ES Scoping request Public Health recommended that as some of the environmental impacts to human health will be addressed as part of the EIA/ES, however, many of the wellbeing and mental health aspects of human health may not, therefore the applicant was requested to undertake and submit a Health Impact Assessment commensurate with the scale of the development as part of the application. The applicant has chosen not to do this but to incorporate the health impacts within a health assessment as part of the environmental statement and has cross referenced other technical chapters of the ES/EIA when necessary, whilst this is acceptable it makes Chapter 16 difficult to read as most of the technical findings on which the assessment is based are not included within this Chapter.	Following a review of responses to the EIA Scoping Report, additional engagement was undertaken on the approach to the assessment of potential effects upon human health. Copies of the proposed methodology were submitted to consultees in September 2020 in a Technical Note. The following were contacted for their views on the approach: • Fenland District Council • Cambridgeshire County Council • Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Council • Norfolk County Council • Public Health England. As a result of the responses on the Technical Note issued in September 2020 (see **Table 16A.2, Section 2.0, Appendix 16A Summary of Consultation Responses ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.4) [APP-089])** it was decided to use the 21 wider determinants of health provided by 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 Technical Note was issued to confirm the approach. The approach taken to the ES Chapter reflects the approach set out in the April 2021 Technical Note (see **Table 16A.3, Section 2.0, Appendix 16A Summary of Consultation Responses ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.4) [APP-089]**) Potential effects on human health are considered throughout the ES (Volume 6.2) and ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043] draws out relevant information from the ES chapters, cross referencing relevant

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		parts of those chapters, rather than repeating detailed technical information from each of them.
Health	Data 12.3 The Desktop Data Table (Table 16.5) lists the JSNA's as a data source but hasn't specified which JSNA's were used or if they are Cambridgeshire or Norfolk JSNA's. This was requested as part of the Scoping Request response and has not been addressed. In particular the Cambridgeshire JSNA core data set and the Cambridgeshire Transport and Health JSNA should have been explicitly used and referenced. The data contained in these JSNA should form part of the baseline evidence base on human health to supplement health data already proposed as part of the ES/EIA.	The JSNA core data set for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was reviewed. The district summary for Fenland is referenced at paragraph 16.5.28 of the **ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]**. Professional judgement was used to identify relevant data and the most up to date sources of data. For example the JSNA core data set references the Public Health England Profile for 2018 but the most up to date PHE Profile was used in the ES Chapter (which is data from 2019). The PHE Profile for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk is discussed at **Section 16.5.42, ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** as part of the baseline evidence base.
Health	12.4 Officers query why Data used in the initial scoping request has not been included within the ES/EIA e.g. Child Health Data, economy and employment, Indices of Deprivation.	**ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** includes key socio-economic and other data and is more extensive than what was included in the Scoping Report, **Appendix 16B (Volume 6.4) [APP-089**] provides additional data, including data on deprivation. There is consideration of child health data, e.g. from PHE Profiles. This includes consideration of data on breastfeeding, obesity in Year 6, rates of alcohol-specific hospital admissions for those aged under 18 and GCSE attainment, which was also included in the Scoping Report. The conclusions of other ES chapters do not suggest that there would be any significant effects on children (with mitigation in place). **The Human Health Risk Assessment, Annex G, Appendix 8B: (Volume 6.4) [APP-078]** includes consideration of impacts on human receptors associated with the Energy from Waste (EfW) Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Facility, including resident adult and child and farmer adult and child.
Health	12.5 Section 16.5.31 mentions ONS Data. The ONS population Data has recently been updated following the latest release and therefore considerable population growth won't have been accounted for in the initial assessments.	Subject to agreement with all parties and if requested by the ExA, the data could be reviewed and a technical note provided to explain whether this affects the conclusions reached in the **ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]**. Note that 16.5.31 refers to data from the 2011 census

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		about the percentage of people with a limiting long-term illness or disability at the ward level. The release date for equivalent data from the 2021 census is uncertain.
Health	12.6 Section 16.5.9 uses data captured during the Covid Pandemic to assess economic activity in Fenland, this data may not be representative of economic activity due to various government schemes to address employment during Covid. In addition, the data is given at District Council Level, if this data is not available at the study area level or below it should be stated as such.	**ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** acknowledges that the data on economic activity covers the period affected by the Covid Pandemic. Data at the ward level was only available from Nomis using the 2011 census at the time the Health chapter was prepared. It is understood that Ward data from the 2021 census will be published on 30 January 2023. Subject to agreement with all parties, and if requested by the ExA, the data could be updated as part of a technical note to explain whether this affects the conclusions reached in the **ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]**.
Health	12.7 Table 16.6 gives the local GP Practices and if they are accepting new patients, it would be helpful to include the Primary Care Network (PCN) these practices are in as GP capacity is also measured by PCN.	There is no prescribed approach but generally the focus of the assessment is on relevant GP practices. From a review of the PCNs, two of the practices fall within the West Norfolk PCN, which comprises 21 GP Practices serving a population of 185,000. It is not therefore considered appropriate to review capacity at the PCN level.
Health	Policy 12.8 Reference to the Draft joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2020-2024 is out of date. This strategy was not progressed and has been replace by a new joint ICS/Health and Wellbeing Strategy. One of the key themes of the new Strategy is Environment which should have been considered as part of the application	The link to the Draft joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2020-2024 was still live at the time of preparing the chapter and there was no indication that it had been withdrawn (it was still online 18th October 2022). **ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** has considered the relationship between health and the environment, including air quality, noise, transport and landscape and visual impacts through consideration of the topics put forward by PHE.
Health	Health Assessment 12.9 As part of the formal response to the scoping request Public Health requested the status and use of the disused railway line be ascertained and scoped into the Health Assessment is it is used by local residents, even it is not a formally adopted PROW, this appears not to have been done.	Section 15.6.7, ES **Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042]** states: The potential for effects upon the disused March to Wisbech Railway running alongside the site was raised in the Scoping Opinion as a potential recreational Receptor by CCC (see Table 15.1 Summary of EIA Scoping Opinion responses for socio economics, tourism, recreation and land use). However, this is wholly in the ownership of Network Rail and is not publicly accessible or in use as a recreational route with any legal or formal status. There are also no known formal plans to designate or develop this line as

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		a recreational asset in the future and there are instead plans to reopen the railway. There would therefore be no recreational effects on this route from the construction or operation of the Proposed Development and this railway line is therefore not assessed any further.
Health	12.10 Sections 16.6.4 and 16.9.72 have not adequately assessed the health impacts during decommissioning which will not be the same as construction impacts. There will be additional impacts due to decommissioning the combustion equipment which may or may not pose a risk to human health, more information is needed from the applicant to justify the position that there are no health impacts during decommissioning.	The environmental effects associated with the decommissioning phase are expected to be of a similar level to those reported for the construction phase works, albeit with a lesser duration of one year. This is due to the nature of the decommissioning works (dismantling of infrastructure and removal from the site), the machinery used, the staff required, and transport routes adopted. Similar embedded mitigation measures would be used to avoid and reduce effects on receptors. The likely significance of effects relating to the construction phase assessment reported are therefore applicable to the decommissioning phase. The timing of decommissioning is uncertain but would need to comply with legislation and regulations in force at that time. Requirement 25 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** sets out the need for a Decommissioning Environmental Management to be produced and agreed with the relevant planning authority, which will include measures to manage decommissioning effects on health.
Health	12.11 In Table 16.7, Screening exercise for the consideration of effects on physical and mental health and wellbeing, the following areas of the screening exercise have not been addressed or need improvement: · Access to local public and key services, this should be scoped in and any potential increase in demand on local service should be assessed. · Physical security, Public Health disagree that there will be "no anticipated impacts". Construction sites by their nature often become targets for theft and crime and therefore should be considered (impacts during construction phase only), therefore this should have been scoped into the assessment. · The connection to grid is to take place at night therefore	Demand for housing, local services (such as schools), and community facilities (such as sport and recreation) during the operational phase was scoped out of the ES (in terms of impacts on the population) and this was agreed with the Secretary of State at scoping, (see **Table 15.1, Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042]**. **Section 15.9 of Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042]** considers the potential impacts on local facilities during the construction phase and concludes that there will be no significant effects. Drawing on the conclusions of **Chapter 15 of the ES, Table 16.7 (Volume 6.2) [APP-042]** considers access to local public and key services and facilitates during both construction and operation and concludes that there will be no significant effects. Effects on GP services and health facilities have been considered in **ES Chapter**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	what are the potential; health impacts due to noise and what are the proposed mitigation measures, therefore this should have been scoped into the assessment. · The assessment has not included the potential for impacts on mental health from perceived pollution from the operational plant, however this has been further addressed under embedded environmental issues.	**16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]**. **Section 4.9 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** provides details on construction site security. **ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** considers noise associated with the construction phase, including the Grid Connection for residential receptors (Table 7.30) and non-residential receptors (Table 7.31). **Section 16.9.45 of ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** summarises the effects associated with construction, including works associated with the Grid Connection and identifies the potential for a Major (Significant) effect in relation to health associated with construction noise at the local level. Additional mitigation measures to avoid significant effects at residential and non-residential premises due to construction noise are set out in **Section 7.10, ES Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034].** The assessment concludes that with the additional mitigation measures, impacts will be reduced such that the resultant effects are Not Significant. Assuming a Medium sensitivity and Low magnitude of change a Minor (Not Significant) effect in relation to health is identified on this basis. **Section 16.9, ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** does consider health effects arising from community perceptions of risk. The concerns raised in consultation responses (including emissions to air) are acknowledged in the assessment. **Section 16.9.8, ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** recognises that it is difficult to gauge the scale of concern and the community perceptions of risk and then how this might impact on health and quality of life within the population. As noted in the comment, further consideration is given to perceptions of risk under embedded environmental measures at Table 16.9.
Health	12.12 Some of the health receptors identified in Table 16.8 have not been addressed in table 16.7 and should be, these include: the potential for health impacts associated with community perception and risk, which is wider than electro-magnetic etc. e.g. there is a local concern from emissions and pollutants; and, increase in demand for health services.	Community perceptions of risk have been considered as outline above. **Section 16.9, ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** considers an increase in demand for health services. No significant effects are identified.
Health	12.13 The proposed operational operating hours of the plant, once commissioned, of 07.00 to 20.00 is long and may	**Section 3.5.51 to 3.5.52, ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030]** states:

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	generate Mental Health impacts on local residents. The hours of operation have not been assessed as a health impact and should be included.	Once operational, the EfW CHP Facility would be capable of processing up to 625,600 tonnes of residual commercial, industrial and household waste 24-hours a day, up to 365-days a year. Operational hours for the acceptance of waste would be limited to 07:00 to 20:00 during the 365-days. 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. The ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043] has adopted a 'source-pathway-receptor' approach and has been informed by other ES Chapters, principally: **Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033]; Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]; Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) [APP-035]; Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.2) [APP-036];** and **Chapter 15: Socio-economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042].** these do not suggest that the period over which waste would be received would give rise to significant effects and any associated health impacts on the wider population.
Health	12.14 Section 16.9.23 mentions the possible installation of a crossing, can the applicant confirm if this will be delivered or if it is an aspiration/proposal.	The pedestrian crossings associated with the New Bridge Lane Access Improvements are secured as Work No. 4A in the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013**]. Draft DCO Requirement 7 (Highway access) also stipulates that the final access plan will be agreed with the relevant highways authority and relevant planning authority. The illustrative design of the access on New Bridge Lane is set out in **Figure 3.18 Design Case New Bridge Lane Access Design (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Health	12.15 Table 16.13 should list the mitigation measures to understand exactly what mitigation is proposed, as the Health Assessment cross references other sections and documents it is difficult to ascertain exactly what mitigation measures are being proposed to address any adverse health impacts.	The layout of the **Table 16.13, ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** is consistent with other ES Chapters. The final column includes an outline of mitigation to address potential effects and cross references **Table 16.9 ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]** which summarises embedded environmental measures.
Health	12.16 Public Health welcome the proposal to set up a liaison committee and employ a community liaison officer, the applicant is asked to confirm how long this community liaison officer post is for.	The Community Liaison Officer will be a full time, permanent post. **Draft DCO Requirement 22 (Community liaison manager) (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** confirms that the relevant planning authority will be provided with the contact details of the appointed person in advance of final commissioning. For the duration of construction, the **Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12)** confirms a stakeholder engagement plan will be prepared as part of the final CEMP; to be secured by **Draft DCO Requirement 10 (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. The Outline CEMP also makes provision for a local liaison group. This is confirmed in the revised Outline CEMP submitted at Deadline 1.
Health	12.17 Public Health welcome inclusion of an employment and skills strategy, particularly if it can address some of the health impacts due to unemployment in the local area as employment status and well paid employment are key determinants of health outcomes and health inequality.	Agreed – the ES makes the same point, **Section 16.5 of ES Chapter 16: Health (Volume 6.2) [APP-043]**
Health	12.18 Public Health welcome the Outline Community Benefits Strategy and the proposed approach. Should consent be granted Public Health would welcome a discussion with the applicant on how health benefits can be included in the criteria for assessing application as part of the sponsorship proposals.	Noted and welcomed.
Historic Environment	Fenland District Council (FDC) Heritage comments 6.13 Officers at FDC have reviewed the documents from a Heritage perspective. It is considered that the analysis of the significance of the various heritage assets identified in the	The ES Chapter (**Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037]**) was prepared with reference to a walkover survey including visits to assets included in the settings assessment. This assessment was undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance (English Heritage 2017, The Setting of Heritage Assets). The approach to describing the

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	submitted reports is insufficient. Associated to this is the fact there appears to have been no significant attempt to identify how the various assets (and their associated settings) are appreciated by those visiting/viewing them. Consequently, the potential impact of the proposed development has not been fully assessed.	significance of the assets was informed by this and guidance and all potential impacts on the significance were fully assessed.
Historic Environment	6.14 The planning assessment has not been presented in a form that accords with the requirements of Paragraphs 5.8.14 to 5.8.18 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1).	Table 10.5 of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037]** sets out the relevant provisions of the National Policy Statement and where these are addressed within the ES chapter. The purpose of the ES chapter is to describe and assess the effects of the proposed development on the historic environment. The planning assessment is provided in **Volume 7.1 Planning Statement [APP-091]**.
Historic Environment	6.15 Clearly the scale of the structures of the new facility will impact the setting of both designated and undesignated built heritage assets within the historic town and in the broader landscape. Consideration should therefore be given to the impact that the scale of the building has in the context of the scale and built form of buildings in the town of Wisbech as a whole and whether this impacts on the qualitative appreciation of the characteristics of the town to the detriment of visitors and the local population. Historic England, in their capacity as advisors on statutory designation, will also be providing comments on the impacts and proposed mitigation with regard to designated heritage assets, and both CCC and FDC would request considerable weight is afforded to their advice.	Heritage assets likely to be impacted by the proposed development are identified in the ES chapter**, Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037].** This goes on to describe the heritage significance of the assets in question and assess the nature of any impacts on them, in accordance with relevant guidance (English Heritage 2017, The Setting of Heritage Assets) It is noted that Historic England has stated in their relevant representation that "*The information provided is of a high standard and we broadly accept the conclusions and, further detailed comments will also be provided in our written representation*".
Historic Environment	7.1 A series of documents pertinent to the archaeology of the scheme has been reviewed, including: Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment; Volume 6.3 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment Figures; and, Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment Appendices including Appendix 10B1 Baseline Desk Study Report. A comprehensive, although repetitious account of the small amount of archaeological data set out in these volumes concludes that impacts to known and potential	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	archaeological evidence has already occurred within the Combined Heat & Power site and is unlikely to occur in the Grid Connection route as this has now largely moved to being in the verge of the A47 where archaeological work has already taken place. We agree with this conclusion and are pleased to see that new land take for the cable will be limited thereby eliminating the need for archaeological evaluation and mitigation schemes.	
Historic Environment	7.2 There are key areas to focus archaeological intervention on, firstly including the purported site of the Elm and Wisbech Leper Hospital (Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record reference MCB4765), founded in 1378 at the parish boundary. Here, the applicant considers that there will be a medium likelihood of the presence of contemporary and related remains (Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment Appendices - Appendix 10B1 Baseline Desk Study Report, 5.2.3). Secondly, the sequence of varied environments evident in geotechnical cores/ borehole data for the EfW CHP Facility Site indicate the interplay between freshwater and marine environments in this historic intertidal zone (see Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment Table 10.2). The prehistoric to Roman sequence remains relatively unknown apart from in connection with roddonised palaeoriver channels, that afforded dryland conditions once infilled. It is these roddon surfaces that will require archaeological focus in the cable trench or within the site.	Comment noted.
Historic Environment	7.3 Embedded Environmental Measures Table 10.13 (Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10, 10.7) shows how Listed Buildings along the Grid Connection route will no longer be affected as the cable will now be underground and along the A47 verge. As above, this also ameliorates the impact on buried deposits and archaeological heritage assets as the impacts have previously been caused by road and service works. There is provision for a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for monitoring and recording work	Noted. The final CEMP including the WSI would need to be approved by CCC as part of the discharge of the DCO Requirement 10 (see **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	included in the Outline CEMP (vol 7.12). This is welcome and acceptable; however we advise that any WSI is led by a brief prepared by CCC's Historic Environment Team to ensure that the county's archaeological priorities and requirements are met, which should be responded to by the appointed archaeological contractor.	
Historic Environment	7.4 Sections 10.9.5 to 10.9.9 estimate the impact to potential archaeological assets and paleoenvironmental contexts assuming the assets will be of low heritage significance and the impacts as not significant. In this context and due to the extant impacts of the current site's development and use impacts, we agree with this statement and approve the provision at 10.9.8 for monitoring and recording of the mixed freshwater and marine deposit sequence with the objective of seeking incipient soils indicative of drier land conditions able to host human activity and by researching the surfaces of roddonised prehistoric river channels, in accordance with the East of England Research Framework agenda: "Question: Multi 08 - How can we better realise the archaeological potential of the fenland?" An earlier recommendation was to align the deposit sequence in the boreholes with the quaternary deposits recorded for this part of the fenland region, which would need geoarchaeological or specialist geological input. This small area of work will remain a requirement, along with acquiring absolute dates for peat horizon contacts and any incipient soils identified in the cores and/or during ground works. We have agreed that geoarchaeological boreholes will be conducted post consent, should this be awarded, and included in a mitigation strategy that will be shown in the Construction Environmental Management Plan for this particular development.	Noted. The **Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** has been updated to include the commitment for post consent geoarchaeological boreholes. This updated CEMP is submitted at Deadline 1 and the final CEMP would need to be approved by CCC as part of the discharge of the DCO Requirement 10.
Historic Environment	7.5 FDC Officers and Historic England will provide comment on the impact to Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings as we do not comment on these matters in relation to	Noted. Any further comments received from FDC or Historic England will be responded to during the Examination.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	infrastructure schemes. We are awaiting this information which will be included in the Local Impact Report. There are no scheduled monuments in Cambridgeshire that will be directly or negatively affected by the scheme.	
Historic Environment	7.6 The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) contains a section for the Historic Environment at 5.9. For this scheme, it is satisfactory but requires an additional note to ground crews in the event of discovering human remains as the treatment of human remains is protected by law, specifically the Burial Act of 1857 and the disused Burial Grounds Act of 1884 (amended 1981).	Noted. The **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** has been amended for Deadline 1 to include the necessary powers with an additional Article.
Hydrology	9.1 The following comments are from the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) and relate to flood risk and surface water drainage. The availability and use of water resources for the operation of the plant is not a matter for CCC to comment on but will be considered by the Environment Agency so far as it relates to water resource efficiency and through their permitting regime.	Noted. A meeting was arranged with Cambridgeshire County Council's (CCC) Principal Sustainable Drainage Officer (PSDO) following their review of relevant documents submitted with the DCO application. The aim of the meeting was to discuss CCC's draft relevant representation (dated 13 October 2022) that they intended to issue to PINS and clarify any further queries concerning **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES)) [APP-039]** and relevant appendices. This meeting took place on 24 October 2022. The Applicant has subsequently received the final relevant representation from **CCC (dated 14 November 2022) [RR-002]** and submitted a response as a Technical Note on 2 December 2022. The responses are reproduced in this document for completeness. This information does not alter the conclusions regarding likely significant effects set out in **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES)) [APP-039]**. Where relevant, this information has been included in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086]** submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	9.2 The LLFA expects that as much water is reused within the scheme as possible, in line with the drainage hierarchy. This could be through techniques such as rainwater harvesting for grey water within any part of the proposed facilities. It must be clearly demonstrated within the	There is limited demand for water reuse in the process at the EfW CHP Facility. In addition, there would be constraints in the reuse of surface water runoff in the process due to its water quality (pre-treatment required). However, source control features have been adopted in the design of the EfW CHP Facility. These are set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	submissions that the rainwater reuse has been fully covered and utilised as widely as possible.	**Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 and include permeable paving, rainwater harvesting and green wall and brown roof for the administration building and a brown roof for the Weighbridge Gatehouse. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-086] Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).**
	Climate Change Allowance 9.3 Climate change allowances have been applied to the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) storm event. However, in accordance with the latest climate change peak rainfall intensity allowances, a climate change allowance should be incorporated into the surface water management scheme for the 3.3% annual exceedance probability rainfall event. The allowance used should be based on the lifetime of the development.	The drainage design calculations used a climate change allowance of 20% for the construction phase and 40% for the operational phase and considered the 1% AEP storm event as well as the 3.3% AEP storm event. The climate change allowances used in the hydraulic modelling are in line with the latest Environment Agency guidance. The 1% AEP storm event result was used in the sizing of the attenuation tanks and basins as a worst-case scenario. Details of the attenuation calculations are provided in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F of the ES) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Pumping of surface water 9.4 It is acknowledged that pumping may be required where levels do not permit a gravity outfall. However, justification must be provided for the reasoning for the use of pumps for surface water disposal. Surface water is proposed to be pumped from the Temporary Construction Compound (TCC). Pump failure modelling would be required for any pumped discharge, modelling full pump failure, with 50% capacity in attenuation during the critical duration 1% AEP storm.	The proposed management of surface water drainage for the EfW CHP Facility (construction and operational phases) is described in detail in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 and supporting Figures 4.1 and 4.2. During the construction phase of the EfW CHP Facility, there is a requirement for pumping surface water runoff from the northern area into the temporary drainage network in the southern area and into the Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board (HWIDB) drainage system. The pumping of surface water runoff is also required from the underground attenuation tank located in the TCC, since levels do not permit a gravity outfall into the IDB drainage network. As requested by CCC, the impact of a potential pump failure has been assessed for both the northern area of the EfW CHP Facility and the TCC(i). The calculations are presented Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Appendix 12F of the ES) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. EfW CHP Facility (Northern Area) It is proposed that 0.5m high temporary earth bunds are formed on the northern area of the EfW CHP Facility to contain the build-up of surface water runoff in the event of pump failure. The bunds would be located along the western and southern boundaries of the northern area of the

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		EfW CHP Facility (location of the pumping station and low topographic point of this part of the site). The proposed location of the bunds is shown on revised **Figure 4.1** of Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. A high-level calculation has been undertaken to estimate the volume of surface water runoff which may be generated in this area in the event of a pump failure. Based on a Micro-drainage model output for the 1%AEP storm event over a critical storm period of 12h and 20% climate change allowance, an attenuation volume of approximately 296m3 is required. A 0.5m high bund provides a maximum storage capacity of approximately 7,250m3 and therefore provides ample storage in the event of a pump failure over a 12h period during a critical storm event. The height of the bund has been reduced from the initial proposals of 1m in the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086]** to 0.5m due to sufficient storage capacity provided by a 0.5m high bund. This is presented in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. TCC(i) It is also proposed that 0.5m high temporary earth bunds are formed on the TCC(i), to contain the build-up of surface water in the event of pump failure. It is proposed that the temporary bunds are located along the western and northern boundaries of the TCC(i) (location of pumping station and low topographic point in this area). The location of the proposed bund is shown on revised **Figure 4.1** of Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. Based on the Micro-drainage model output for the 1% AEP storm event with a critical storm period of 24h and 20% climate change allowance, an attenuation volume of approximately 470m3 is required. A 0.5m high bund provides a maximum storage capacity of approximately 2,000m3 and therefore provides ample storage in the event of a pump failure period of 24h during a critical storm event. The height of the bund has been reduced from the initial proposals of 1m in the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086]** to 0.5m due to sufficient storage capacity provided by a 0.5m high bund. This is presented in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Pumped groundwater 9.5 The additional volumes for the maximum volume of groundwater pumped from deep excavations must be available within the receiving body, be it a basin, tanks, or watercourse.	Pumped groundwater arising from the excavations in the Tidal Flat Deposits associated with the construction of the EfW CHP Facility will also be discharged into the HWIDB network via the attenuation basins in the southern part of the EfW CHP Facility Site. The highest pumping rates are expected to be from the deeper excavations associated with the waste bunker. As detailed in **Section 4.3.16 and 4.3.17** of Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1**,** preliminary groundwater pumping calculations using an Environment Agency' tool indicate a likely steady state pumping rate between 5 to 95m3/day, with the most likely value of 30m3/day. Calculations are provided in Appendix B of this document. The indicative groundwater pumping rates will be confirmed at the detailed design stage. via pumping tests as set out in Section 4.3.16 of Rev 2 the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. This is secured via Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy) of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-086].** Groundwater daily pumping rates (most likely value 30m3/day) are less than 10% in comparison with the total capacity of the three attenuation basins (423m3, 141 m3 per basin) solely for surface water runoff for the EfW CHP Facility (Rev 2 the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1). The volume of each of the three attenuation basins has been increased by 10m3 from 141m3 to 151m3 (total capacity increased from 423m3 to 453m3) to accommodate the indicative volume of pumped groundwater (30m3/day). The revised attenuation basins volume is shown on the revised Figure 4.1 of Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. It is noted that the estimated groundwater pumping rates may vary at detailed design stage. If the aquifer pumping tests at the detailed design stage indicate that the dewatering rates are closer to the higher estimate (95m3/day), then sufficient space will still be available in the southern area of the EfW CHP Facility Site to increase the capacity of the attenuation basins if this is required.
Hydrology	Half Drain Times 9.6 It is noted that some of the half drain times are exceeding	The half drain times exceed 24h within the system but additional calculations were undertaken to confirm that the system has suitable capacity to receive a follow up 1 in 10-year storm after 24h. Details of these

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	24 hours within the system. These should be retained as close to 24 hours as possible. Where this is not feasible, the LLFA would accept the available capacity within the system has suitable capacity to receive a follow up 1 in 10-year storm after 24 hours.	calculations are provided in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations 9.7 Acknowledging the submitted calculations are calculating the volume attenuation required, performance calculations for the 100%, 3.3% and 1% AEP storms should be provided including a suitable allowance for climate change on the 3.3% and 1% AEP storm. There should be no surcharging in the 100% AEP storm and no water outside the system in the 3.3% AEP storm including climate change. Low levels of flooding may be acceptable during the 1% AEP storm including an allowance for climate change, however, this must be managed safely within the red line boundary, keeping the future users of the facility safe, and mitigating any risk of flooding of the development, or adjacent land and property.	The PSDO confirmed that these comments apply to the detailed design stage of the drainage strategy. The commitment to undertake further hydraulic calculations at the detailed design stage is provided in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	9.8 Caution should be taken with the diameters of flow controls. Generally, the minimum acceptable diameter from open attenuation is 75mm, to reduce the risk of blockage from litter and debris. From completely closed systems, such as permeable paving or underdrained swales, this can be as low as 20mm in line with the CIRIA SuDS Manual.	The PSDO confirmed that these comments apply to the detailed design stage of the drainage strategy. The commitment to specify the diameter of the flow controllers in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual at the detailed design stage is provided in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Wider drainage proposals 9.9 Details for all parts of the scheme, such as drainage layout and calculations are required. It is noted that the Outline Drainage Strategy focusses on the main facility. However, there are temporary works to the highways that should be provided.	It was confirmed at the meeting with CCC that the Walsoken Substation falls outside the CCC jurisdiction. Drainage proposals for Walsoken Substation will be confirmed with Norfolk County Council (as the Lead Local Authority) and King's Lynn IDB. The drainage proposals for the access improvement works described in detail in Section 4.6 of Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. The access improvement works comprise realignment and widening of New Bridge Lane and the creation of a new access bell-mouth to the site from New Bridge Lane, and a realigned bell-

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		mouth access from Algores Way. It is proposed that surface water runoff from the improved section of New Bridge Lane will discharge via trapped gullies into the HWIDB drain south of New Bridge Lane, subject to the approval of HWIDB. Flows from the proposed New Bridge Lane bell-mouth will be attenuated within the new pipework, before passing through a penstock valve chamber and entering the HWIDB drain. Meetings have been held with HWIDB to reach agreement on the proposals, which will be recorded in a Statement of Common Ground to be submitted during the DCO examination. Highway drainage runoff from the bell-mouth access on Algores Way will primarily be discharged into the adjacent HWIDB drain, but there may be a small quantity of highway drainage runoff which discharges into the existing highway drainage network, which will require approval from the local highway authority. Discussions with the Cambridgeshire Highways Team to determine the form of agreement to secure these arrangements are ongoing.
Hydrology	Consultation with the Internal Drainage Board 9.10 The proposed scheme is within the Hundreds of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board (IDB), which is within the jurisdiction of Middle Level Commissioners (MLC). Works around the watercourses and that may impact the watercourse network, such as discharge rates, water quality or consenting requirements must be discussed with the IDB and MLC. Correspondence must be undertaken with the IDB/MLC from an early stage to ensure consideration is given to their requirements.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the HWIDB and MLC during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].** The Applicant is working to produce a Statement of Common Ground with HWIDB and MLC which will be submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Maintenance 9.11 Management and maintenance schedules have been provided for the scheme, setting out required assets for maintenance as well as the maintenance activity and frequency for each structure. At a preliminary stage this covers the detail for maintenance, however this is subject to	Extensive consultation regarding the surface water drainage network in the vicinity of the Proposed Development has been undertaken with the HWIDB and KLIDB during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. This has included discussions on water discharges into the drains, standoff distances from the drains and maintenance access to the drains. Maintenance considerations have been accommodated within the outline design of the Proposed Development

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	change as the design progresses. It should also be noted that maintenance consideration to existing structures must be accommodated for within the design of the site, such as access to existing watercourse networks. Watercourses in an IDB area will be subject to bylaws, which should be discussed with the IDB/MLC.	and will be confirmed at detailed design stage. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].** The Applicant is working to produce a Statement of Common Ground with HWIDB and KLIDB which will be submitted during the DCO examination
Hydrology	Waldersey Internal Drainage Board and Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board 9.12 Whilst MLC will be submitting their own Relevant Representation for this proposal to PINS on behalf of the IDB, officers of both CCC and FDC are keen to ensure that their concerns are addressed, alongside the hydrological points raised on behalf of the Lead Local Flood Authority.	Noted. Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the HWIDB, MLC and the Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].** The Applicant is working to produce Statement of Common Ground with HWIDB, MLC and LLFAs (relevant host authorities). Draft SoCGs will be submitted at Deadline 1 of the Examination.
Hydrology	9.13 Following discussions with the MLC, their Planning Engineer has confirmed that the following points are of particular concern to them: A. Hydrology - Water level and flood risk management including climate change allowance. B. Integrity of the Boards System and local water level management systems - Encroachment beside watercourses including acoustic fencing and street lighting, footpaths/cycleways etc.; Increased and more regular loading of old drainage structures leading to settlement and/or failure; The adverse impacts of widening and increasing the traffic along New Bridge Lane. C. Piping and filling of open watercourses - Loss of storage volume and habits/species with no apparent mitigation. D. Biodiversity - Loss of habitats and species, Absence of	The Applicant's response to the HWIDB's relevant representation, incorporating the points listed by CCC / FDC is provide in **Table 3.8** of this document.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	suitable mitigation, No apparent Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). E. Future maintenance of the onsite water level and flood risk management systems in perpetuity. F. Water Neutrality, water resource and harvesting - The increasing societal need to manage a decreasing resource in the driest area of the country, which is facing significant growth and other related challenges, Better on site use of water potentially reducing flood risk. G. Water quality and pollution control - Airborne debris collecting within watercourses and creating a flood risk, Chemical spills during normal events and following incidents such as an explosion or fire. H. The impacts following a major incident, accident or disaster i.e. Water source for fire suppression and subsequent pollution control including retardants used, "Fall over" distances of the flue, Breach and/or overtopping of the adjacent tidal defences etc.	
	9.14 Whilst concern D (on Biodiversity), concern G (on Water quality and pollution control) and concern H (on Major incident, accident, or disaster) will also be relevant to chapter 8 of this response for Biodiversity (ES Chapter 11) and chapter 13 for Major Accidents and Disasters, they have been retained here for completeness, and to show our support to the concerns being raised by the MLC that will need addressing as part of the Examination.	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	Cambridgeshire County Council Landscape Architects 6.1 Cambridgeshire County employed Landscape Architects	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	to provide specialist comments on the Medworth CHP Limited DCO application and their comments are contained in paragraphs 6.2 to 6.11 below.	
Landscape and Visual	6.2 The Proposed Development would recover useful energy in the form of electricity and steam from over half a million tonnes of non-recyclable (residual), non-hazardous municipal, commercial, and industrial waste each year. The Proposed Development has a generating capacity of over 50 megawatts and the electricity would be exported to the grid. The Proposed Development would also have the capability to export steam and electricity to users on the surrounding industrial estate. The maximum parameters of the main building are 52m in height, 177m in length and 102m in width. The maximum parameters of the 2 chimneys are 90m in height with a maximum width of 3.2m. The external elevations of the buildings would be clad in flat panels of contrasting bands and will adopt a palette of grey tones with lighter grey cladding used for the highest parts of the EfW CHP Facility. The Finished Floor Level (FFL) across the development Site would be set at 3.0m above ordnance datum (AOD).	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	Submitted Information 6.3 Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement includes a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which presents the Environmental Assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with respect to landscape and visual impacts, including impacts upon townscape. The methodology (appendix 9B) used to prepare the LVIA contained within Chapter 9 is based on the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (GLVIA3) (Landscape Institute (LI) & Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA),	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	2013). Included additionally within Chapter 9 is a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA). The RVAA examined eight individual or small groups of properties identified within 500m of the boundary of the main building at the EfW CHP Facility. The methodology for the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment is presented separately from the LVIA Methodology within Appendix 9K: Residential Visual Amenity. Chapter 9 is supported by 12 appendices that contain the extensive volume of baseline information and the detailed assessments with summaries included within the main body of Chapter 9 at sections 9.5 and 9.9 and the information is supported by 46 Figures.	
Landscape and Visual	Viewpoints and Photomontage 6.4 30 representative viewpoints were used to aid assessment of the effects. Photomontage or wireframes of the proposed development were generated for a selection of these viewpoints. The LVIA States that photomontages have been produced in accordance with Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19.	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	Summary of LVIA Assessment Findings 6.5 The landscape and visual assessment considered the potential effects of the Proposed Development on: the character of the landscape, the character of the town of Wisbech; and, views from numerous different locations within the Study Area. The views include: residential areas, groups of dwellings or individual properties; Footpaths, cycleways and visitor attractions; and, roads (including different sections of the same road). Table 9.10 of the LVIA sets out the Landscape and Visual Receptors that were 'Scoped in' for assessment within the LVIA. Significant effects during construction, operation and decommissioning were identified for the following receptors: · Residents of 9 and 10 New Bridge Lane;	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	· Residents of No. 25 Cromwell Road would see the construction and final form of the middle and upper sections of the EfW CHP Facility above existing commercial buildings; · A small number of properties on the northern edge of Begdale; · People walking along a section of the Nene Way – south of Wisbech; · Cyclists using a stretch of the Sustrans National Cycle Route 63 heading into Wisbech approximately 1.3km from the EfW CHP Facility; · People walking along Halfpenny Lane towards Wisbech would experience short-lived close distance views; · Bank/Narrow Drove/Broad Drove at a distance of 1-2.9km would see upper parts of the main building and chimneys once the EfW CHP Facility had been constructed; · Vehicular users of the A47 eastbound (to Wisbech) which would be short-lived and when operational, seen in the context of the existing cold store and other buildings; and · Vehicular users of the B198 Cromwell Road (southwest of Wisbech town centre) although during both construction and operation the Proposed Development would be seen in the context of existing buildings and would be often screened by them in close-up views.	
Landscape and Visual	6.6 Significant effects were identified during the operation period for Recreational users of the Public Right of Way 'The Still', south of Leverington for the operational phase only and at a distance of 1.8km to 2.8km where users would see the EfW CHP Facility as a low focal point above a short section of the south-eastern horizon above the intervening vegetation.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Landscape and Visual	Conclusions 6.7 The Consultant's assessment has concluded that there would be no significant landscape or townscape effects apart from locally significant effects within the landscape character area closest to the Proposed Development, which is the Wisbech Settled Fen landscape character area. As set out above, there would be many significant visual effects during construction and operation. Significant effects have also been identified to arise from the decommissioning phase.	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	6.8 Technical discussions with the applicant are ongoing. However, the Consultant has identified serious concerns regarding the applicant's assessment as to the extent in which potential significant effects to landscape character and to the surrounding townscape character would extend as a consequence of development of the proposals.	At a meeting held between the Consultant (Liz Lake Associates) engaged by the Host Authorities, representatives from the Host Authorities, the Applicant and the Applicant's Consultant WSP on 21/10/2022, an action was taken for the Host Authorities to clarify which assessment conclusions they did not agree with and why (item 1.9). A follow up email was sent from WSP to the Host Authorities and their consultants on 27/01/2023, to ascertain whether it was the intention of the Host Authorities to provide more information in response to this action and if so, the timescales associated with a response. A response is awaited.
Landscape and Visual	6.9 Based on advice provided by the Consultant, both CCC and FDC have serious concerns regarding the applicant's assessment of the extent of potential significant visual effects as a consequence of development of the proposals.	At a meeting held between the Consultant (Liz Lake Associates) engaged by the Host Authorities, representatives from the Host Authorities, the Applicant and the Applicant's Consultant WSP on 21/10/2022, an action was taken for the Host Authorities to clarify which assessment conclusions they did not agree with and why (item 1.9). A follow up email was sent from WSP to the Host Authorities and their consultants on 27/01/2023, to ascertain whether it was the intention of the Host Authorities to provide more information in response to this and if so, the timescales associated with a response. A response is awaited.
Landscape and Visual	6.10 The ZTV splash demonstrated on ZTV Figures 1 – 4 (refined October 2022) is substantial, essentially covering all of the study area including large areas of the urban area of Wisbech and surrounding settlements. The accompanying photomontage visualisations demonstrate the vertical prominence of both the chimneys and the mass of the buildings.	The refined ZTVs for the main building and stack of the EfW CHP Facility (figure references **ZTV1 4130-Shr347_v2** and **ZTV2 4130-Shr349_v2**) were issued to the Host Authorities Consultant and representatives from the Host Authorities as clarification material on the 02 November 2022 to address the points raised in the 21/10/22 meeting. A copy of these ZTVs is provided as part of the Deadline 1 submission **(Volume 9.2 Part 9 Appendices**). These show large areas of Wisbech and the surrounding

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		settlements of Wisbech St Mary, Leverington, Emneth, Elm and Friday Bridge as lying outside of the ZTVs. The visualisations presented **ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Figures 9.17 to 9.24 [APP-058], ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Figures 9.25 to 9.32 [APP-059], ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Figures 9.33 to 9.39 [APP-060]** and **ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Figures 9.40 to 9.46 [APP-061]** all of which are in **Volume 6.3** demonstrate varying levels of prominence, depending on proximity, direction and presence or absence of screening elements.
Landscape and Visual	6.11 Given the Consultant's conclusions, both CCC and FDC have serious concerns regarding the visual effects to residential properties within proximity to the proposal site, particularly in regard to 10 New Bridge Lane where there is a concern that there is potential for the operation of the EFW CHP Facility to breach the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold (RVAT).	Given the concerns of the Host Authorities Consultant and the Host Authorities, following the 21/10/22 meeting, cross sections were prepared **(Figure CS1** and **CS2**) to clarify the relationship between the EfW CHP Facility and 10 New Bridge Lane and to compare a similar bungalow on New Bridge Lane (Potty Plants) with the existing Cold Store building. These were issued to the Consultant and the Host Authorities on 02 November 2022 and a copy is provided as part of the Deadline 1 submission (**Volume 9.2 Part 9 Appendices).** The sections demonstrate that the Cold Store is much closer to Potty Plants than the EfW CHP Facility main building would be to 10 New Bridge Lane. Furthermore, the Cold Store occupies a greater vertical proportion of the view than the EfW CHP Facility main buildings in relation to 10 New Bridge Lane. The chimneys of the Proposed Development would occupy a slightly smaller vertical angle of view than the Cold Store from Potty Plants, however chimneys are slimline structures that have a lower potential to be considered overbearing, compared with the much greater bulk of a building. The cross sections support the ES analysis that the RVAT would not be breached between 10 New Bridge Lane and the proposed EfW main buildings and chimneys.
Landscape and Visual	Cambridgeshire County Council Education Capital 6.12 In the Landscape and Visual Assessment (Chapter 9) of the Environmental Statement, it states that the pupils and staff at the TCA would experience a 'Very Low' and 'Low' magnitude of change at both construction and operational	CCC's summary is as reported in Appendix 9J Visual Assessment Table of **ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual (Volume 6.4) Appendices [APP-079]** and visual effects from the TCA would be Not Significant.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	phases. The only elements of the proposal that would be visible from the TCA would be the 90 metre chimney columns and upper section of the building. Even though no viewpoints have been prepared from TCA or Weasenham Lane, there will be a change to the skyline when looking south from the TCA and Free School site, although they would be of low level of magnitude.	
Landscape and Visual	6.16 FDC's EHOs have produced the following comments regarding the impact the outline Lighting Strategy may have on the immediate locality and landscape. This should be viewed as a separate matter to the wider Landscape and Visual comments as addressed by CCC's Landscape Architects above.	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	6.17 The following documentation has been reviewed by FDC's EHOs: "EN010110-000514-MVV Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development Appendix 3B Outline Lighting Strategy" 6.18 It is recognised that the Strategy makes suitable refence to recognised lighting industry guidance.	Comment noted.
Landscape and Visual	6.19 Notwithstanding the above, consideration must also be given by the applicant to ensure that light overspill and/or glare does not adversely impact on any other premises (including, but not limited to isolated residencies on New Bridge Lane) - despite the proposed development site being a considerable distance from any built-up residential areas.	**ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development Appendix 3B Outline Lighting Strategy (Volume 6.4) [APP-071]** makes a commitment at paragraph 1.1.1 to designing and controlling the lighting so as to avoid *sky glow and light pollution.* Paragraph 1.1.8 outlines the measures that would be taken to minimise light spill and glare. The **Outline Lighting Strategy** is secured in Requirement 18 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Landscape and Visual	6.20 The Environmental Health service reserves the right to investigate any complaints(s) of lighting that are alleged to be impacting on the amenity of those living and working nearby and take relevant action if it is considered to constitute a statutory nuisance.	Comment noted.
Major Accidents and Disasters	Cambridgeshire County Council Emergency Planning Team 13.1 Statement in the draft DCO: Flood emergency management plan 13. 1) Prior to the date of final commissioning, a flood emergency management plan must be submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval. The flood emergency management plan submitted for approval must be substantially in accordance with the outline flood emergency management plan. 2) The flood emergency management plan submitted and approved under sub–paragraph (1) must be implemented as approved and remain in place throughout the operation of the authorised development unless otherwise agreed by the relevant planning authority.	An appropriate Flood Emergency Management Plan consistent with the Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9 of the ES) [APP-100] will be implemented and secured via **Draft DCO Requirement 13 [APP-013]** and will remain in place throughout the operation of the Proposed Development.
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.2 Within the proposals there is an acknowledgement of the potential of a residual risk of flooding, during a breach of the raised tidal defences protecting the area, or a severe flood event that exceeds the flood management design standard.	As set out in the **Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 6.4 of the ES) [APP-084],** the Proposed Development will remain entirely dry during the design flood event (overtopping of the Nene flood defences plus climate change) but is at risk of flooding during a residual risk event (breach of the Nene flood defences plus climate change) and/or a particularly severe overtopping event in excess of the design flood.
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.3 The preparation and implementation of an Emergency Flood Response Plan is proposed for the operational phase of the facility to address the residual risk of tidal flooding.	The Proposed Development will remain entirely dry during the design flood event (overtopping of the Nene flood defences plus climate change) but is at risk of flooding during a residual risk event (breach of the Nene flood defences plus climate change) and/or a particularly severe overtopping event in excess of the design flood. The proposed embedded environmental measures to address the residual risk of flooding of the Proposed Development are set out in Table 12.10 of **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		039] and were agreed with the Environment Agency through extensive consultation during pre-application. These measures include raising the ground levels of sensitive infrastructure (1 in 1000 year plus climate change tidal breach flood level) and implementing an appropriate Flood Emergency Management Plan, secured via **Draft DCO Requirement 13 [APP-013]** consistent with the **Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9 of the ES) [APP-100].**
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.4 Cambridgeshire County Council Emergency Planning Team endorses the proposal to develop an Operational Flood Emergency Management Plan for the site.	An appropriate Flood Emergency Management Plan consistent with the **Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9 of the ES) [APP-100**] will be implemented and is secured via **Draft DCO Requirement 13 [APP-013].**
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.5 Cambridgeshire County Council Emergency Planning Team proposes that the site operator should engage with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF) to develop this plan.	An appropriate Flood Emergency Management Plan consistent with the **Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9 of the ES) [APP-100]** will be developed in consultation with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF) and will be implemented and secured via **Draft DCO Requirement 13 [APP-013].**
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.6 On the completion of the plan, the operator, would in conjunction with the CPLRF undertake training, testing and validation of the plan to ensure that the arrangements are effective, and are appropriately shared and understood by all relevant parties.	Training, testing and validation of the Flood Emergency Management Plan will be undertaken in consultation with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF).
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.7 This plan should consider the impact and response to any concurrent incidents that might occur on the site during a significant flooding incident that might impact the site.	The Flood Emergency Management Plan will consider the impact and response to any concurrent incidents that might occur on the EfW CHP Facility site during a significant flooding incident that might impact the site.
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.8 When the plan is validated and in place, the operator would be expected to put in place and agree, an appropriate programme to review, amend and update the arrangements, including periodic liaison and validation with the CPLRF.	Following validation and implementation of the Flood Emergency Management Plan, the Applicant will put in place and agree, an appropriate programme to review, amend and update the arrangements, including periodic liaison and validation with the CPLRF.
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.9 This approach would help to ensure that the flood risk arrangements for the site in its operational phase, were appropriate, up to date, and shared fully with responding agencies including the emergency services.	Noted

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Major Accidents and Disasters	Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service 13.10 Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service (CFRS) acknowledges and endorses Cambridgeshire County Council Emergency Planning Team's submission with regards to Medworth CHP Limited's proposed Energy from Waste Facility and the need to engage with Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Local Resilience Forum (CPLRF).	Noted
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.11 CFRS note the inclusion of the outline Fire Protection Plan (FPP) following Environment Agency Guidance 'Fire Prevention Plans: Environmental Permits'.	Noted
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.12 CFRS propose that the local mains water supply be assessed for impact of construction and occupation phase water demands and implications this may have on firefighting flow rates should a fire incident occur either on site or locally.	The **Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) [APP-101]** describes the requirements for firewater supply including the onsite storage of two hours water provision, to buffer any requirement to rely on mains supply. The potential impact on water resources is described in **Chapter 12 of the ES (Volume 6.2) [APP-039**] for both the construction and operational phase.
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.13 The impact of compulsory acquisitions of interests in, and rights over land, will need to be assessed. In particular, where this includes access to existing premises and infrastructure, or impacts on access to mains water supplies and hydrant provision which would be expected for firefighting use during emergency response.	The Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) [APP-101] describes the requirements for firewater supply including the onsite storage of two hours water provision, to buffer any requirement to rely on mains supply. The detailed design of the firewater supply infrastructure will account for any impacts of compulsory acquisition. The potential impact on water resources is described in **ES Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2) [APP-039].**
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.14 During detailed design stage, CFRS encourages early consultation under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 and in line with Building Regulations and Fire Safety Procedural Guidance, July 2020, published by the National Fire Chiefs Council, Local Authority Building Control and the Association of Consultant Approved	This is noted. The Applicant is committed to complying with all legal requirements under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order, Building Regulations and associated guidance.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	Inspectors, and stated good practice by MHCLG (now Department for Levelling Up Housing and Communities).	
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.15 CFRS notes reference within FPP to the requirement for Fire Risk Assessment: A suitable and sufficient fire risk assessment of the premises must be carried out in accordance with article 9 of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. The documentation and any necessary safety measures must be in place on the first day that the premises are occupied.	The Proposed Development acknowledges the requirement for a Fire Risk Assessment which complies with the requirements of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order. This is described in **ES Chapter 17 Major Accidents and Disasters (Volume 6.2) [APP-039]** and **The Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) [APP-101]** secured by Requirement 17 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Major Accidents and Disasters	13.16 Stated objectives of FPP aim for fire to be extinguished within 4 hours. CFRS consider this a conservative estimate and the impact of protracted incident where a controlled burn should be considered and planned for. In these instances, burn out times should be considered in days not hours.	The **Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) [APP-101],** has been drafted in accordance with controls dictated by MVV's existing Integrated Management System (IMS), which is certified in accordance with international standards for Environmental, Occupational Health & Safety, Quality and Energy Management. Based on the MVV's operational experience, the Applicant is confident that the stated objectives in the **Outline Fire Prevention Plan (Volume 7.10) [APP-101]** are realistic. A detailed Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared prior to the final commissioning of the EfW CHP Facility; secured by Draft DCO Requirement 17 (**Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** In preparing the detailed Fire Prevention Plan, the Applicant will consult the Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Services.
Noise and Vibration	Fenland District Council (FDC) Environmental Health Officers 4.1 FDC's Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) have reviewed the following documentation in addition to the more general documentation submitted to support this application: · EN010110-000472-MVV Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration · EN010110-000496-MVV Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration Appendix 7A -7C AC	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	· EN010110-000497-MVV Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration Appendix 7D Outline Operational Noise Management Plan · EN010110-000486-MVV Volume 6.3 ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration Figures · EN010110-000526-MVV Volume 7.12 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan · EN010110-000530-MVV Volume 5.2 Statement of Statutory Nuisance	
Noise and Vibration	4.2 Annexes B, C, E and F were omitted from the original application submission. This was highlighted to the applicant during the technical officer meetings – resulting in these Annexes subsequently being provided for review.	The omitted annexes were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and published on the PINS project website on 26 August 2022 **[AS-010]**. The ExA accepted this additional submission on 11 November 2022.
Noise and Vibration	4.3 Whilst the Council is still waiting for some minor additional data / clarifications to be shared, the outcome of the assessment and conclusions drawn in this documentation (including Annexes B, C, E and F) are accepted – and Officers are satisfied that this work has been undertaken by suitably competent personnel, in accordance with all relevant legislation and technical guidance.	Comment noted.
Noise and Vibration	4.4 It is recommended however, that the matters identified in sections 4.5 to 4.11 below are taken into consideration by the Inspectorate, before a recommendation is made to the Secretary of State and a final decision reached:	Comment noted.
Noise and Vibration	4.5 It is noted that the assessment is necessarily complex – but, as a result, it would benefit from the addition of a further table which easily identifies - at a relatively high summary level and in relation to each receptor:	The assessment outcomes at each receptor are summarised in **Table 7.39 of the ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]**. Requirements for mitigation are described in the subsequent Section 7.10 of the ES.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	· type of noise assessed (operational or construction noise /vibration) · determined significance of noise / vibration impact · what type of mitigation is proposed – if any 4.6 Whilst signposting has been requested from the applicant (to clarify the location - within the application – of the information identified in section 4.5), in the future, this (and similar) information, should still be presented more clearly – to enable non-expert readers of the assessment to be able to easily identify the outcomes of this technical assessment.	Comments on the complexity of the assessment are noted, however, it is our view that the summary provided in Table 7.39 referred to above is clear and that it has been summarised as concisely as possible. Due to the complexities of the topic, we consider that the assessments could not be simplified any further without lengthening the noise and vibration chapter.
Noise and Vibration	4.7 The reviewed documentation contains several references to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) and the Outline Noise Management Plan (Outline NMP) which have been submitted to support the planning application. 4.8 These references make it clear that the actual detail of site-specific measures which are to be implemented to mitigate any identified environmental impacts (including noise) – are intended to be specified further in the Outline CEMP and Outline NMP.	Comment noted.
Noise and Vibration	4.9 It is understood – following discussions with the applicant - that provision for securing this documentation is made within relevant Planning Legislation as it relates to this specific type of Development Consent Order application. However, this needs to be clarified and expressly confirmed as part of the Examination process to ensure that the detail and relevant mitigation can be secured if permission is to be granted.	The noise and vibration mitigation measures for the construction phase are secured in Requirement 10 **(Construction Environmental Management Plan)** of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**, and for the operation phase via **Requirement 19 (Noise Management**).
Noise and Vibration	4.10 Considering the high level of public interest in applications of this nature, and the integral role which these	

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	documents have in relation to minimising all potential environmental impacts in relation to all aspects of this application - it is considered essential that the following is secured via the planning process: · An updated CEMP to be submitted for approval by all relevant consultees (including but not necessarily limited to FDC) prior to the commencement of any site clearance, ground preparations, demolition and construction associated with the site – which: o Is drawn up in accordance with the relevant legislation and technical guidance – and contains all associated content o Is presented in a logical format, to enable ease of interpretation o Includes a table which provides a high summary level of the determined significance of construction noise and vibration impact at each receptor o Includes detailed explanation of the measures which will be implemented to address each identified impact as necessary for each measure, a statement and/or other evidence/calculations as necessary - to verify the predicated impact outcome of the implementation of each mitigation measure at each receptor · An updated NMP to be submitted for approval by the relevant consultees (including but not necessarily limited to FDC) prior to the operation of the installation on the site – which: o Is drawn up in accordance with the relevant legislation and technical guidance – and contains all associated content o Is presented in a logical format, to enable ease of	The **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-106]** has been updated to cover the matters raised and is submitted at Deadline 1 as Rev 2. The final document will be approved by the relevant host authorities via the requirement in the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	interpretation o Includes a table which provides a high summary level of the determined significance of operational noise impact at each receptor o Includes detailed explanation of the measures which will be implemented to address each identified impact as necessary for each measure, a statement and / or other evidence / calculations to verify the predicated impact outcome of the implementation of each mitigation measure at each receptor	
Noise and Vibration	4.11 Care should be taken to ensure that all future submissions of technical documentation in relation to the noise impacts of this development - shall: · contain all appendices / annexes as referenced within the relevant reports - to enable a complete review to be undertaken. · contain sufficient data / content to support all assumptions and professional judgements made – to ensure as high a degree of traceability and transparency as possible is provided.	Comment noted.
Noise and Vibration	4.12 Notwithstanding the content of the "EN010110-000530-MVV Volume 5.2 Statement of Statutory Nuisance", legal advice received confirms that should FDC receive allegations of any type of statutory nuisance (not just noise), it would still have a duty to investigate - and take enforcement action if any such allegation is substantiated.	Comment noted.
Noise and Vibration	Cambridgeshire County Council Education Capital comments and wider educational concerns raised in relation to the Cambian Education Foundation Learning Centre	TCA is identified as receptor R28 in Table 7.14 of the **ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** and is shown in **Fig 7.5 Operational Noise study Area - EfW CHP Facility [APP-051].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	(CEFLC) and the Riverside Meadows Academy (RMA) by Fenland District Council (FDC). 4.13 The Noise and Vibration Chapter (7) of the Environmental Statement does not identify the Thomas Clarkson Academy (TCA) as a noise sensitive receptor even though it is within 750 metres of the site and closer to the CHP Connection works. Whilst it is standard practice for a study area to be up to 300 metres, this is not a maximum and is only "normally sufficient" according to the relevant British Standard. The study area section does not acknowledge sensitive receptors such as the TCA and especially the external areas associated with the Academy's play areas and sports pitches.	Given the distances involved, the screening provided by existing buildings between the CHP corridor and TCA, and the dominance of road traffic noise from traffic on Weasenham Lane at TCA, it is considered most unlikely that there would be any adverse impact at TCA from construction noise arising from works on the CHP connection.
Noise and Vibration	4.14 The TCA and Free School site falls within the study area for the EfW CHP as identified on figure 7.5 (Operational Noise Study Area). However, no long term or short-term monitoring is proposed to assess the impact of the proposed development on the school even though the southern boundary of the TCA site where the existing MUGA (Multi-Use Games Area) is located is identified as a 'Noise Sensitive Receptor'. Whilst the noise modelling results suggest that noise levels will be between 35-40Db, given that the TCA should be regarded as a sensitive receptor, some acknowledgement and further consideration, along with monitoring to mitigate any real-time impact should be provided. Furthermore, on the basis that only short-term monitoring is proposed for the CEFLC and RMA school sites this also needs to be given further consideration and longer-term mitigation.	TCA is identified as receptor R28 in Table 7.14 of the **ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034],** and is shown in **Fig 7.5 Operational Noise study Area - EfW CHP Facility [APP-051].** Results of short term monitoring at ST3, considered representative of TCA, are presented in **Table 3.13 of Appendix 7A Baseline Noise Monitoring Report [AS-010].** The results of the survey indicate an average daytime sound level of 72 dB $L_{Aeq,T.}$ As road traffic on Weasenham Lane is observed to be dominant at ST3, and applying attenuation for distance calculations, the baseline road traffic sound level in the TCA MUGA, approx 50 - 100 m from Weasenham Lane, is predicted to be around 60 - 63 dB $L_{Aeq,t}$. The predicted increase in traffic noise level on Weasenham Lane during the construction phase, presented in Table 7.15 of the ES [APP-034], is 0.3 dB. Operational sound levels from the EfW CHP Facility at R28, presented in Appendix 7C Operational Noise Assessment Data [AS-010], are predicted to be no greater than 32 dB $L_{Aeq,T}$.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		At the time of completing the assessment, a planning application for the free school had not been submitted. The location of the proposed free school is known and is within the existing school grounds at TCA, which has been assessed. Therefore, the findings of the assessment for TCA are applicable to the free school. On the basis of the information provided in the DCO submission, and the considerations above which are considered a positive indication that there will not be any adverse noise impacts due to construction road traffic or operational noise. There will therefore, not be any significant effects at TCA. Monitoring is not recommended at these school locations, and no additional mitigation is considered to be required. In the assessment, the RMA is referred to as TBAP Unity Academy (which appears to be its former name) and was therefore accounted for in the assessment. On the basis that significant effects are not anticipated at any nearby school site during the construction and operation phases of the Proposed Development, there is no immediate requirement to recommend monitoring to quantify noise impacts or additional mitigation to minimise any adverse noise impacts. If, following detailed design, any significant effects are identified at any nearby school site, then monitoring and additional mitigation may be specified in accordance with the provisions contained in the Construction Environmental Management Plan and the Operational Noise Management Plan, as secured by DCO Requirement 10 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** for the construction phase, and Requirement 19 (Noise Management) for the operational phase.
Noise and Vibration	4.15 The baseline assessment has used noise monitoring data from November 2021 which is within the Covid-19 lockdown period and therefore should not be considered a true representation of the baseline noise levels.	This is not correct. The information below on key dates associated with the easing of lockdown restrictions is from 'Timeline of UK government coronavirus lockdowns and restrictions', from the Institute for Government Analysis.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		"12 April 2021: Non-essential retail, hairdressers, public buildings (e.g. libraries and museums) reopen. Outdoor venues and self contained holiday accommodation reopened." *"19 July 2021: Most legal limits on social contact removed in England, and the final closed sectors of the economy reopened (e.g. nightclubs)."* The commencement of surveying was agreed through stakeholder engagement, as outlined in **Table 7.2 of the ES [APP-034],** pages 7-10 and 7-11, which states: *"The Senior EHO for FDC responded agreeing that baseline surveys may go ahead after 12 April 2021, assuming local activity has returned to normal following the lifting of lockdown restrictions in place to control the spread of coronavirus. They requested that data is provided (traffic and footfall data) demonstrating that local activity has returned to typical levels. ..."* Typical levels of traffic and ambient noise were demonstrated by the discussions presented in Section 4.1 and Section 4.3 of **Appendix 7A Baseline Noise Monitoring Report [AS-010].** Footfall data was not addressed, however it is considered that footfall data may not directly relate to traffic noise levels, which were found to be representative of conditions pre-pandemic.
Noise and Vibration	4.16 The concern is that the proposed development will lead to increased noise levels and exhaust emissions from additional HGVs and associated vehicle movements from the proposed development along the local road network used by the TCA and potentially the Free School. The Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) also proposes measures to reduce construction noise including using quieter plant, programming activities to avoid overlapping with other intensive works. Therefore, the implementation of mitigation measures in the Outline CEMP and their performance will be key to ensuring the noise and exhaust emission levels do	Traffic noise change calculation results provided in **Table 7.15 of the ES [APP-034]** indicate that the predicted increase in traffic noise level on Weasenham Lane during construction is 0.4 dB - this would not be perceptible and is most unlikely to give rise to any adverse impacts. With regard to operational traffic on Weasenham Lane, the Proposed Development results in some net benefit. As described at paragraph 6.5.51 of the ES [APP-034], permitted traffic to the site is through Algores Way from Weasenham Lane. The proposed use would entail operational traffic being removed from this route and routed via access on New Bridge Lane.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	not further impact air quality in and around the TCA and Free School site.	The implementation of the CEMP is secured in the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Planning	Compatibility with surrounding land uses 14.16 Policy 18: Amenity Consideration of the MWLP seeks to protect the amenity of surrounding uses. Although some of the surrounding uses are detailed in Volume 7.5 Design and Access Statement, this provides more of an illustration of character of the local area, and is not a comprehensive land use survey. With the instruction of Land planning Use Class E (Commercial, Business and Service), there is the potential for incompatible uses to be introduced into sites that were historically industrial in nature (B2/B8/B1). Land within Use Class E Commercial may be used for any of the following uses and changing between the uses within Use Class E is not considered to be development and therefore does not require planning permission. Use Class E – Commercial, Business, and Service – Use, or part use, for all or any of the following purposes – a) for the display or retail sale of goods, other than hot food, principally to visiting members of the public, (shops & Post Offices etc.) b) for the sale of food and drink principally to visiting members of the public where consumption of that food and drink is mostly undertaken on the premises, (cafes & restaurants) c) for the provision of the following kinds of services principally to visiting members of the public— (i) financial services, (banks & building societies) (ii) professional services (other than health or medical services), or (estate & employment agencies etc.)	Comment noted. As set out in **the Planning Statement (Vol 7.1) [APP-091],** the proposed EfW CHP Facility Site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Wisbech and in an employment area such that it is in accordance with the broad spatial strategy set out in Policy 4 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP). Allied to this, the proposed EfW CHP Facility Site is also designated as a Waste Management Area (WMA). The Proposed Development is, therefore, considered to be an acceptable use of land from a planning policy perspective. On this basis, there is not considered to be a need to undertake a survey of land uses nor is there an express policy requirement to do so. Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on surrounding land uses and development plan allocations and this is presented in **Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042] of the Environmental Statement (ES).** It concludes that surrounding (existing and proposed) land uses would not be affected significantly by the Proposed Development with mitigation measures in place. These measures include for a **Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 6A Volume 6.4) [APP-072],** a **Construction Noise and Vibration Monitoring Plan (within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** and an **Operational Noise Management Plan (Appendix 7D Volume 6.4) [APP-077].** Updated versions of these management plans have been submitted at Deadline 1. **ES Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) [APP-045]** of the ES also assesses the potential for cumulative effects to arise as a result of the Proposed Development with other developments and allocations, concluding that effects will not be significant. Taking into account the conclusions of the ES, including in respect of air quality, noise and vibration and visual amenity, the Planning Statement

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	(iii) any other services which it is appropriate to provide in a commercial, business or service locality, d) for indoor sport, recreation or fitness, not involving motorised vehicles or firearms, principally to visiting members of the public, e) for the provision of medical or health services, principally to visiting members of the public, except the use of premises attached to the residence of the consultant or practitioner, (Doctors, clinics & health centres, acupuncture clinic etc.) f) for a creche, day nursery or day centre, not including a residential use, principally to visiting members of the public, g) for— (i) an office to carry out any operational or administrative functions, (Offices) (ii) the research and development of products or processes, or (iii) any industrial process, being a use, which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust, or grit. (Light Industrial)	has assessed the Proposed Development against Policy 18 of the MWLP. It concludes that the Proposed Development is in accordance with the policy and would not result in unacceptable adverse effects on amenity. On this basis, it is not considered that the introduction of Use Class E alters the conclusions of the ES and Planning Statement. Indeed, the potential for future neighbouring development (that is not currently planned, proposed or consented) to be affected by the Proposed Development is not possible to accurately predict nor is this an express requirement of Policy 18. It will be for future neighbouring development proposals to consider the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on their development and use (and vice-a-versa). In this regard, the EfW CHP Facility Site is located in a Consultation Area pursuant to Policy 16 of the MWLP. Consultation Areas are buffers around WMAs and other plan designations that are intended to ensure such sites are protected from development that would prejudice operations within the area for which the buffer is identified, or to protect development that would be adversely affected by such operations.
Planning	14.17 The land planning use of most of the units in the immediate area appear to mainly be B2/B8, but some may be considered Use Class E and a local assessment would be required to establish the local land uses. Examples may include the Brewers Decorator Centre, 92 Boleness Rd, PE13 2RB, or Taymor Plumbing Supplies, 2 Algores Way, PE13 2TQ, which could be considered Use Class E. Another incompatible use, may be the Cambian Education	Comment noted. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on surrounding land uses and development plan allocations and this is presented in **Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042] of the Environmental Statement (ES).** It concludes that surrounding (existing and proposed) land uses would not be affected significantly by the Proposed Development with mitigation measures in place.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	Foundation Learning Centre, Unit 3, Anglia Way, PE13 2TY but further more in depth assessments may be required.	On this basis, further assessment is not considered to be necessary.
Planning	14.18 Without a baseline of surrounding land uses, it is difficult to ascertain what the permitted uses are and, if any of the uses listed under Use Class E could be established in close proximity to the proposed development, without the need of planning permission. Furthermore, the implications of potential for interactions between the land uses, is not possible to assess. For example, assessments based on activities currently undertaken near to the site may not remain accurate if there were to be a significant increase in the number of members of public visiting a nearby location (which could be achieved within a Class E land use). In this context the effect of paragraph 187 which sets out the 'Agent of Change' may also be relevant, where significant effects are identified.	Comment noted. The potential for future neighbouring development (that is not currently planned, proposed or consented) to be affected by the Proposed Development is not possible to accurately predict. It will be for future neighbouring development proposals to consider the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on their development and use (and vice-a-versa). In this regard, the EfW CHP Facility Site is located in a Consultation Area pursuant to Policy 16 of the MWLP. Consultation Areas are buffers around WMAs and other plan designations that are intended to ensure such sites are protected from development that would prejudice operations within the area for which the buffer is identified, or to protect development that would be adversely affected by such operations.
Planning	14.19 The Council is of the view that it would assist the Examination if the applicant were able to provide: a) A survey of the local area to identify the local land uses and set out the worst-case scenario for the land uses currently permitted. And update any relevant assessments, to reflect how the area could develop within the current permitted uses; or b) An explanation as to the sensitivity of the different uses within Use Class E, and how land use conflict would be resolved if a sensitive activity within Use Class E was established in close proximity to the EfW	Comment noted. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on surrounding land uses and development plan allocations and this is presented in **Chapter 15: Socio economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) of the ES [APP-042].** It concludes that surrounding (existing and proposed) land uses would not be affected significantly by the Proposed Development with mitigation measures in place. These measures include for a **Construction Traffic Management Plan (Appendix 6A Volume 6.4) [APP-072],** a **Construction Noise and Vibration Monitoring Plan (within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** and an **Operational Noise Management Plan (Appendix 7D Volume 6.4) [APP-077].** Updated versions of these management plans have been submitted at Deadline 1. **Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) [APP-045]** of the ES also assesses the potential for cumulative effects to arise as a result of the Proposed Development with other developments and allocations, concluding that effects will not be significant. It is not considered that the introduction of Use Class E alters the

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		conclusions of the ES. Indeed, the potential for future neighbouring development (that is not currently planned, proposed or consented) to be affected by the Proposed Development is not possible to accurately predict. It will be for future neighbouring development proposals to consider the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on their development and use (and vice-a-versa). In this regard, the EfW CHP Facility Site is located in a Consultation Area pursuant to Policy 16 of the MWLP. Consultation Areas are buffers around WMAs and other plan designations that are intended to ensure such sites are protected from development that would prejudice operations within the area for which the buffer is identified, or to protect development that would be adversely affected by such operations. On this basis, a land use survey is not considered to be necessary.
Planning	In 2019, Wisbech Town Council's motion to oppose the Incinerator project met with nearly unanimous support, as did the February 2020 Fenland District Council motion. An original local campaign opposing the Incinerator has since been joined by a second Campaign doing the same thing. Rallies, public meetings and large campaigns have taken place, and many Environmental Groups are opposed to incineration due to the issues already discussed. The local public are overwhelmingly opposed to the building of an Incinerator in Wisbech. The Incinerator proposal is of such a large size that it bypasses the usual Planning route through local Councils and instead will be decided directly at Government level. This means the County Council will be a statutory consultee, but will not be the decision maker in this instance. It is important that local people see that the elected councillors of Cambridgeshire County Council understand the strength of public opinion against the Incinerator and that	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	they are willing to stand up and be counted in the campaign to try and prevent it ever happening.	
General	This Council states that: 1. We do not support the construction of an incinerator in Wisbech. 2. We will use all legal powers and avenues available to us to oppose any plans to build any Incinerators in Wisbech. 3. We will write to the Secretary of State to make clear our opposition to these plans." Following the aforementioned motion considered at the last County Council meeting it is vitally important that the Cambridgeshire residents can see that their elected representatives understand the strength of public opinion against the Incinerator and that they are willing to stand up and be counted in the campaign to try and prevent it ever happening. We hope that you will be able to swiftly provide a response acknowledging our opposition to these plans.	The Members of CCC's position regarding the DCO Application is noted.
General	Appendix 2 – FDC Member's Letter to Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy	The letter confirms the Members of FDC objections to the DCO Application. The justification provided reflects that set out in Appendix 1 of the CCC/FDC Relevant representation and is not repeated in this table.
Socio economic	Fenland District Council (FDC) 11.1 Economic officers at FDC are concerned that no amount of S106 contributions, or commitments to involve apprentices and interns from the local area, would outweigh the economic harm perceived to exist from these proposals; particularly in relation to the local food factories in the surrounding area that employ vast numbers of Wisbech residents and who have confirmed to the Action Group that	As FDC notes, the Applicant is committed to working with the local community to deliver local employment, an approach undertaken at MVV's other UK facilities. These benefits are set out in the **Outline Employment and Skills Strategy (Volume 7.8) [APP-099]** which has been developed in consultation with Norfolk County Council and includes the following proposals: • A waste education programme and support for higher and further education establishments, including STEM support; and • Apprenticeships, Internships and work experience/placements.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	if permission is granted they would need to close, as they would not be able to meet their clients contract requirements. This local business concern is further compounded by the potential negative implications for inward investment in this growth area (which includes the aspirations for more housing to support the business growth) if this proposal is given consent.	• Local employment during construction and operation; and • Support the local supply chain. The final version of the Employment and Skills Strategy is secured by **Requirement 21, Schedule 2, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** This document also explains how the Applicant will work with local supply chains in order to maximise local economic benefits. A key objective for the project is to supply local businesses with low carbon heat and power. This would be provided via the proposed CHP pipeline and it would provide local businesses with a competitively priced alternative to the use of natural gas (in the case of heating). The CHP pipeline could be extended in the future (subject to further consent) to create a network which could supply new business and residential areas. This would be consistent with the way in which MVV operates at many of its European facilities. **Chapter 15 Socio Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042]** concludes that there would be no significant negative effects upon local businesses. There is no methodology to predict the potential indirect effect (positive or negative) upon future inward investment.
Socio economic	11.2 Furthermore, with the potential closure of local food factories, and current reluctance from local businesses to receive the heat / electricity from such a facility, some of the benefits put forward by the applicant may not come to fruition. Indeed on the basis that the surrounding road infrastructure serving the existing industrial estate is not fit for this purpose (which has already been identified in the transport comments and the appropriate mitigation outlined) the significant disruption to existing businesses on the industrial estate should not be underestimated. This is without the implications of being able to attract new businesses to locate to this area as noted above.	The Applicant is confident that local business will see the competitive and environmental advantages of using locally sourced heat and power. Should this not be the case, then the generation of 55MW of renewable electrical energy into the national grid will itself provide much needed electricity at a time when Government is encouraging the reduction in the use of fossil fuels and an increase in renewables for the generation of electricity. **ES Chapter 15 Socio Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042]** concludes that there would be no significant, negative effects upon local businesses as a direct result of the Proposed Development. The Applicant has engaged with the local highway authorities and with National Highways throughout the preparation of the application. The Transport Assessment **(ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6B Transport Assessment Volume 6.4) [APP-033]** confirms that there

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		is sufficient capacity within the local highway network to accommodate the Proposed Development.
Socio economic	11.3 From an economic perspective it is crucial that if permission is granted, then it must first be demonstrated in full that the re-opening of the Wisbech to March rail route is not prejudiced by these proposals and the appropriate mitigation and land sought to deliver this is confirmed at this stage. Without the Wisbech Rail proposals being able to come forward, this would significantly hold back the economic growth of the Wisbech economy, which both FDC and CCC would fundamentally object to."	The Applicant supports the reopening of the disused March to Wisbech Railway and the wider benefits this would bring to the 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. It has designed the Proposed Development such that it will not prejudice the reopening of the disused March to Wisbech Railway. This is illustrated by the way in which the proposed CHP Pipeline has been designed to ensure sufficient room remains to accommodate an operational railway (**ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development, Graphic 3.19. Volume 6.2) [APP-030],** that the Applicant has set aside land within the future EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate a potential future rail unloading area and in the Applicant's commitment to the provision of a road bridge over any future, reopened railway along New Bridge Lane. The Applicant has engaged in regular consultation with Network Rail such that it has secured business clearance for its proposals. The Applicant has also prepared a legal agreement with Network Rail which will require the Applicant to pay for any future bridge or alternative means of rail crossing as agreed by Network Rail.
Socio economic	Connecting Cambridgeshire 11.4 Cambridgeshire County Council's Connecting Cambridgeshire Team have reviewed the plans to place the Grid Connection route along the verge of the A47, and if permission is granted, request that, for all engineering works that go below ground, they are consulted well in advance of the work taking place. This will allow for fibre ducting placement to be scheduled to coincide with the applicant's digging, to maximise 'dig once' opportunities, and utilise the existing trench without causing further disruption to networks. More information will be provided in the Local Impact Report, and the Connecting Cambridgeshire Team will seek to discuss this with the applicant.	The Applicant has no objection to providing advanced notice of its proposals to lay the grid connection cable. It is committed to providing 28 days notice to National Highways in the form of plans (including programmes) and is happy to include Connecting Cambridgeshire within this notification. The Applicant would be happy to discuss this matter further and to provide any commitments which Connecting Cambridgeshire may require. The Applicant's commitment to providing notice to National Highways is contained within the Schedule 11 Part 5, to the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Socio economic	Burning waste often creates less employment opportunities than recycling. Incinerators offer relatively few jobs when compared to recycling. The large footprint of a huge Incinerator could clearly produce more jobs as a regular manufacturing space. Other than at the construction phase, the idea that the Incinerator is a valuable job creator for local people is questionable.	The Proposed Development does not seek to act as a substitute for recycling. The waste used at the facility is that which is left over after recycling; waste that cannot be recycled and known as residual waste. The substantial part of the proposed EfW CHP Facility Site has planning permission as a waste transfer station and it is identified within the current Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the Draft Fenland Local Plan August 2022 as a Waste Management Area. The site is not therefore allocated for 'regular manufacturing space'. **ES Chapter 15 Socio-Economics Tourism Recreation and Land Use, (Volume 6.2) [APP-042]** concludes that whilst direct and indirect employment could be significant at the local and district level during construction, it is likely to not be significant during the operational phase, although the Proposed development could generate approximately 72 direct and indirect jobs at the County level.
Traffic and Transport	3.1 Matters relating to the crossing and use of the former railway line have been considered by the Transport Strategy Team in relation to the aspirations of the Wisbech Area Transport Strategy and the Wisbech Railway project being funded by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. These comments can be found in paragraphs 3.44-3.47. These comments are also made without prejudice to the response provided by the Transport Assessment Team in respect of trip generation and distribution, which may impact upon off-site junction layout/ geometry. In relation to Operational Access Figures 6.18i & 6.18ii, the comments below relate to proposed access infrastructure.	Noted
Traffic and Transport	New Bridge Lane Access 3.2 The principle of widening/ extension of New Bridge Lane is acceptable. However, there is an iteration of the access drawings available which are overlaid with topographic data, and these should be submitted as part of the DCO for consideration. For roads required for DCO works, highway	Subsequent to the receipt of the relevant representation the Applicant updated **Figure 3.19i-iii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** with topographical data overlaid. Highway boundary information had been obtained from the relevant highway authorities prior to the submission of the DCO application. This highway boundary information has now been overlaid on to the **Access and Public Rights of Way Plan (Volume 2.4) [APP-008]** and is clearly included in the

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	boundary information should be sought from the Local Highway Authority (LHA), if it has not already been obtained. Highway boundaries should be marked on Access and Rights of Way (ROW) sheets and clearly included in the legend.	legend. This plan has been discussed subsequently with CCC and is submitted at Deadline 1 as Rev2.
	3.3 Access arrangements to the site/ access to affected premises and properties does not take into account the potential need to turn east from accesses towards the A47, when the aspirations of the South Wisbech Broad Concept Plans are realised and a link is formed to a new roundabout on the A47 (See FDC Broad Concept Plans - Fenland District Council).	**ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6D Stakeholder Consultation (Volume 6.4) [APP-033]** states that the Applicant was informed by National Highways on 4 March 2021 that a new access onto the A47 from New Bridge Lane would not be acceptable.
Traffic and Transport	3.4 Visibility splays should be shown for all properties/ accesses affected by the widening proposals.	Subsequent to the receipt of the relevant representation the Applicant prepared updated drawings to show the relevant visibility splays. These was submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023 for comment. The plans are submitted at Deadline 1 as **ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development Figure 3.19 rev2 (Volume 6.3)** and as a new figure within **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6A Outline CTMP Figure 10.1 (Volume 6.4).**
Traffic and Transport	3.5 Proposals only show provision of tactile paving at the junction New Bridge Lane/ Cromwell Road junction, and it is unclear (i) if any greater junction improvements are necessitated as part of the Transport Assessment process, or (ii) whether the existing junction is geometrically adequate to cater for the increased HCV usage.	The conclusions drawn from the **Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) [APP-073]** are that the works proposed to the junction of New Bridge Lane and Cromwell Road are adequate to cater for the additional usage resulting from the Proposed Development. In response to another point raised by CCC in its relevant representation, the Applicant does now propose to include for a signalised Cromwell Road. details of this proposal were submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023 and are included at Deadline 1 as **ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development Figure 3.19 rev2 (Volume 6.3)** and as a new figure within **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6A Outline CTMP Figure 10.1 (Volume 6.4).**
Traffic and Transport	3.6 Tactile paving is shown north of the Salters Way junction crossing south-west to north-east, but not across the Salters Way junction itself.	**Figure 3.19i-iii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** has been updated to show the additional tactile paving across Salters Way junction.
Traffic and Transport	3.7 Street lighting is proposed (in principle), but only shown between the site access and the Salters Way junction. The	**ES Figure 3.19i-ii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** has been updated to show the additional street lighting. The

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	final requirements for street lighting must be approved by Cambridgeshire County Council's street lighting team, and the detail of this will need to be agreed with the County Council during the detailed design stage of the project. Discussions are currently being held with the applicant to ensure the lighting arrangements (street lighting columns, illuminated traffic signs and illuminated solar bollards) are given full consideration and must comply with all requirements detailed in Cambridgeshire County Council's street lighting specification (CCC Street lighting Development Specification, Revision 03 - dated January 2016). Any approvals greater than 2 years old would need to be checked against the current streetlighting standards. This will be covered further in the Local Impact Report, where details of the additional street lighting provision will take account of a number of factors, including CCC's aspirations for climate change/Net Zero and environmental and ecological issues.	details were submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023. The mechanism for agreeing the detailed design is contained within **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6A Outline CTMP Section 10.**
Traffic and Transport	3.8 Officers have been unable to locate access drawings showing AutoTrack of accesses and junctions.	Updated drawings, **ES Figure 3.19i-ii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** showing AutoTrack of accesses and junctions were provided to CCC on 10 January 2023. The drawings are submitted at Deadline 1 as ES Figure 3.19 rev2.
Traffic and Transport	3.9 The existing carriageway of New Bridge Lane is highly unlikely to be of suitable construction for retention and will need to be removed in its entirety or completely reconstructed to the County Council Distributor road specification, particularly beyond the unit adjacent Salters Way.	Noted. The Applicant will reconstruct New Bridge Lane to the necessary road specification. The Applicant's intention is for the specification to be approved by Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) via a Section 278 Agreement. Heads of Terms for the Section 278 Agreement are being negotiated with CCC.
Traffic and Transport	3.10 The proximity of the New Bridge Lane widening to adjacent drains and culverts will require greater clarity and detail in the fullness of time in relation to their proximity to the highway in terms of construction and safety.	Noted. **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013] Requirement 7** requires that the Applicant submits a detailed access plan for approval by the relevant highway authority.
Traffic and Transport	3.11 A reduction in the speed limit to 30mph is appropriate, particularly given the future context of the link through to the	Noted. Additional street lighting has now been proposed. **Figure 3.19 New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [App-049]** has been

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	A47 as part of the Wisbech Broad Concept Plan (BCP). This will require a separate Traffic Regulation Order and will necessitate the implementation of the comprehensive street lighting system linking to Cromwell Road.	updated as Rev2 to show the additional street lighting linking to Cromwell Road. This was submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023 and will be submitted at Deadline 1 as **ES Chapter 3: description of the Proposed Development Figure 3.19 Rev2 (Volume 6.3***).* With regard to the reference to a Traffic Regulation Order, **the Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Article 17 Traffic Regulation Measures provides the necessary powers for the Applicant to undertake such measures providing that they are first provide a minimum of four weeks notice to the relevant highway authority.
Traffic and Transport	Algores Way Access 3.12 The Algores Way linking to the site is not a public highway beyond Britannia Way and, to the best knowledge of the LHA, is owned by FDC. The County Council therefore has no statutory function as in relation to these streets, and any streets created by the DCO therein cannot legally be created as public highway.	Noted. The Applicant is seeking access along that part of Algores Way which is classified as a private street. **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** includes for the Algores Way south of Britannia Way to be adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council.
Traffic and Transport	Volume 3.1 Draft DCO 3.13 The proposed DCO will require review by County Council Managers and legal representatives. However, Article 12 does not provide for certification by the LHA that any alterations to means of access are acceptable. The proposed DCO establishes no timeline or process for the inspection and approval of works affecting or joining the highway, nor does it address the requirement to engage with the LHA during the design process. This is unacceptable to CCC who will, after completion of works, resume its statutory maintenance responsibilities for the affected highways. The LHA request engagement in respect of this matter. Protective provisions requested and could be expanded to include a sub-clause relating to any new or altered means of access that are proposed to connect to the public highway as mentioned in Article 12, covering the right of the LHA to review the design, construction and completion of such	**Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013] Requirement 7** requires that the Applicant submits a detailed access plan to the relevant highway authority before any new or temporary means of access can be constructed or any alteration of any existing means of access can be carried out. Engagement and approval from the LHA must take place before the powers in Article 12 can be exercised by the Applicant. Therefore, there is no need for protective provisions to deal with this point. This Article is similar to Article 12 of the Riverside Energy Park Order 2020 and Article 12 of the South Humber Bank Energy Centre Order 2021. Discussions are ongoing with Cambridgeshire County Council regarding Heads of Terms for a S278 Agreement to cover the other points raised relating to certification of completed works, commuted sums and maintenance.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	works, prior to certification that such works are acceptable and the institution of a maintenance period, broadly in the sequence below. (i) Right of the LHA to review and comment upon detailed design of works affecting the road network, (ii) the right to observe and make representation to the undertaker regarding ongoing works that affect the highway, (iii) the ability of the LHA to inspect and approve the completed works within the highway, (iv) the requirement of the undertaker to obtain certification from the LHA that works are satisfactory and can be adopted, (v) the provision of a 'maintenance period' of a minimum of 12 months to follow adoption, during which time the LHA can require the undertaker to resolve any defects in the construction of newly completed works. Further, the payment of reasonable fees, commitment to any commuted sums, commitment to undertake condition/ dilapidation surveys of highways, and any necessary mitigation requirements, such as a bridge to avoid prejudicing the reopening of Wisbech rail discussed further in paragraphs 3.44-3.47 are to be discussed and agreed.	
Traffic and Transport	3.14 Consents and approvals (S278 works and highway dedications), payment of reasonable fees, commitment to commuted sums, commitment to undertake condition/ dilapidation surveys of highways, are to be discussed and agreed. Detailed discussions with the	Discussions are ongoing with Cambridgeshire County Council regarding Heads of Terms for a S278 Agreement to cover the other points raised relating to certification of completed works, communted sums and maintenance.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	County's Street Works and Permitting Team will also need to take place to understand the status of the statutory undertaker following the discharge of the DCO and who would own the longitudinal apparatus. Where apparatus is placed in the public highway that will not be adopted by a statutory undertaker (private apparatus), agreement on how the apparatus is made identifiable to other third party works promoters and where it is registered will be required. Notwithstanding that the cable connection along the A47 verge will be commented on by National Highways (NH), longitudinal non-passive private apparatus in the highway would be an unacceptable risk to the LHA.	
Traffic and Transport	3.15 CCC agree with Norfolk colleagues that the existence of private longitudinal apparatus in the public highway represents a safety risk to operatives working in the public highway as there is no effective mechanism for those opening the road to be notified of its existence. Statutory Undertakers and others with powers to open the road cannot know either by visual inspection or by administrative search that such apparatus exists and may damage it, which for power cables is clearly dangerous. Accordingly, the underground cable and apparatus will need to be adopted by a statutory undertaker. The applicants' position is they are seeking to be classed as a Statutory undertaker as part of their DCO. However, if the Department for Transport (DfT) do not recognise the applicant as a statutory undertaker and/or refuse to grant "state codes", the applicant will not be able to connect their EfW facility to the power grid at the Walsoken Substation. Accordingly, the applicants progress at their own risk as there is no right of appeal.	The Applicant has the powers to carry out the street works under **Article 10 of the Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. As set out in Article 10(2), the power is a statutory right for the purposes of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Once the DCO has been granted, the Applicant will register for a Street Works Act (SWA) Code as an organisation that has the power to undertake works in a street. The SWA Codes are administered by GeoPlace on behalf of the Department for Transport. The Applicant is not aware of any reasons why it would not be granted a SWA Code as it will be able to demonstrate that it has the necessary powers once the DCO is granted.
Traffic and Transport	Appendix 6A Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan 3.16 Comments on the Outline Construction Management Plan will be included in the relevant representation once the	It is noted that CCC/FDC may provide comments on the **Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** at a later stage during the Examination.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	Transport Assessment Team has confirmed their acceptance of trip generation and distribution.	
Traffic and Transport	3.17 Detailed Combined Heat and Power (CHP) accesses/ connection points to CHP1, CHP2 to Weasenham Lane are required.	Noted. **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013] Requirement 7** requires that the Applicant submits a detailed access plan for all temporary and permanent accesses for approval by the relevant highway authority.
Traffic and Transport	Volume 7.15 Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan 3.18 Further comment on the above will be included once the Transport Assessment Team confirm acceptance of trip generation and distribution.	It is noted that CCC/FDC may provide comments on the Outline **OTMP (Volume 7.15) [APP-106]** at a later stage during the Examination.
	Cambridgeshire County Council Highway Asset Information 3.19 The Draft DCO, Article 11 (Power to alter layout, etc., of streets) does not make provision for certification by the LHA that any alterations to the highway are acceptable, despite the extensive proposed alterations included in Schedule 4 of the draft DCO. The draft DCO establishes no timeline or process for the inspection and approval of works affecting the highway, nor does it address the requirement to engage with the LHA during the design process. This is unacceptable to CCC who will, after completion of works, resume its statutory maintenance responsibilities for the affected highways.	The proposed alterations to New Bridge Lane and Algores Way are set out in **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) Rev2** submitted for Deadline 1. The final design will be submitted to and approved by CCC. Discussions are ongoing with CCC regarding Heads of Terms for a S278 Agreement to cover the other points raised relating to certification of completed works, commuted sums and maintenance.
Traffic and Transport	3.20 The draft DCO should be amended to include protective provisions for the LHA at various points in the delivery of works that affect the public highway network. Indicatively, the LHA would require protections of the nature outlined below (although engagement with the LHA should be undertaken to define a comprehensive list). (i) Right of the LHA to review and comment upon detailed design of works affecting the road network, (ii) the right to observe and make representation to the undertaker regarding ongoing works that affect the highway, (iii) the ability of the LHA to inspect	As set out above these matters will be addressed in **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) Rev2** submitted for Deadline 1 and the S278 Agreement that is currently under discussion.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	the completed works within the highway, (iv) the requirement of the undertaker to obtain certification from the LHA that works are satisfactory and can be adopted; (v) the provision of a 'maintenance period' of a minimum of 12 months to follow adoption, during which time the LHA can require the undertaker to resolve any defects in the construction of newly completed works.	
Traffic and Transport	3.21 Article 12 Construction and maintenance of new or altered means of access, does not make provision for certification by the LHA that any alterations to means of access are acceptable. It establishes no timeline or process for the inspection and approval of works affecting or joining the highway, nor does it address the requirement to engage with the LHA during the design process. This is unacceptable to CCC who will, after completion of works, resume its statutory maintenance responsibilities for the affected highways. CCC would request engagement from the applicant in respect of this matter. Protective provisions requested as part of paragraph 3.20 above could be expanded to include a subclause relating to any new or altered means of access that are proposed to connect to the public highway as mentioned in article 12, covering the right of the LHA to review the design, construction and completion of such works, prior to certification that such works are acceptable and the institution of a maintenance period, broadly in the sequence requested to help resolve the concerns raised at paragraph 3.19 above.	**Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 7 requires that the Applicant submits a detailed access plan to the relevant highway authority before any new or temporary means of access can be constructed or any alteration of any existing means of access can be carried out. Discussions are ongoing with CCC regarding Heads of Terms for a S278 Agreement to cover the other points raised relating to certification of completed works, communted sums and maintenance.
	3.22 Article 13 - Temporary prohibition or restriction of use of streets and public rights of way, does not impose any requirement on the undertaker to consult with the LHA, or gain its approval, prior to temporarily closing or diverting any highways. Such works could impact the adjoining public highway network for which CCC is both the local highway authority and the street authority. It would be reasonable for the undertaker to consider this impact in collaboration with CCC. CCC would request amendment of Article 13 to	These concerns have been addressed in amendments to **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) Rev 2** submitted for Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	include a requirement on the undertaker to consult with the LHA prior to enacting any temporary closures of highways, and to observe any reasonable requests made by the LHA in respect of the timing of such closures.	
Traffic and Transport	3.23 Schedule 6, Part 1, Those parts of the access to be maintained at the public expense, specifies that new accesses A3, A4 and A5 (as labelled on the Access and Rights of Way Plan sheet number 1 of 4), are to be maintained at public expense. This is unacceptable to CCC as these accesses are not connected to any publicly maintainable highways. Case law following the decision in Kotegaonkar v Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2012) is clear that "a way that can only be accessed by crossing private land… cannot be created as, or continue to exist as, a highway"1. . Therefore, it cannot be considered that highway rights exist in those areas, and they cannot be adopted by the LHA as highway maintainable at public expense.	The Applicant had initially understood that CCC was intending to adopt this section of Algores Way, and powers had been included in the draft DCO to facilitate this process. The Applicant now understands that this is not the intention (although written confirmation on this point is awaited from CCC). Once confirmed, the Applicant will amend the draft DCO so that these access points are maintained by the relevant street authority.
Traffic and Transport	3.24 It is unclear whether parcel A3 is connected to the publicly maintainable section of Algores Way, but parcels A4 and A5 are, according to CCC's legal highway records, remote from any other public highway. This serves to emphasise the importance of showing the extent of the public highway on the Access and Rights of Way plans, as raised below.	The **Access and Public Rights of Way Plan (Volume 2.4)** has been amended in order to address the comment made and will be submitted as Rev2 at Deadline 1.
Traffic and Transport	The draft Access and Rights of Way Plans 3.25 Highway boundaries. A number of highways that are affected by the draft Order have been identified in the Access and Rights of Way sheets, but the highway boundaries are not shown on the plans. It is important for this to be shown so that the highway authority can understand the extent of the highway that will be affected by the proposed works. As an example, only part of Algores	The **Access and Public Rights of Way Plan (Volume 2.4)** has been amended in order to address the comment made and submitted to CCC for comment and final agreement.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	Way forms part of the highway maintainable at public expense, but no indication of this is given on the Access and Rights of Way Sheets.	
Traffic and Transport	3.26 It is recommended that, if not already done, the applicant seeks to obtain highway boundary information from the LHA, for the roads affected by the proposed works. Highway boundaries then to be marked on a new iteration of the Access and Rights of Way plans, and clearly detailed in the associated legends.	Highway boundary information had been obtained from the relevant highway authorities prior to the submission of the application. For the avoidance of doubt this has now been added to an updated **Access and Public Rights of Way Plan (Volume 2.4)** which is submitted at Deadline 1 as Rev2.
Traffic and Transport	Highway status 3.27 The Access and Rights of Way plans use a number of different colours to indicate different named roads within the Wisbech urban area. While the use of different colours is helpful in identifying different named roads, it is a distraction from the more important details shown on the plan. The name of a highway has no bearing on its status and so it is considered unnecessary to have multiple different coloured roads on the same plan.	An updated **Access and Public Rights of Way Plan (Volume 2.4)** has been prepared to respond to the comment made. This is submitted at Deadline 1 as Rev2.
Traffic and Transport	3.28 Furthermore, it is inadequate to refer to roads by name only. Their legal status (i.e. whether or not they form part of the public highway) also needs to be indicated on the Access and Right of Way plans. This is vital to define the assets for which the LHA is responsible and thus where it may or may not need to make representations to the applicant/undertaker or at a possible public inquiry. For this reason, the plans should also make distinction between highways that are maintained by the LHA, and those that are the responsibility of NH (i.e. trunk roads). CCC would request that colours for different named roads are removed from the Access and Rights of Way plans, unless the colours are strictly necessary for reference to the draft DCO schedules or other wording. Failing this, the colours of the roads should be muted so as not to distract from the other	An updated **Access and Public Rights of Way Plan (Volume 2.4)** has been prepared to respond to the comment made. This is submitted at deadline 1 as Rev2.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	information shown on the map sheets, and if the colours are to remain, clarity should be provided that the colour of a given road does not give any indication as to its legal status as a public highway. As noted above, the provision of highway boundaries on the plans would clarify this matter by clearly showing areas that fall within the highway maintainable at public expense.	
Traffic and Transport	Environmental Statement, Chapter 6, Traffic and Transport, Appendix 6A. 3.29 CCC requires confirmation that Wisbech Byway 21 and Elm Byway 6 will not be used as a haul road, as was originally proposed.	Wisbech Byway 21 and Elm Byway 6 run along Halfpenny Lane north and south of the A47. Neither byway will be used by construction traffic with all necessary construction access taken from the A47 eastbound carriageway.
Traffic and Transport	Design and Access Statement 3.30 The Design & Access Statement makes no reference to the byways 266/21 and 72/6 at all. This is a problem; the applicant needs to demonstrate that impact on the byway and the byway users has been fully considered, since the A47 provides the connectivity between the two byways. e.g. closure during construction, or provision of safe crossing points, (noting that an Equality Impact Assessment has been prepared by the Council). However, if this has not been considered by the applicant, then they will need to reassess, and provide details of the impact to the LHA for consideration. If it has been considered, CCC requests sight of the assessment of the impact of the works on the aforementioned byways.	The potential for impacts upon users of local public rights of way, including byways 266/21 and 72/6 has been considered within **ES Chapter 15 Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use (Volume 6.2) [APP-042**]. Paragraph 15.9.64 notes that the byway/footpath is effectively severed by the A47 and that works to install the grid connection will be undertaken at night, at a time when the footpath either side of the A47 is unlikely to be in use. The same approach to the mitigation of construction effects upon these byways is also recorded with **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6A Outline CTMP (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** Table 6A.4 Issues and Constraints Management.
Traffic and Transport	Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team 3.31 The following is a summary of the Transport modelling related comments.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	3.32 The baseline surveys were undertaken in October 2021 which was agreed by both Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and National Highways (NH). Whilst certain restrictions/advisory working practices were still in place due to the Covid 19 pandemic this would not have affected traffic patterns in this part of the County to a large extent. Wisbech and surrounding areas have a predominantly manufacturing/agricultural economy and working from home would not have been practical.	
Traffic and Transport	3.33 The base traffic surveys have been used to model two junctions, these being: · A47/Cromwell Road / Redmoor Lane roundabout and, · Cromwell Road / New Bridge Lane crossroads The extent of this junction modelling had been previously agreed with CCC and NH and accords with both National and Local Authority (CCC) Requirements.	Comment noted.
Traffic and Transport	3.34 The base models have been validated against Queue length surveys as required by both CCC and NH. The models validate well against the observed situation and are considered acceptable.	Comment noted.
Traffic and Transport	3.35 Future year modelling has been carried out, again in accordance with the requirements of CCC and NH. Local growth factors (from TEMPro) have been used to give a future year traffic flow baseline. In addition, committed developments in the vicinity of the site have been added to give a robust forecast of the future year base.	Comment noted.
Traffic and Transport	3.36 The forecast flows in the Transport Assessment have been agreed by both CCC and NH as being a robust case. The HGV traffic will enter and exit the site via New Bridge Lane only. Some light vehicles (cars and vans) may also use this route with some coming into the site via Algores Way.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Traffic and Transport	3.37 Future year modelling has been undertaken to compare the 'base' future year traffic situation with the addition of the proposal's traffic.	Comment noted.
Traffic and Transport	3.38 The modelling shows that the addition of the proposal's traffic will not cause any issues in terms of capacity at the A47 / Cromwell Road / Redmoor Lane roundabout. All arms of the roundabout will operate below effective capacity i.e. a ratio of flow to capacity (RFC) of less than 0.85. It should be noted that as this junction is on the A47 trunk road network, NH would need to agree the results of the modelling and their conclusions in respect of this roundabout.	Noted. The Applicant has discussed the scope of the Transport Assessment with National Highways. Record of the pre-application consultation held with National Highways is recorded within **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6D Stakeholder Consultation (Volume 6.4) [APP-075].** It records that national Highways agreed the Applicant's traffic generation and distribution methodology at a meeting in November 2021.
Traffic and Transport	3.39 The modelling results show that the addition of the proposal's traffic will not cause any issues in terms of capacity at the Cromwell Road / New Bridge Lane roundabout, the Highway Authority do not agree with this. The Transport Assessment Team are of the view that the increase in slow moving Right Turning HGV vehicles could potentially cause a more localised capacity and safety issue at the junction, and one which standard junction modelling (such as has been used) cannot accurately predict.	Noted. Subsequent to the receipt of relevant representations the Applicant has met with CCC. The Applicant remains of the view that the modelling demonstrates that there is capacity at the junction and noted that CCC's concerns related more to the potential safety issues for vehicles turning into and out of New Bridge Lane. It was therefore agreed that the Applicant would develop a proposal to signalise the junction of Cromwell Road/New Bridge Lane. Details are provided within an updated **ES Figure 3.19i-ii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** which was submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023 and is submitted as a Figure 3.19 Rev2 at Deadline 1.
Traffic and Transport	3.40 Cambridgeshire County Council have previously worked with FDC on the Wisbech Area Transport Strategy (WATS) which set out the interventions required to cater for the growth of Wisbech. One of the identified interventions or 'Schemes' was the signalisation of the Cromwell Road / New Bridge Lane junction.	Noted. Subsequent the receipt of relevant representations the Applicant has met with CCC and agreed to signalise the junction of Cromwell Road/New Bridge Lane. Details are provided within an updated **ES Figure 3.19i-iii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** which was submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023, and which will be submitted as a Rev 2 at Deadline 1.
Traffic and Transport	3.41 The Transport Assessment Team are of the view that as well as the proposed enhancements to New Bridge Lane, the applicant should be required to signalise the Cromwell Road / New Bridge Lane junction as per the proposed WATS scheme. This would reduce the risk of any localised issues including queuing back through the Tesco access junction to the north. Signals at the Cromwell Road/ New Bridge Road	Noted. Subsequent the receipt of relevant representations the Applicant has met with CCC and agreed to signalise the junction of Cromwell Road/New Bridge Lane. Details are provided within an updated **ES Figure 3.19i-ii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** which was submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023, and which will be submitted as a Rev2 at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	junction would need to be linked to the Tesco's signals and possibly other signals along Cromwell Road, this would be subject to further modelling. Technical discussions on the junction design will need to involve the Signals Team within the County Council, and further information will be supplied as part of the Local Impact Report. Any signalised junction provided would be subject to a commuted sum.	
Traffic and Transport	3.42 No assessment has been made of the proposed temporary access via Algores Way, full details on distribution, trips and capacity need to be provided. The following junctions need to be assessed: · Algores Way with Weasenham Lane · Weasenham Lane with Cromwell Road (B198) · Cromwell Road with Sandown Road · Cromwell Road with Cromwell Park (Tesco access) Without any capacity assessment being undertaken it is not known what impact the proposed development will have on the above junctions.	Access via Algores Way will be required for construction and, during operation, for light vehicles only. The Applicant has prepared a technical note which provides information on the number of HGV vehicles which are proposed to use the Algores Way access during construction and compares the numbers with those related to the current use, permitted use of the EfW CHP Facility Site as a waste transfer station and aggregate storage. This technical note was submitted to CCC for comment and is attached as an appendix to this response to this relevant representation. **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6B Transport Assessment Section 7 (Volume 6.4) [APP-073]** records that both CCC and NCC agreed that only junctions predicted to experience an increase in traffic flows above 30 two-way movements would require assessment. The two junctions are Cromwell Road/New Bridge Lane and Cromwell Road/A47/Redmoor Lane.
Traffic and Transport	3.43 Summary - The Transport Assessment Team would have no concerns over the impact of the applicant's development subject to the (already proposed) enhancements to New Bridge Lane and also the signalisation of the Cromwell Road / New Bridge Lane junction.	Noted. The Applicant has agreed to signalise the junction of Cromwell Road/New Bridge Lane. Details of the proposed enhancements to New Bridge Lane, including the signalisation are provided within an updated **ES Figure 3.19i-ii New Bridge Lane Access Proposal (Volume 6.3) Rev2** which was submitted to CCC on 10 January 2023. This is included at Deadline 1.
Traffic and Transport	Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Strategy Team (including Wisbech Area Strategy and Wisbech Rail) 3.44 Strategic Road schemes along the A47 (considered as part of the Wisbech Area Strategy) and future rail opportunities linked to the Wisbech area (with options being developed by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) to deliver this future rail priority	Noted. The Applicant is working with Network Rail and CCC to ensure that suitable agreements are entered into regarding future rail opportunities.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	as part of the original Devolution Deal) will need to be considered by PINS when assessing this DCO application. Both CCC and the CPCA will be seeking the necessary reassurance and appropriate mitigation as part of the Examination process to ensure that these proposals wouldn't be prejudiced moving forward if consent is granted.	
Traffic and Transport	3.45 Whilst we acknowledge that paragraph 6.6.133 in Chapter 6 of the ES states the following, if consent is to be granted, both CCC and the CPCA would require the applicant to not only provide funding to deliver this infrastructure, but also provide commuted sums for the ongoing maintenance that would fall to the County Council, in addition to the land that is referenced in paragraph 6.6.134: *'The construction of a railway bridge does not form part of the Proposed Development. This alternative to the crossing of the disused March to Wisbech Railway by a reopened New Bridge Lane has been accommodated to provide key Stakeholders with the confidence that the Proposed Development will not compromise their proposals and that sufficient land within the site of the Proposed Development has been set aside to enable the construction of a new railway bridge should a bridge be considered by Network Rail to be the most appropriate means of crossing the reopened railway'.*	The Applicant is in regular discussion with Network Rail with regard to the necessary measures and legal safeguards which need to be in place to ensure that the Proposed Development does not compromise the reopening of the disused March to Wisbech Railway. In addition, the Applicant is discussing heads of terms with CCC to ensure that its requirements are met in relation to a future reopening of the railway.
Traffic and Transport	3.46 The details of the March to Wisbech link are not yet finalised, and the nature of the solution for the New Bridge Lane Crossing is not currently known. The commitments in 6.6.133 in relation to a bridge will therefore also need to provide sufficient flexibility to apply to any crossing form identified by either Network Rail, and / or by the CPCA and CCC in the event that the final solution changes. Without this guarantee, we cannot be reassured that the proposals would	The Applicant has discussed future possible proposals to reopen the disused March to Wisbech Railway with network Rail such that it has secured business clearance. Network Rail requires the Applicant to provide a legal commitment to fund the works required to maintain a road crossing of a reopened railway. The Applicant has agreed to this and in addition, has set aside land within the EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate works which may be necessary to provide a road bridge, should this be the necessary access solution. The area of land is shown

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	not prejudice the reopening of the disused Wisbech Rail for sustainable travel.	as a rail embankment reservation area on **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed development Figure 3.19ii (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]**.
Traffic and Transport	3.47 Discussions on the design detail and legal obligations to deliver this strategic infrastructure in line with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) will need to be undertaken with the applicant, to ensure that further information can be provided in the Local Impact Report.	The Applicant is discussing the legal mechanism by which the proposed access improvements will be secured with CCC with a view to agreeing heads and terms. Progress towards agreement will be reported to the ExA with the submission of the Statement of Common Ground.
Traffic and Transport	Cambridgeshire County Council Education Capital comments and wider educational concerns raised in relation to the Cambian Education Foundation Learning Centre (CEFLC) and the Riverside Meadows Academy (RMA) by Fenland District Council (FDC). 3.48 Thomas Clarkson Academy (TCA) provides secondary education to around 1,200 pupils aged 11-16 and a further 270 pupils aged 17-18. The TCA is situated off Corporation Road, Wisbech approximately 750 metres from the northern boundary of the application site. The application site is approximately 1km from the nearest school building on the TCA site and the southern boundary of school is defined by a row of trees. There is an aspiration, by the Department for Education, to build a new Free School for 600 pupils on part of TCA campus, to the southwest of the main school buildings.	Comment noted.
Traffic and Transport	3.49 The application site is proposed to be serviced by five key routes – all five routes would be via New Bridge Lane. Table 6.16 on 6-53 contains a schedule of the type of vehicles that will be used and the percentage that will use each route. Route 1 (New Bridge Lane – B198 Cromwell Road (South), A47 (West), A1 (M)) will accommodate most of the vehicle's movements (60%) particularly from HGVs. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) contains strategies and measures to mitigate the impact from associated traffic movements on the local network	**Appendix 6A Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **Outline CTMP** 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. The final CTMP is secured by **Requirement 12, Schedule 2, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** The routing restrictions will prevent HGVs from passing by the Thomas Clarkson Academy during both construction and operational phases and the measures to monitor and control these

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	during construction and during operational phases of the development. The proposal is anticipated to generate 362 number vehicle movements per day during the operational phase (78 staff and light vehicles, and 284 HGVs). This is a significant amount of additional traffic for the local road network to accommodate. There is no reference or acknowledgement in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement of The TCA which is located on the main road into the commercial estate where the application site is located.	restrictions are also set out with the Outline CTMP and **Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (Volume 7.15) [APP-106]**.
Traffic and Transport	3.50 Whilst the proposal is to create a new access from New Bridge Lane, a significant amount of the non-HGV traffic will be using the existing road network passing the TCA site and also in close proximity to the Cambian Education Foundation Learning Centre (CEFLC) and the Riverside Meadows Academy (RMA) school locations. Therefore this will potentially have an impact on all these schools, particularly during peak times (drop off and pick up times) and to not acknowledge the location of these schools is of concern.	The current approved use of the EfW CHP Facility Site is as a waste transfer station and for aggregate storage. Presently the WTS has a permit to handle up to 75,000 tonnes per year. This is estimated to generate up to 44 two-way HGV movements with the aggregate sales a fourth 4 HGV and 10 LGV two -way movements respectively. During the peak construction months the EfW CHP facility will generate a maximum of 12 additional two-way movements but for 33 of the 36 construction months the number of HGV vehicles would be less than that which could currently operate from the site. Once operational there will be no HGV movements to the site along Algores Way and as a consequence past the school locations. The Applicant has prepared the following documents to manage the movement of construction and operational vehicles: • **Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for Construction Staff Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 10, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** • **Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) – secured by Requirement 11, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • **Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) including route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. – secured by Requirement 12, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** **and** • **Operational Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 15, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** With the above controls in place it can be concluded that there will be no HGV movements on the road network passing the TCA, and the CEFLC sited on South Brink. HGV movements past the RMA 2 Algores Way will be higher for two out of the 36 month construction period than that currently permitted to use the existing site subject to the proposed EfW CHP Facility and for the remaining months

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		will be less. During operation there will be no HGV movements along Algores Way other than if local refuse vehicles serving the town of Wisbech are contracted to the facility.
Traffic and Transport	3.51 Whilst the HGVs movements during the construction and operation stages of the proposed development will be routed via New Bridge Lane, this does not include the contractor, staff, visitor, and other associated traffic that would approach the site from the north via Algores Way. There are therefore concerns that need to be considered further in respect of traffic movement associated with the construction and operational stages. The potential direct and indirect effects of traffic movement, including noise and air quality is proposed to be dealt with by mitigation measures. It is of concern that there is a significant amount of reliance of the mitigation measures being robustly and properly installed and followed.	Detailed traffic generation, distribution and modelling has been undertaken as part of the submission of the Application which includes contractors, staff, visitors and other associated traffic. 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), [APP-033]** accompanied by **Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073]**. 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 indirect effects arising from traffic such as noise and air quality have been assessed within **ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** and **ES Chapter 8 Air Quality (Volume 6.2) [APP-035].** Mitigation are either embedded into the Proposed Development or secured by DCO requirement.
Traffic and Transport	Wisbech Roads will be heavily affected. An Incinerator of the size proposed is likely to create hundreds of additional large lorry journeys daily creating significant additional congestion and wear and tear on already busy roads.	Detailed traffic generation, distribution and modelling has been undertaken as part of the submission of the DCO. 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), [APP-033]** accompanied by **Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073].** 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 and concludes that the Proposed development would not have a significant effect upon congestion. **Appendix 6A Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** sets out the Applicant's proposals for highway condition surveys and restoration.
Traffic and Transport	Wisbech Rail is under threat. Wisbech's long held hope to re-open its rail line has been championed by the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, the local MP and all	The Applicant has discussed future possible proposals to reopen the disused March to Wisbech Railway with Network Rail such that it has secured business clearance. Network Rail requires the Applicant to

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	local Councils. Millions of pounds have been invested to get to the current point. The proposed location of the Incinerator limits the potential options for a new rail station and may cut off part of the potential route it could take.	provide a legal commitment to fund the works required to maintain a road crossing of a reopened railway. The Applicant has agreed to this and in addition, has set aside land within the EfW CHP Facility Site to accommodate works which may be necessary to provide a road bridge, should this be the necessary access solution. The area of land is shown as a rail embankment reservation area on **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed development Figure 3.19ii (Volume 6.3) [APP-049].**
Waste Need	Schedule 2 - Additional Requirement Requested (Priority for the management of local waste and wider catchment restriction) 14.26 The Council is concerned that there is a possibility that the operator could, through reasonable commercial contractual arrangements, find the facility receiving waste from locations further afield than the Host Authority areas and, when a more local contract arises, the operator may be unable to accept it owing to prior commitments. The Council would be keen to see a requirement that addresses the following: 1. Priority for the treatment of waste within the host Planning Authorities area, followed by those areas nearest to the facility, before seeking waste from those more distant. The exact mechanism for this to be the subject of discussion during this Examination. 2. A wider catchment restriction to prevent the importation of waste over unreasonable distances, again to be subject to discussion during the Examination. This will aid in demonstrating the proximity principle is being applied.	As outlined in the stand-alone Technical Note 'Response to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations' **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)** - the EfW CHP Facility has a design R1 value of 0.81 (0.90 with application of climate change correction factor based on regional heating degree day analysis) at design load conditions (DLC) without the export of heat, ensuring that the installation can be classed as an energy recovery operation irrespective of the level of heat export. A stand-alone Technical Note on responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment representations provides a CHP-R assessment and details of the R1 calculation. Operational data will be collected during commissioning and each subsequent year, with a re-assessment of the R1 calculation made to ensure the EfW CHP Facility does/can continue to achieve R1 status.
	Incinerators can be wasteful. They can burn much of what is otherwise recyclable and their demand for fuel can sometimes result in a reduction in recycling due to their need to bid for more and more waste at a specific calorific value to feed the 24 hour combustion process. This means that it is possible for incineration to lead to a reduction in recycling and can discourage efforts to preserve resources. This is	The focus of the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** is solely 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. Additionally, (and importantly), the WFAA only considers the need

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	contrary to the waste hierarchy that seeks to avoid the production of waste in the first instance, followed by re-use and recycling ahead of any disposal methods.	for the Proposed Development 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.
Waste Need and Policy	14.1 The proposal is for an Energy from Waste Facility which will be able to manage 625kt of non-hazardous combustible waste to be located at Algores Way, Wisbech. It will produce 60MWe (of which 6MWe will be consumed by the plant) of electrical power, and 55 MWth of available steam for export. The minimum amount of waste to produce that power does not appear to be stated within the documentation. The study area for the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment [APP-094] is based on two-hour drive time. This encompasses the entirety of Cambridgeshire, Peterborough, and Rutland. It partially covers Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire (as of 1 April 2021, North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire), Bedford, Central Bedford, Hertfordshire, Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk. A map showing the extent can be found on page 22 of the APP-094.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste Need and Policy	14.2 Existing capacity for recovery in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) Area is currently limited. The MWLP (2016 to 2036) Waste Needs Assessment (2019) (WNA19) sets out that in 2017 537kt (kilo-tonnes) of waste was disposed to non-hazardous landfill (including stable non-reactive hazardous waste (SNRHW), and it is forecast that this will rise to 602ktpa (kilo-tonnes per annum) in 2021 before declining to 476ktpa by 2036. This is set out in Table ES1 of the WNA19 and expressed as a total need for non-hazardous landfill in the second table of Policy 3: Waste Management Needs of the MWLP. Of that waste, approximately 114ktpa is local authority collected waste, which is already subject to contract, an allowance between 79ktpa in 2015, declining to	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	nil by 2026 has been made for London's waste, and the remainder is commercial and industrial waste. The Council acknowledge that is likely that a significant proportion of the waste identified above could be recovered using thermal treatment.	
Waste Need and Policy	14.3 This response focuses on three areas of particular concern, these are: a query regarding the facility achieving R1 Status; compliance with Policies 3 and 4 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) (MWLP) / Waste Availability and effect on Minerals and Waste Local Plans; Compatibility with surrounding land uses (with particular reference to Use Class E). A fourth topic relating to the Draft Development Control Order text follows. These and other topics will be further developed within the Local Impact Report.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste Need and Policy	A query regarding the facility achieving R1 Status 14.4 Paragraph 2.2.5 of the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment [APP-094] states that for energy generation to be considered as waste treatment (rather than disposal) it must achieve a minimum level of energy recovery efficiency, as specified in the revised Waste Framework Directive (rWFD). There is a footnote to this paragraph stating that the Proposed Development will be designed to meet the relevant energy recovery co-efficient (i.e. R1 of 0.65). However, the Council has been unable to identify the documentation detailing how this will be achieved and if it requires both heat and power recovery to be operating to achieve the required energy recovery co-efficient. If the Proposed Development cannot achieve the required level of energy recovery efficiency it will be regarded as a waste disposal operation under the rWFD, and not a recovery operation. The Council requests the applicant provide further detail so that there is clarity on this issue, and it may inform the Council's Local Impact Report.	As outlined in the stand-alone Technical Note 'Response to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations' **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)** - the EfW CHP Facility has a design R1 value of 0.81 (0.90 with application of climate change correction factor based on regional heating degree day analysis) at design load conditions (DLC) without the export of heat, ensuring that the installation can be classed as an energy recovery operation irrespective of the level of heat export. A stand-alone Technical Note on responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment representations provides a CHP-R assessment and details of the R1 calculation. Operational data will be collected during commissioning and each subsequent year, with a re-assessment of the R1 calculation made to ensure the EfW CHP Facility does/can continue to achieve R1 status.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste Need and Policy	Compliance with Policies 3 and 4 of the MWLP / Waste Availability and effect on Minerals and Waste Local Plans 14.5 As the proposal is for an energy facility, the framing of the waste need is as if there is an adequate feedstock of waste for the facility. To demonstrate this the applicant has submitted a Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) [APP-094]. This document considers both waste arisings within the study area designated within the WFAA [APP-094], existing capacity of energy recovery facilities within the study area and within England. It does not appear to consider other forms of recovery capacity.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste Need and Policy	14.6 Paragraph 4.1.5 of National Policy Statement EN-1, relating to the delivery of energy infrastructure, states that Development Plan Documents, (such as Minerals and Waste Local Plans) may be both important and relevant considerations. Policy 3: Waste Management Needs of the MWLP sets out that Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council seek to achieve net self-sufficiency in respect of waste management provision, the policy goes on to set out the capacity gap that the Plan seeks to meet in a table. The information within this table is based on the WNA2019 and it, and the supporting text demonstrate that for the Plan Period (2021 – 2036), the Plan Area is net self-sufficient in respect of Local Authority Collected (also known as Municipal) Waste (LACW), Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste, and Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste (CDEW); albeit relying on the disposal of some waste to landfill. The Policy initially presents the situation without the PREL Energy Park / Peterborough Green Energy Project (PGEL) being built, with PGELs capacity reflected in brackets underneath the relevant capacity figures, under Other Recovery – Treatment and energy recovery processes etc. Policy 3 goes onto state that: …The net capacity figures in the table above are not ceilings	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	for recycling, treatment or recovery of waste. As such, proposals will, in principle (and provided they are in accordance with Policy 4: Providing for Waste Management), be supported if any of the following scenarios apply: … (c) it moves waste capacity already identified in the above table up the waste hierarchy.	
Waste Need and Policy	14.7 The text in Policy 3 criteria (c) refers to moving waste capacity identified in the table up the waste hierarchy. This can be interpreted as either displacing existing capacity, for example, a recovery facility becomes a recycling facility with the same capacity; or, that the waste managed by the facilities that provides that capacity is treated higher up the waste hierarchy than presented in that table, which would be more in keeping with the National Planning Policy for Waste. The Council uses the second interpretation, this also reflects national policy. And this is also reflected in paragraph 3.39 which states that: …the Councils are supportive, in principle, of proposals to move waste as high up the hierarchy as possible to ensure that opportunities to move as much waste away from landfill can be achieved over the plan period. In this context, the support of criterion (c) is dependent on moving waste that would otherwise be disposed of further up the waste hierarchy, likewise criteria (a) required the development to: "… assist in closing a gap identified in the table, provided such a gap has not already been demonstrably closed…"	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste Need and Policy	14.8 Consideration of these criteria is complicated by the proposed PGEL which is a 595ktpa energy recovery facility that, if constructed, would result in the Plan Area being able to recover that waste. Planning permission has been granted and although work has been done on site which constitutes implementation of the permission, the bulk of construction has not commenced. There is a condition attached to the permission (condition 28) for PGEL which states that a minimum of 80% of the feedstock must originate from (a) an area within 32km radius of the site; or (b) an area within the administrative boundary of Peterborough; or (c) an area within the administrative boundary of Cambridgeshire. PGEL is referred to as Storeys Bar Road, Fengate, Peterborough in Appendix C of the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (page unnumbered) and is included in the total of consented and not built capacity within the study area.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste Need and Policy	14.9 If the PGEL project were to be abandoned, then the applicant's proposals could foreseeably meet criteria (c) of Policy 3, and potentially contribute to criteria (a). The applicant's documentation (WFAA [APP-094] Page 36 Table 4.4) identifies 236,031 tonnes of suitable waste originating from within Cambridgeshire. The Council has not yet reviewed the exact content of this figure, but assuming that this is material that cannot be treated further up the waste hierarchy, this would still result in a significant overprovision of recovery capacity, well beyond the net self-sufficiency provided for within the MWLP, and would require the importation of waste from surrounding areas to the value of at least 390,000 tonnes (or 350,000 allowing for Peterborough). These figures do include LACW (Municipal) waste, as well as C&I waste, both of which may be subject to existing contracts of various lengths. The Council will further expand on the potential sources of waste and the distances involved in transporting this waste in the LIR.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste Need and Policy	14.10 The proposed facility is envisioned to be of a regional scale ,sourcing waste from the East of England and the East Midlands. For any waste facility, Policy 1 of the MWLP: Sustainable Development and Climate Change, is a key consideration. Given the scale of this facility, and the potential impact of moving the waste involved, Policy 1, Section 4.8 Climate Change of NPS EN-1 and NPPF paragraphs 153 – 158 (Planning for climate change), should all be key considerations in any decision. This will be expanded on in the LIR.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
	14.11 The support of Policy 3 is contingent of being in accordance with Policy 4: Providing for Waste Management, which is comprised of two elements, the first requires the movement of waste up as far up the waste hierarchy of possible, and the second sets out the criteria for suitable locations for waste facilities, it states. *"In line with Objective 2 of this Plan, the Councils aim to actively encourage, and will in principle support the sustainable management of waste, which includes encouraging waste to move as far up the waste hierarchy as possible, whilst also ensuring net self-sufficiency over the Plan area. In order to ensure this aim can bemet, waste management proposals must demonstrably contribute towards sustainable waste management, by moving waste up the waste hierarchy; and proposals for disposal must demonstrate that the waste has been pre-treated and cannot practicably be recycled. Proposals which do not comply with this spatial strategy for waste management development must also demonstrate the quantitative need for the development."* In this context, the applicant is presenting this development as a power station that requires waste for fuel, and they have sought to demonstrate that there is adequate fuel available. However, they have not addressed the requirement of Policy 4 that the waste should	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	be moved up the waste hierarchy as far as possible. Consequently, even though the proposal may meet the second element of Policy 4 in terms of location, it does not currently meet the first, which in turn means that the proposed development is not in accordance with Policy 3 or Policy 4 of the MWLP. The Council recognises that until the nature of waste changes, some recovery capacity will be required, but in respect of this part of Policy 4 the Council is seeking that the applicant demonstrate that waste that could be treated further up the waste hierarchy would not be recovered.	
Waste Need and Policy	14.12 Noting the above, the Council also wishes to highlight a tension in the project between seeking to reduce the distance that waste travel by sourcing waste that could be managed further up the waste hierarchy or bringing in waste over longer distances that is only suitable for recovery. The Council would like to explore the implications of this and how it could be resolved through the Examination.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste Need and Policy	Net self-sufficiency 14.13 Paragraph 3 of the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) requires Waste Planning Authorities to identify in their Local Plans sufficient opportunities to meet the identified needs of their area for the management of waste streams. Having acknowledged that there will be a degree of cross-boundary movement of waste for a given area, the waste management capacity of an amount of waste which is equivalent to the amount arising in that Waste Local Plan area will be provided. This does not necessarily mean that the capacity must be of the type of waste arising in the area. Cambridgeshire are signatories to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Waste Planning Authorities of the East of England (March 2019), which sets out that the signatories seek to provide for net self-sufficiency in waste management capacity. This means that the signatories can	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	plan in confidence that they only are required to meet the need of their area, unless it has been explicitly raised by another authority; and that by planning to provide for the needs of only that area, there is an appropriate distribution of waste management facilities in locations proximate to the waste arisings. An over provision in one area is likely to result in other areas being unable to meet the requirement to provide for net self-sufficiency, or alternatively to result in an overprovision of waste management capacity, should it be planned for, but there be an overprovision in another area.	
Waste Need and Policy	Site selection 14.14 Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 2 Alternatives (page 7), it states that an essential siting criteria for the facility was a requirement for additional EFW capacity and that: *"CCC also had the second highest amount of HIC waste from commercial sources disposed to non-hazardous landfill in the East of England (approximately 236,000 tonnes of waste suitably for use as fuel in an EfW). A current shortfall in HIC treatment capacity was therefore identified in Cambridgeshire, together with a predicated shortfall up to 2035 and beyond (excluding permitted but non-operational capacity)."* One of the main reasons for the site selection is, therefore, predicated on the PGEL facility not being constructed. The Chapter goes on to identify waste need from surrounding counties, which would also provide a fuel supply. It is not documented if sites other than those in Wisbech were considered, and if so, which sites those were. This is particularly key for, what is proposed to be a facility accepting waste on a regional scale, and the potential long distance vehicle movements and associated carbon emissions.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste Need and Policy	14.15 If both the proposed development and PGEL are constructed, this would result in approximately 1.2 million tonnes per annum of recovery capacity, in the Peterborough and Wisbech areas, which are 25km apart. This would result in a more than significant overprovision of waste recovery capacity, that can only be supplied by road. In the event PGEL was not subject to a catchment restriction, it is likely that it would operate within a similar area to this proposal. Therefore, the Council believes it would assist the Examination, if the applicant were to produce: a) a map or series of maps showing the location of waste currently being disposed of to landfill, the key road linkages, and the location of existing and permitted EFWs and their capacities (if the existing and permitted were distinguished on the map this would also be helpful). b) A statement explaining how the proximity principle will operate in practice, e.g., what is there to prevent the operator accepting a contract to manage waste from locations outside the study area such as London?	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste Need and Policy	Schedule 2 - Requirement 14. Waste Hierarchy Scheme 14.21 The details to be included within the Waste Hierarchy Scheme, under Requirement 14, appear to require little more than any Environmental Permit would require. As the European Waste Catalogue (EWC) codes permitted by the Environmental Permit will include wastes that could be recycled or reused. Reporting tonnages of such waste being incinerated would not achieve the objective of moving waste further up the Waste Hierarchy. It is therefore requested that the following additional criteria are interested between criteria (d) and (e) of section 2 of Requirement 14: "(#) Details of operational procedures that seek to ensure	Draft DCO Requirement 14 **(Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** states the controls and monitoring to be in place to ensure waste processed at the EfW CHP Facility is residual waste, therefore complies with the waste hierarchy. Moreover, as outlined in the **Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) [APP-094],** the Proposed Development will provide much needed capacity for residual waste that is currently sent to landfill. In this regard, the facility would not prejudice or detract from future recycling efforts, as it has been demonstrated that there is sufficient material left over after reuse, recycling and other forms of recovery have taken place that would then be managed by the Proposed Development. Additionally, (and importantly), the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** also considers the need for the Proposed Development in the context of how

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	that waste suitable for recycling and reuse is not received at the facility. These procedures are to be regularly reviewed and improved, where possible; (#) A record of the tonnages of material considered suitable for recycling and reuse that has been diverted further up the Waste Hierarchy; and, (#) A record to be kept of how these procedures have been regularly reviewed (on an annual basis at a minimum), what changes were made, and how these have reduced the amount of waste potentially suitable for recycling and reuse being received at the facility."	much residual waste will require management in the future. In this regard, the achievement of national targets for the recycling and reuse of waste have been taken into account when considering how much residual waste is likely to require management in the future. Even with the achievement of high, aspirational levels of recycling, there remains sufficient residual material for the Proposed Development." Proposed bullet point 1 and 2 are addressed by **Draft DCO** Requirement 14(2)(a) to (e) **(Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** Proposed bullet point 3 is addressed by **Draft DCO** Requirement 14(2)(e); records shall be kept and made available for inspection **(Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**.

Table 2.3 Applicant's Comments on the NCC Relevant Representation [RR-004]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	In relation to Chapter 8 Air Quality, Norfolk County Council Highway Authority has identified potential amenity issues as including emissions from traffic and the resulting impact on residents' quality of life. However, assessment of this issues falls outside the local highway authority's remit so that NCC defers to any Relevant Representations submitted by the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council on this matter.	Comment noted.
Biodiversity	The direct impacts on ecology within Norfolk will be limited to the impacts of the grid connection along the A47 corridor. An Outline CEMP has been drafted which includes Appendix D (Outline Ecological Mitigation Strategy) which will need to be secured via the requirements in the DCO. Broadly speaking, the	Noted. The Applicant will continue to work with NCC to finalise the CEMP during the process of discharging DCO Requirement 10 **(Volume 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order) [APP-013].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	embedded environmental measures set out in the CEMP appear acceptable.	
Biodiversity	The Outline Landscape & Ecology Strategy Management Plan (and BNG calculations) doesn't relate to Norfolk so is not relevant for NCC.	Comment noted.
Biodiversity	Responsibility for the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)/Appropriate Assessment (AA) will lie with the Secretary of State as 'Competent Authority' rather than NCC. It should however be noted that the Applicant has concluded in the HRA No Significant Effect Report that 'no potential for likely significant effect' on European wildlife sites, including those within Norfolk (i.e. Ouse Washes and The Wash).	Comment noted.
Climate Change	Chapter 14 Climate Change Given the scale of the development within Norfolk NCC does not raise any issues in relation to Chapter 14, but instead defers to any Relevant Representation submitted by Cambridgeshire County Council in respect of the proposed EfW plant itself.	Comment noted.
Cumulative	Chapter 17 Cumulative Impacts The County Council does not have any further issues to raise in respect of the cumulative impact of the development within Norfolk i.e. the cabling and connection to the gird [grid] connection at Walsoken.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Geology	Chapter 13 Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land NCC does not raise any issues in relation to Chapter 12, but instead defers to any Relevant Representation submitted by KL&WNBC on this matter.	Comment noted.
Health	It is noted that the proposed site for the plant is in Wisbech, Cambridgeshire, but that the connection to the grid will be in Norfolk. Public Health in Norfolk will comment only on the impact of the project as it pertains to population health in Norfolk. The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) is the national technical expert on possible impacts on health of energy from waste facilities. Public Health England guidance1, subsequently adopted by UKHSA as one of its successor bodies, states 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. This view is based on detailed assessments of the effects of air pollutants on health and on the fact that these incinerators make only a very small contribution to local concentrations of air pollutants." Once operational, controls and monitoring will be via an Environmental Permit managed by the Environment Agency.	Comment noted.
Health	The impact of the proposal on traffic in Norfolk during construction has been assessed as minor as the works in Norfolk relate solely to the laying of an underground electricity cable, causing only temporary disruption to traffic and managed through the construction traffic management plan. Equally, additional operational traffic movements in Norfolk are assessed as not severe, with 85% of additional	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	traffic movements falling outside of Norfolk. As such, any health impacts related to additional traffic will be negligible.	
Health	The scheme could give rise to potential anxiety in local populations both among those living and working immediately adjacent to the proposed site and those further afield due to community perceptions of risks to health. The Applicant has undertaken a mental health impact assessment which is welcomed and has proposed setting up a community liaison committee and employing a community liaison officer to allay community concerns about the scheme. This committee and officer should work both with communities immediately adjacent to the scheme and those further away in areas such as King's Lynn, for example.	The Community Liaison Officer will be a full time, permanent post. **Draft DCO Requirement 22 (Community liaison manager) (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** confirms that the relevant planning authority will be provided with the contact details of the appointed person in advance of final commissioning. For the duration of construction, the **Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) [App-103]** confirms a stakeholder engagement plan will be prepared as part of the final CEMP; to be secured by **Draft DCPO Requirement 10 (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. The revised outline CEMP that will be submitted at Deadline 1 makes provision for a local liaison group. The Local Liaison Group will include the four host authorities, NCC and the BCKLWN cover the Kings Lynn area.
Health	Public Health Norfolk also welcomes the creation of a Community Benefits Strategy setting out how the developer could fund and support existing wellbeing initiatives in the local area.	Comment noted.
Historic Environment	In relation to Chapter 10 Historic Environment, the Norfolk County Council Historic Environment Team advise, that the archaeological impact of the grid connection at Walsoken and the cable route in Norfolk is minimal and have no other comments at this stage. The Examining Authority should however note that K&WNBC may wish to make a Relevant Representation in relation to this matter.	Comment noted.
Hydrology	The LLFA has reviewed the ES Chapter 12 Hydrology and its supporting FRA. The LLFA notes the element of the proposed development within the Norfolk County boundary is the cable route to the grid connection station. The cable route is proposed to cross ordinary watercourses that are adopted by the King's Lynn internal Drainage Board (IDB) and therefore under the jurisdiction	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board (KLIDB) during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. This has included discussion of stand off distance from KLIDB drains, crossing of KLIDB drains and water discharges into KLIDB drains. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085]. As indicated in the meeting with NCC's Strategic Flood Risk Planning** Officer on 10 January 2023, the only

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	of the IDB rather than the LLFA. In addition, there are a number of other ordinary watercourses that are not adopted by the IDB and are under the jurisdiction of the LLFA. Should any temporary or permanent works be required in these ordinary watercourses, the LLFA will require the Applicant to obtain consent prior to undertaking works within these watercourses.	proposed crossings are of KLIDB maintained/adopted drains, and these require consent from KLIDB. KLIDB have also confirmed that consents are also required for: water discharges into KLIDB maintained drains (under Byelaws 10 and 23) and drains which are not maintained by KLIDB (under Byelaw 23) and works within 9m of the brink of KLIDB maintained drain (under Byelaw 10). The Applicant is working to produce a Statement of Common Ground with KLIDB which will be submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	A review of the surface water flood risk along the route of the order limit, indicates that surface water flood risk is localised and with a limited extent. The proposed Walsoken Substation and the Grid Connection are indicated to have a minimal increase in surface water runoff during both the construction and operation phases of the development.	The **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086]** for the proposed development, including dewatering and attenuation requirements, has been agreed through extensive consultation with KLIDB and NCC (for the development elements within the NCC area) and remains ongoing following submission of the DCO application. Further details on the proposed drainage strategy for Walsoken substation was submitted as a Technical Note to NCC and KLIDB in early February 2023. Where relevant, this information has been included Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Appropriate attenuation approaches are proposed. In addition, consideration to the dewatering activities associated with the construction phase activities has been provided and standard site management and mitigation approaches are intended to be applied with further detail provided in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).	The **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES**) **[APP-086]** for the proposed development, including dewatering and attenuation requirements, has been agreed through extensive consultation with KLIDB and NCC (for the development elements within the NCC area). This engagement remains ongoing following submission of the DCO application. Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 responds to comments raised by Interested Parties within their Relevant Representations.
Landscape and Visual	Whilst the ZTV does not extend that far, I also wonder whether views of the stack/plume (at least) would be seen from as far as King's Lynn western edges, which could potentially bring in additional residential receptors.	The 17km LVIA Study Area was agreed with the Host Authorities during a meeting held on 2 November 2020. Receptors located outside of the study area, including those within King's Lynn (in excess of 19km distant) have not been considered in the LVIA. Visualisations presented for Viewpoints 28, 29 and 30 in **Volume 6.3 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Figures 9.40 to 9.46 [APP-061]** and the accompanying viewpoint assessments in Appendix 9I in **Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		Appendices [APP-079] demonstrate that at distances in excess of 16km, the magnitude of visual change would not exceed Very Low.
Major Accidents	Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service has identified the following issues: It does not have any comment on hydrants for that part of the proposed Energy from Waste Combined Heat and Power facility. The does however identify that the proposed grid connection at the electricity substation site at Walsoken does lies within the Norfolk county boundary. This it advises requires the installation of a fire hydrant to serve the development at the substation. The hydrant should be installed in a location to approved by Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service to ensure adequate fire-fighting water provision. The fire hydrant should conform to BS750 and should provide a minimum sustained outlet discharge in line with the 'National guidance document on the provision of water for fire fighting' published by Water UK. The hydrant is required to ensure adequate water infrastructure provision is made on site for the local fire service to tackle any fire.	The substation facility will be subject to a fire risk assessment in line with the requirements of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. As this is an existing legal requirement, it does not need to be separately secured through the DCO. The design of the facility will account for the risk of fire. It is noted that the substation will house High-Voltage (HV) electrical infrastructure, and water is unlikely to be a safe medium for firefighting.
	A minimum requirement for commercial/industrial development would normally require fire hydrants on no less than a 125mm main. This is subject to clarification of the type, size and use of the commercial premises. The developer is responsible for ensuring sufficient hydrants are installed, in compliance with water regulations and Building Regulations Approved Document B, Volume 2 sections 15 & 16 (Fire Hydrants / Water Supplies and Vehicle Access) with reference to the 'National guidance document on the provision of water for fire-fighting' published by Water UK.	If the fire risk assessment identifies the requirements for firewater supply on site with hydrant provision, then this main will be adequately sized in line with regulatory requirements, recognised industry standard and good engineering practice.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	All proposed hydrant provision should be to the satisfaction of the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service. All expenses incurred shall be borne by the developer, owner or occupier of the commercial entity.	Comment noted.
	In addition, Norfolk County Council, Resilience Team has advised that CCC would be the emergency lead for any incident, but that NCC would expect to be informed and involved, given the potential cross-boundary issues in the event of an incident. It advises that particular importance should be attributed to the flood plans for the construction and post completion phases and it expects further co-ordination when emergency plans are being prepared.	Noted. An outline **Flood Emergency Management Plan (FEMP) (Volume 7.9) [APP-100]** has been included with the application and is secured by DCO Requirement 13 (**Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013])** which requires a final plan to be prepared prior to commissioning and submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval. The plan will be developed to account for changes through the construction phases with a view to operation. The FEMP will be produced in consultation with CPLRF and where necessary will liaise with other responders including NCC.
Noise and Vibration	In relation to Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration, Norfolk County Council Highway Authority has identified potential amenity issues as including noise and vibration from traffic and the resulting impact on residents' quality of life. However, assessment of this issues falls emit so that NCC defers to any Relevant Representations submitted by the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council on this matter.	Comment noted
Socio-economics	Chapter 15 Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use In relation to Chapter 15 Socio-Economics, Tourism, Recreation and Land Use, Norfolk County Council's Economic Development team, have identified the employment and skills benefit of the Proposed Development as a relevant consideration, to be considered in the planning balance.	Noted. The planning considerations given to the employment and skills benefit of the Proposed Development are set out in Section 4.14 of the **Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) [APP-091].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Socio-economics	It advises that the Applicant has taken a proactive and positive approach to developing an outline Employment & Skills Strategy that reflects the needs and priorities of the local area. The outline Employment and Skills Strategy summarises: · The delivery of support already in place at the Applicant's existing operational facilities; · The Applicant's approach to identifying specific opportunities to support employment and skills development for the Proposed Development; and · The Applicant's commitments in relation to the Proposed Development.' It advises that NCC will continue to work with the Applicant to finalise the strategy.	The Applicant will continue to work with NCC to finalise the strategy during the process of discharging DCO Requirement 21 **(Volume 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order) [APP-013]**.
Traffic	The local highway assessment has been undertaken for two scenarios, one during the construction phase and the second during the operational phase. To minimise potential impacts on Wisbech, the Applicant has ruled out highway connections through the town in both scenarios, with route restrictions placed on the A1101 north of the A47 Elm Road roundabout. This commitment is contained in the Construction and Operational Traffic Management Plans, which are then secured via the Requirements in the DCO. Accordingly, traffic associated with both scenarios entering and leaving Norfolk will do so via the A47(T).	Noted. Management of traffic during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development will be via the following documents: • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for Construction Staff Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 10, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** • Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) – secured by Requirement 11, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) including route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. – secured by Requirement 12, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** and • Operational Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 15**, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Traffic	In relation to operational traffic, taking into consideration trip distribution patterns and route restrictions, five routes have been identified to transport waste and	Noted. The predicted traffic flows identified by NCC are taken from **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6B Transport Assessment**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	residues/consumables to/from the EfW CHP facility, two of which affect Norfolk:- · Route 3: - A47 east to the A1101 Elm High Road roundabout; then south/east to the A1122 then A10; and · Route 4: - A47 east of the A1101 Elm High Road roundabout. The largest impact to the County Road network would be at the Elm High Road junction which exhibits some driver delay from east and west on the A47 in the AM Peak and on the A1011 south of the roundabout. In the PM Peak the situation is reversed with delay on the A1011 north of the roundabout and on the approaches to the junction on the A47. The assessment indicates that 5% of the HGV traffic will use route 3 and 10% route 4, the other 85% falling outside Norfolk. When calculating the traffic volumes passing through the A1101 Elm High Road roundabout, it works out at 8 vehicles (5 HGV's) routing the junction in the am peak and 5 vehicles (2 HGV's) routing the junction in the PM Peak. In accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF, development can only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Whilst the impact at the Elm High Road roundabout will be fully assessed by National Highways, given the volume of background traffic already using the A47 roundabout, County officers do not regard the impact of an additional 8 vehicles am Peak and 5 vehicles Pm Peak as severe.	**(Volume 6.4) [APP-073]** and this concludes that effects would not be significant.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Traffic	Impact of the Grid Connection at Walsoken (including the Installation of Apparatus in the Public Highway etc) The EfW will connect to the power grid at the Walsoken Substation, which is accessed from Broadend Road. The Applicant's intention is to route the connection cable underground along the A47 verge, pass under the Elm High Road/A47 junction and then continue longitudinally underground along the highway verge of Broadend Road. The existence of private longitudinal apparatus in the public highway represents a safety risk to operatives working in the public highway as there is no effective mechanism for those opening the road to be notified of its existence. Statutory Undertakers and others with powers to open the road cannot know either by visual inspection or by administrative search that such apparatus exists and may damage it, which for power cables is clearly dangerous. Accordingly, the underground cable and apparatus will need to be adopted by a statutory undertaker. The Applicant's position is they are seeking to be classed as a Statutory undertaker as part of their DCO. However, if the DfT do not recognise the Applicant as a statutory undertaker and/or refuse to grant "state codes", the Applicant will not be able to connect their EfW facility to the power grid at the Walsoken Substation. Accordingly, the Applicant's progress at their own risk as there is no right of appeal.	The Applicant has the powers to carry out the street works under **Article 10 of the Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. As set out in Article 10(2), the power is a statutory right for the purposes of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Once the DCO has been granted, the Applicant will register for a Street Works Act (SWA) Code as an organisation that has the power to undertake works in a street. The SWA Codes are administered by GeoPlace on behalf of the Department for Transport. The Applicant is not aware of any reasons why it would not be granted a SWA Code as it will be able to demonstrate that it has the necessary powers once the DCO is granted.
Traffic	Given the A47 is a trunk road, the impact to the A47 and its connecting junctions will be assessed by National Highways. Nevertheless, County Council officers have also assessed the impact to the A47/A1101 Elm High Road roundabout as traffic will disperse south and east into Norfolk via this roundabout.	The Applicant will continue to engage with NCC in relation to traffic management during the course of the DCO examination. Management of traffic during the construction phase of the Proposed Development will be via the following documents: • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for Construction Staff Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 10, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** • Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) – secured by Requirement 11, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	In relation to construction traffic, the physical works in Norfolk relate solely to laying the underground 132kV cable. As with all roadwork there will be some disruption to residents/businesses in the immediate area in terms of driver delay. However, the associated roadworks will be temporary in nature and managed via the Construction Traffic Management Plan. The impact in Norfolk is assessed as minor. It is anticipated that discussions and negotiations between the Highway Authority and the Applicant will remain on-going throughout the application process, particularly in respect of traffic management.	
Waste Need and Policy	Waste Policy matters, including Waste Availability, Composition and Capacity. NCC does not raise any issues in relation to this, but instead defers to any Relevant Representation submitted by Cambridgeshire County Council, where the EfW facility is proposed to be located.	Comment noted.

3. 3(a) Statutory Parties

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Relevant representations were received from fourteen 3(a) statutory parties. The Applicant's comments on the points raised within the relevant representations from these statutory parties are provided below:

- **Table 3.1: Applicant's comments on the Walsoken Parish Council Relevant Representation [RR-008]**;
- **Table 3.2: Applicant's comments on the Wisbech Town Council Relevant Representation [RR-010]**;
- **Table 3.3: Applicant's comments on the Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd Relevant Representation [RR-011]**;
- **Table 3.4: Applicant's comments on the Royal Mail Group Limited Relevant Representation [RR-012]**;
- **Table 3.5: Applicant's comments on the East of England Ambulance Service Trust Relevant Representation [RR-013]**;
- **Table 3.6: Applicant's comments on the Environment Agency Relevant Representation [RR-014]**;
- **Table 3.7: Applicant's comments on the Historic England Relevant Representation [RR-016]**;
- **Table 3.8: Applicant's comments on the Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board Relevant Representation [RR-017]**;
- **Table 3.9: Applicant's comments on the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board [RR-019]**;
- **Table 3.10: Applicant's comments on the Anglian Water Relevant Representation [RR-020]**;
- **Table 3.11: Applicant's comments on the National Highways Relevant Representation [RR-021]**;
- **Table 3.12: Applicant's comments on the Natural England Relevant Representation [RR-022]**;
- **Table 3.13: Applicant's comments on the UK Health Security Agency [RR-023] Relevant Representation**; and
- **Table 3.14: Applicant's comments on the Waldersey Internal Drainage Board Relevant Representation [RR-024]**.

Table 3.1 Applicant's Comments on the Walsoken Parish Council Relevant Representation [RR-012]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	Walsoken Parishioners are located downwind from the proposed site which is only around 2 miles away. They could be effected by fallout and pollution caused by the incinerator impacting residents day to day lives.	The environmental impacts of the Proposed Development including air quality have been assessed. **ES Chapter 8: Air Quality (Volume 6.2) [APP-035]** includes detailed dispersion modelling from the chimney and includes traffic modelling of HGVs during construction and operation, to predict potential impacts on human and ecological receptors. The air quality assessment was undertaken considering air quality objectives for a series of pollutants including metals and particulate matter (PM), set for the protection of human health and ecological sites and concludes that effects are not significant. A full list and figure of the 338 modelled sensitive receptors can be found in **Annex C,** Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1 **and Figure 8.3, ES Chapter 8: Air Quality Figures (Volume 6.3) [APP-052]** respectively. This includes schools, medical facilities and residential properties. Appended to the Air Quality Assessment is a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA), Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. The HHRA considers the potential effects arising from chimney emissions upon humans. The Assessment assumes that the receptors would eat food grown in the local area and considers potential impacts from the bioaccumulation of, for example, polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/Fs) and dioxin-like PCBs in the food chain. The assessment concludes that potential effects are not significant. All EfW facilities in England require an Environmental Permit (EP) from the Environment Agency to operate. The EP application has been submitted and 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.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		With respect to air quality, including odour, further environmental measures to be implemented and secured under the DCO Application include: • Construction dust management; included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) – secured by Requirement 10, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**; • Odour Management Plan – secured by Requirement 16, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**; • Fire Prevention Plan – secured by Requirement 17**, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013] ;** • Construction Staff Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 10, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) – secured by Requirement 11, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) including route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. – secured by Requirement 12, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Operational Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 15, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** and • Odour Management Plan – secured by Requirement 16, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Traffic	They are also very concerned by traffic flow and traffic levels in an area which is already gridlocked several times a day and road conditions which aren't suitable for the current traffic load without any increase.	HIGHWAY CAPACITY: 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), [APP-033**] accompanied by **Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (TA) (Volume 6.4) [APP-073].** 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 junction assessment includes a 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 Proposed Development also includes for improvements to New Bridge Lane which include for widening, a footpath, pedestrian crossing points and reducing the road speed from the national speed limit to 30mph. With these

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		improvement measures in place the assessments conclude that there will be no significant residual effects resulting from the increase in HGV traffic. Where necessary, embedded mitigation, such as, onsite HGV queuing lanes, 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: • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), includes a requirement for Construction Staff Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 10, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) – secured by Requirement 11, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** • Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) including route restrictions to reduce impacts to Wisbech Town and surrounding villages. – secured by Requirement 12, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013];** and • Operational Travel Plan – secured by Requirement 15**, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** VEHICLE ACCESS TO THE EFW CHP FACILITY SITE Construction **Appendix 6A Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Volume 6.4) [APP-072]** has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The Outline CTMP 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. The final CTMP is secured by Requirement 12, Schedule 2, Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]. Operation Unlike the current arrangements to the existing operational Waste Transfer Station (WTS), **Section 3.4.105, ES Chapter 3 Description of the**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030] confirms, once operational, HGVs will access the EfW CHP Facility Site via New Bridge Lane only, thereby avoid Weasenham Lane. Staff and visitors and occasional light good vehicles will access the EfW CHP Facility Site from Algores Way via Weasenham Lane. **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033]** 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 Cambridgeshire County Council during the consultation process and is an agreed approach. Route restrictions for any HGVs other than local RCVs would therefore be implemented in relation to: • A1101 north of A47 Elm Road roundabout; • Churchill Road (north of Elm High Road); and • Weasenham Lane (between Algores Way and Elm High Road. Accompanying the DCO Application is the Applicant's **Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) (Volume 7.15) [APP-106]**. Figure 2.1 of the Outline OTMP displays the proposed operational route restrictions that are described above. The final OTMP is secured by Requirement 12, Schedule 2, **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**
Environmental	Additionally, the proposed grid connection is in the Parish of Walsoken at the UK Power Substation which will have some impact on the village and therefore the Parish Council wishes to be kept fully informed throughout all stages of the process.	Comment noted.

Table 3.2 Applicant's Comments on the Wisbech Town Council Relevant Representation [RR-010]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste Need	Wisbech Town Council object to the application principally on the basis that there is no need for the facility to meet residual waste requirements within the Study Area and to include such an over-provision in recovery capacity will jeopardise the achievement of recycling targets and would be contrary to emerging Government policy set out in the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3).	The need for the Proposed Development, and how it meets the requirements of NPS EN-3 is set out in the **Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) [APP-091].** The **Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (WFAA) (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** has assessed both the local/ regional requirement for the Proposed Development as well as the national need. This has concluded that there is insufficient residual waste management capacity available to ensure that 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 to other locations in the UK for final disposal.
Waste need	Despite seeking to justify the need for the EfW on the availability of residual waste within the defined catchment area, the Applicants wish to retain the flexibility to accept waste from anywhere and do not wish the proposed development to be tied to that specific catchment area. This seems at odds with the requirements in the NPS as there is no safeguards to ensure that the development will not prejudice the achievement of local or national waste management targets if there has been no assessment of the implications for those targets in the first place.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	A plan showing the two-hour travel time of an HGV is included in the WFAA. Regardless of whether only a small proportion of an individual waste authority is within the two-hour travel time, the Applicant has assumed that waste from the entire waste planning authority (WPA) is within the catchment. By way of example, only a	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	very small proportion of Essex and Hertfordshire is within the two-hour catchment (approximately 10% in area) yet the applicant has included residual waste from the entire WPA. This is particularly important as Table 4.2 demonstrates that Household, Industrial and Commercial (HIC) arisings within the study area are greatest in Essex and Hertfordshire, the vast majority of which are beyond the 2-hour catchment.	
Waste need	There is no justification for including the entire WPA in the catchment as the data relied upon by the Applicant in Table 4.1 is published at individual local authority level. When the Applicant's adjustment to the travel time for defining the catchment area is applied to all of the WPAs, it significantly distorts the outcome of the assessment. The consequence of this approach is that the Applicant is reliant on waste being transported significant distances to the Medworth facility, contrary to the proximity principle.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	Rather than the 693,179 tonnes of local authority collected waste included by the Applicant for Essex in Table 4.1, the figure should actually be only 97,275 tonnes (i.e. the waste collected in Uttlesford – 34,069 tonnes, and Braintree – 63,206 tones as the only two authorities partially within the two hour catchment). Bearing in mind only a very small portion of Braintree District Council is within the two-hour catchment, even this figure is likely to be a significant over estimate. The vast majority of waste generated in Essex, i.e. 86% of the quoted figure or nearly 600,000 tonnes, comes from locations beyond the two hour catchment. A similar case applies to Hertfordshire. Only a small proportion of East Hertfordshire and North Hertfordshire lie within the two-hour catchment. The waste generated in these areas is only 105,851 (57,077 tonnes from East Herts and 48,774 from North Herts) or 21% of the figure quoted by the Applicant of 509,762 tonnes. Over	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	400,000 tonnes of the figure for Hertfordshire are generated by authorities beyond the two hour catchment. If waste generated in Luton, Milton Keynes and Leicester City is also excluded from the WFAA on the basis that they are outside the two-hour catchment, the total amount of available waste would fall by a further 357,195 tonnes. By applying the Applicants own two-hour drive time to the data for these five authorities alone, the total local authority collected waste would be reduced by nearly 1.4 million tonnes. Not only has the Applicant included waste from areas outside the two-hour catchment, but it also then seeks to expand the waste catchment further by including all authorities within the former East of England planning region on the basis that waste data is generally presented on a regional basis. Milton Keynes, Thurrock and Southend are therefore also included in the waste catchment area despite them lying entirely outside the two-hour drivetime catchment. Luton is also outside the travel time catchment, but this is not acknowledged by the Applicant.	
Waste need	Despite seeking to justify the use of the former East of England regional planning region as the basis of the catchment, the Applicant then seeks to add additional authorities from the former East Midlands regional planning region on the basis that the two-hour travel catchment covers these authorities. Leicester City is included despite it appearing to be outside the two-hour travel time	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	If it is possible to disaggregate waste data to WPA level to enable authorities outside the East of England to be included, it is also possible to exclude	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	those authorities from within the East of England that do not fall within the two-hour catchment. The application of the methodology underpinning the catchment area has been manipulated to such an extent that the outputs are seriously distorted and cannot be relied upon. If professional judgement is that it is not commercially viable to transport waste more than two hours from the proposed development, then the waste catchment should be defined on this basis. The Applicant suggests that at 2019 there was a total of approximately 17.9 million tonnes of HIC arisings within the Study Area (Table 4.2 of WFAA). If waste generated within Essex, Hertfordshire, Luton, Milton Keynes and Leicester is excluded from this calculation as being either entirely out of the catchment area (Luton, Milton Keynes and Leicester) or almost entirely out of the catchment area (Essex and Hertfordshire), this figure falls to only 7.65 million tonnes. Even this figure is likely to be an over estimate as it assumes all of the waste within the remaining WPA is available, even though a significant proportion would be outside the two-hour catchment. In terms of the waste currently disposed to landfill (Table 4.3 of WFAA), Essex accounts for a significant proportion (28% for the total for the East of England). As set out above, the vast majority of Essex is out of catchment. If waste disposed to non-hazardous landfill is excluded from the aforementioned authorities on the basis that they are out of catchment, the total amount landfilled falls from 2.4 million to 1 million tonnes. If exports of RDF from the Study Area are calculated on the same basis, they are likely to amount to only 72,000	

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	tonnes rather than the 102,000 tonnes quoted by the Applicant. These figures very clearly demonstrate that the Applicant is relying on a significant proportion of waste generated in areas beyond the two hour travel time, in the case of much of Essex, significantly so.	
Waste need	The Applicant is relying on data from 2019 in their calculation of available waste. This does not take into account the effect of the opening of the Rookery South Energy Recovery Facility near Bedford in early 2022 (on the edge of the two hour catchment area). With the ability to manage over 545,000 tonnes of residual waste, this will have a significant bearing on waste movements within the catchment. As the waste catchment area of the proposed facility will significantly overlap with the catchment for Rookery South (only Lincolnshire and Norfolk would be outside the catchment for Rookery South), the amount of residual waste available to the proposed Medworth facility will be significantly reduced. It is highly unlikely that any residual waste from Bedford, Central Bedfordshire (and Luton – although this has previously been discounted from the assessment of available waste as it is out of catchment) would be available.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste need	The WFAA does not include any information on the recycling rate of WPAs within the catchment area. Without this information, it is not possible to consider the effect of increasing the rate of recycling to 65% required by the Environment Act 2021. In 2019/20, municipal recycling rates in the East of England region stood at 48.6% and those in the East Midlands region were at 44.2%. To reach 65% would require an additional 16.4% and 20.8% of municipal waste to be recycled in the East of England and East Midlands respectively.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	Notwithstanding the fact that the Applicant has significantly over-estimated the amount of residual waste within the catchment, no consideration has been given to how much of this waste is genuinely available to the proposed facility taking into account existing waste management contracts.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	It is noted that Veolia is contracted to supply the majority of waste to Rookery South ERF and is currently delivering waste through municipal waste contracts with Bedford Borough, Central Bedfordshire, Norfolk and Hertfordshire. When the LACW from these authorities is removed from the supply, this reduces the amount of available to the proposed facility by over 725,000 tonnes. Veolia also delivers non-hazardous commercial and industrial waste to the facility, mainly from within an 80 mile radius.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste need	As set out in Table 1 below [within the WTC rep], by only considering available residual waste within the two hour catchment, and excluding waste under contract to Rookery South, the total amount of Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) available falls to only 2,067,377 tonnes.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	When the waste catchment is applied according to the two hour travel time and waste is removed from WPAs with a contract to supply the Rookery South ERF, the availability of waste falls from nearly 18 million tonnes to less than 6.6 million tonnes (see Table 2 above) [of the WTC rep]. Improvements in levels of recycling to meet the 65% target will reduce this figure further.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	Whilst it is accepted that the total HIC waste arising in Essex and Hertfordshire is an estimate based on an assumption that the proportion of HIC waste within catchment will be the same as that for LACW, it is likely to be a more accurate reflection of available waste than that presented by the Applicant.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The Applicant has sought to forecast future residual waste requirements through an assessment of the Waste Local Plan evidence base. It is noted that the Applicants state that they have paid particular attention to any anticipated shortfalls in future requirements but have excluded any over provision when calculating the total requirement.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste need	In respect of the Bedfordshire and Luton Minerals and Waste Local Plan, it is noted that the data relied on is from 2012 and therefore out of date. No account is taken of the Rookery South ERF, which at 550,000 tpa will have a significant impact on the amount of residual waste available to the Medworth facility.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted in July 2021. It demonstrates a surplus of recovery capacity of 495,000 tonnes per annum. The Applicant notes that this includes the implementation of an EfW at Peterborough capable of managing 650,000 tonnes per annum but has yet to be implemented. Although consent was originally granted in 2009, amendments to the original consent were approved in July 2019, therefore there is no reason to assume that this facility will not come forward.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	In Essex, the Non-Hazardous Waste Capacity Update Report (May 2018) states that there was a surplus of consented capacity of 1,454,000 tonnes of non-hazardous waste at 2017, reducing to 1,408,000 tonnes by the end of the Plan period (2035). This includes consented capacity of 823,000 tpa (including a 595,000 tpa waste to energy facility) at the Rivenhall Waste Management Facility which is expected to begin commissioning in early 2025 and be fully operational by the end of 2025. This facility would come on stream before the proposed Medworth facility and should be taken into account in the assessment of available residual waste.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	In Hertfordshire, all of the LACW is managed out of county under contracts which run until 2039. The Draft Waste Local Plan Review (January 2021) referred to in the WFAA was withdrawn in December 2021. The Hertfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2040 Draft Plan (July 2022) includes	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	a surplus of 0.001Mt (1,000 tpa) of treatment and energy recovery by 2035 and a shortfall of capacity of only 0.021Mt (21,000 tpa) by 2040.	
Waste need	In Milton Keynes, there was a surplus of 193,000 tpa of recovery capacity for MSW/C&I waste at 2015.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication document (May 2022) confirms that sufficient capacity already exists to accommodate the forecast growth in waste arisings over the Plan period to 2038. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to allocate any specific sites for waste management facilities in the NM&WLP. This document is not referred to in the WFAA, rather reliance is placed on information contained in the outdated 2011 Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2010-2026.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The adopted Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2020) confirms that there is no immediate identified shortfall in waste management facilities (paragraph 6.8).	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste need	The WFAA relies on waste forecast data from the Thurrock Waste Arising and Capacity Studies (2009 and 2010) and is therefore out of date and should not be relied upon. The WFAA does however acknowledge the consent for the Tilbury Green Power plant which was recently varied by the Secretary of State (August 2022) to increase the electrical export capacity of the development from 80MW to 88MW. This includes an increase in the electrical capacity of the energy from waste (EfW) facility (Phase 2) to 45MW. Although Phase 2 (350,000 tpa of EfW capacity) has yet to be built, there is no reason to assume it will not be implemented given the very recent variation to the consent.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	There is no up to date analysis of future waste management requirements in the emerging Leicester Local Plan.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan up to 2031 was adopted in 2019 and is not an emerging plan as stated in the WFAA. It confirms at paragraph 4.11 that sufficient capacity has already been permitted to handle the waste requiring management. This includes the 350,000tpa Newhurst Energy Recovery Facility near Shepshed being developed by Biffa, Covanta and EQT, which is currently in its construction phase and due for completion in 2023. The shortfall identified in the WFAA would therefore not exist.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The Review of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (February 2021) allocates sufficient sites in the Sites Location Plan to meet the requirement for energy recovery.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Monitoring Report 2019 (March 2021) is not referred to in the WFAA, rather it relies on data from 2012. Table 4 of the aforementioned report confirms that there was	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	a surplus in capacity of 0.043Mt of treatment and other forms of recovery.	
Waste need	The WFAA relies on data from the emerging Rutland Local Plan 2018-2036 which was withdrawn in September 2021. The Local Needs Assessment (September 2018) confirms that the existing contract for municipal waste treatment reduces the future advanced treatment requirements by 8,500tpa, leaving around 20,000tpa.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The waste catchment area has been heavily manipulated by the Applicant in an attempt to justify the need for the facility. As a consequence of this, residual waste will need to be imported significant distances to the proposed facility. By the Applicant's own admission, journey times beyond two-hours are unlikely to be economically viable and therefore the amount of residual waste genuinely available to the facility will be significantly less than that suggested.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The assessment of residual waste forecasts in Waste Local Plans is inaccurate in that the data it relies upon is out of date. By way of example, the WFAA records a shortfall in capacity in Norfolk of 703,000 based on data at 2013 despite the fact that the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication document (May 2022) confirms that sufficient capacity already exists to accommodate the forecast growth in waste arisings over the Plan period to 2038. Additionally, the summary of WPA	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	forecasted future residual waste requirements only records shortfalls. WPAs with a surplus of capacity (including the 495,000 tonnes per annum within Cambridgeshire (i.e. the host authority) are not taken into account in the calculation of the total forecasted residual waste requirements, significantly distorting the figure.	
Waste need	No account has been taken of the implications for waste forecasts within the Study Area of the requirement to increase rates of recycling of LACW waste to 65%. The WFAA notes that this will present a significant challenge but does not address the issue that this will be more difficult if there is an over provision of recovery capacity.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The WFAA does not consider the impact of other EfW facilities in the catchment on the availability of waste. In a number of cases, these facilities will compete for waste from the same waste catchment and have either recently come on stream e.g, Rookery South or will do shortly e.g. Rivenhall Waste Management Facility and Newhurst Energy Recovery Facility. The impact of these facilities will not be reflected in historic data relied upon by	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	the Applicant on the availability of residual waste or the amount of waste landfilled.	
Waste need	Paragraph 2.577 of the NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) and 2.18.7 of the emerging draft NPS) makes it clear that the assessment should include the production and disposal of residues as part of the ES. Any proposals for recovery of ash and mitigation measures should be described. Paragraph 2.5.78 and 2.18.8 of the emerging draft states that applicants should set out the consideration that they have given to the existence of accessible capacity in waste management sites for dealing with residues for the planned life of the power station.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	As much as 26.5% by weight of the waste import (approximately 165,000 tpa) will need to be exported as Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA), and 5% by weight (approximately 31,280tpa) will be Air Pollution Control residue (APCr).	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Waste need	The ES confirms at paragraph 3.5.41 that IBA would be sent to a suitably licensed facility in the UK for recycling, where materials contained within the IBA would be extracted and the remainder reclaimed for use as secondary aggregate, however no detail is provided on the likely location of this facility or the extent of available capacity. No information is provided on the existence of accessible capacity in waste management sites for dealing with residues.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste need	No assessment has been undertaken of the existence of accessible capacity for dealing with APCr. The ES simply states that residues would be sent to a suitable licensed facility in the UK where possible, for disposal. Not only is the likely location not stated, but it is also possible that these residues might need to be exported out of the country.	See separate, standalone Technical Note entitled 'Responses to the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment Representations" **(Appendix 9.2d Part 9)**.
Alternatives	No consideration has been given to alternative sites, despite this being requested by PINS, Cambridgeshire County Council and Public Health England. The reluctance of the applicant to undertake an alternative site assessment suggests that had they done so, the proposed site would not score favourably.	The Scoping opinion provided by PINs states that '*The ES should also address alternative locations, where these have been considered*'. The site selection process for the EfW CHP Facility Site is set out in **ES Chapter 2 Alternatives Volume 6.2 (APP-029)** and explains the Applicant's main reasons for selecting the location of the Proposed Development, highlighting the 'essential' and 'preferable' site selection criteria that were applied in identifying and determining the suitability of the site. Section 2.3 of the chapter explains why the EfW CHP Facility Site was selected. The reasons for selecting the preferred options for the Proposed Development are also described Chapter 2: Alternatives (Vol. 6.2) [APP-029] of the ES including the alternatives considered relating to site configuration; location of the TCC; CHP Connection design; and the Grid Connection Corridor, including substation location and design (a separate Grid Connection Options Report has been submitted as Appendix 2A (Vol. 6.4) to Chapter 2: Alternatives (Vol 6.2) [APP-029] of the ES). .
Alternatives	In its response to the consultation, Wisbech Town Council queried the omission of proximity to waste fuel from the list of essential siting criteria used by the applicant. If it has been, a location within an area with a surplus of recovery capacity would suggest that it is not an appropriate location. Rather the applicant will be reliant upon waste being transported significant distances to the facility.	Following receipt of the consultation response, the Applicant supplemented the information it had provided in the PEIR in order to explain the appropriateness of the site as a location to respond to the residual waste management capacity gap in the East of England. This gap had been explained within the draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment that accompanied the PEIR documentation and therefore the information provided within **ES Chapter 2 Alternatives Volume 6.2 (APP-029)** is not new or retrospective.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Alternatives	The applicant's response to this issue fails to address the specific point raised. It is not disputed that Government policy encourages EfW facilities to include CHP, however this does not override the proximity principle. The location of a potential CHP market should not dictate the choice of site. It is inconceivable to suggest that an alternative location in an area with a recovery capacity deficit would not have a similar potential CHP market.	**ES Chapter 2 Alternatives Volume 6.2 (APP-029)** demonstrates the appropriateness of the site against a number of criteria foremost of which is that it is in an area of waste management need (i.e. an area which is presently landfilling residual waste). The site is also currently in use for waste management and safeguarded as a waste management area whilst benefiting from proximity to potential CHP customers. Graphic 2.1 in **ES Chapter 2 Alternatives Volume 6.2 (APP-029)** details the demand potential for CHP in the East of England, with Wisbech and Norwich possessing the highest number of large heat loads. The locations of potential CHP users in Wisbech are detailed on Graphic 2.2 in **ES Chapter 2 Alternatives Volume 6.2 (APP-029).**
Alternatives	Despite the fact that the PEIR made it clear that proximity to waste arisings was not an essential site criterion, the applicant is now seeking to retrospectively amend these criteria in Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement. If proximity to waste arisings was not taken into account at the PEIR stage, it cannot have been taken into account at submission stage as the location of the facility was already fixed.	**ES Chapter 2 Alternatives Volume 6.2 (APP-029)** explains that the site was selected because it met a number of essential and preferable criteria, fundamentally, that it was located within an area of waste management need. It is noted that the PEIR sets out the Applicant's preliminary environmental information, it will not therefore contain all of the detailed information provided in the final ES. During statutory consultation the Applicant consulted upon a Draft Waste Fuel Availability Assessment in order to demonstrate the need for such a facility within the Study Area. This demonstrates that at the PEIR stage, the availability of waste arising was a key consideration of the Applicant in determining the suitability of the EfW CHP Facility Site and the need for the Proposed Development in this location.
Alternatives	Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant does not refer to the fact that provision has been made for managing waste further up the waste hierarchy with the recently adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan and that there is a surplus of recovery capacity of 450,000 tpa. This figure includes implementation of an EfW at Peterborough capable of managing 650,000 tpa. No consideration has been given to the implications of the implementation of this facility on the amount of residual waste in the study area.	The **Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** includes for the Peterborough Green Energy Ltd facility within its calculations as to the volume of residual waste within the Study Area.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Alternatives	The applicant states that a minimum site area of 3.5ha is required to accommodate an EfW and CHP facility of the type and size proposed. As the need for a facility capable of processing 625,600 tpa has not been sufficiently justified, a smaller facility (or series of smaller facilities) on alternative sites may well be more appropriate.	The **Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** demonstrates that there is sufficient waste to support the operation of a 625,600 tpa EFW CHP Facility. As such a minimum site size of 3.5ha is required for such a facility.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	The failure to consider alternative sites is a serious omission given that the application site is within Flood Zone 3. The Sequential Test required by both the NPS EN-1 (paragraph 5.7.9) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires consideration of alternative sites at lower risk of flooding (i.e. Flood Zones 1 or 2) as part of site selection. This has not been done.	Sequential Test The Applicant's consideration of the sequential test is set out within **the FRA (ES Chapter 12 Hydrology, Appendix 12A FRA (Volume 6.4) [APP-084]** and summarised within the **Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) [APP-091].** At the time the EfW CHP Facility Site was first identified and at the point the option agreement for the land comprising the majority of the EfW CHP Facility Site was signed in 2019, the EfW CHP Facility Site was allocated in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste and Minerals Development Plan Site Specific Allocations 2012 as a Waste Allocation and Consultation Area (W1C inset map 39) as site allocation W1C (an allocation for waste recycling and recovery facilities (non-landfill) under Policy SSP W1. In view of national policy as set out in EN-1, Draft EN1, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance Flood Risk and Coastal Change there was no requirement upon the Applicant to undertake a sequential test at the time it selected the site, nor through the stages of scoping and period of non-statutory consultation (at which times it still comprised an allocation). In July 2021 (after the commencement of the statutory consultation period for the Proposed Development), the Development Plan was replaced by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021. This Plan does not allocate sites for waste management purposes instead identifying waste management areas (Policy 10 WMAs). WMAs are existing or committed waste management sites. The EfW CHP Facility Site is identified as a WMA 'existing or committed waste management facility' in the 2021 Minerals and Waste Local Plan and retained within the Fenland Local Plan 2014 as an allocated waste management site. Following the adoption of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021, and taking into account feedback received

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		during statutory consultation, the Applicant re-evaluated its site selection process. As part of this re-evaluation, the Applicant undertook a sequential test which considered other WMAs in the Wisbech area (as set out in the **Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084**]). The **FRA (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084])** records that the WMA which is located approximately 0.5km to the east of the EfW CHP Facility is too small to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility of the type and size proposed (3.5ha). The other WMA is located approximately 2.5km to the north and alongside the River Nene and is close to residential areas and does not benefit from proximity to larger users of heat. The Applicant did not identify any other available sites that met its essential site selection criteria, in particular the availability of potential CHP users, and that were located in either Flood Zone 1 or 2. Site layout Having applied the sequential test, the Applicant followed a sequential approach at the site level, consistent with NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.7.9, with the EA with the identification on compatible and non-compatible uses within the relevant flood zones. The definition of such uses was agreed with the EA at a meeting on 28/4/21 and with CCC on 26 October 2021. Essential infrastructure elements of the EfW CGHP Facility, CHP Connection and Grid Connection were required to pass Part 2 of the Exception Test. The Part 2 assessment is presented **in FRA (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084])** and provides further detail at Section 7.2 which demonstrates that the Proposed Development would be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, would reduce flood risk overall. It also demonstrates how the Essential Infrastructure located in Flood Zone 3a has been designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of flood.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Traffic and Transport	It is not clear whether the access improvements on New Bridge Lane (reopening of New Bridge Lane to motorised vehicles; widening road to form a two-way carriageway suitable for HGV traffic and footway) would be implemented in the absence of the Southern Access Road (SAR) schemes or instead of it. Paragraph 3.4.106 of the ES states 'To facilitate the Access Improvements for the EfW CHP Facility, a highway improvement scheme is required along New Bridge Lane. Minor improvements to the existing site access off Algores Way will also be required.' It is not clear whether the highway improvement scheme that is being referred to is the SAR. If the access improvements are dependent on the SAR coming forward, as there is no certainty that it will be implemented, an assessment should be undertaken in the absence of the scheme.	The reference quoted relates to the Access Improvements proposed by the Applicant. The widening of New Bridge Lane and improvements to Algores Way junction is for the purpose of access to the Proposed Development and not related to the Southern Access Road. The current status of the SAR as understood by the Applicant is set out within **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033] paragraph 6.5.66 to 6.5.71**. The Applicant's proposed Access Improvements are considered to be consistent with the SAR and should not prejudice its future implementation. The Applicant's assessment considers the works proposed by the Applicant (rather than the SAR) and concludes that effects upon the highway and users of the highway would not be significant.
Traffic and Transport	The applicant has relied on data from the construction of its Devonport facility in Plymouth to inform the assessment of construction traffic. As this facility was much smaller (capable of managing only 265,000 tpa of waste as opposed to the 625,600 tpa being proposed at the Medworth facility), further justification is required to demonstrate that the facilities and sites are comparable. No information is provided on the facilities at Shrewsbury, Oxford, Wilton and Avonmouth (e.g. size, requirement for cut and fill, demolition works etc) and therefore it is not possible to verify whether the data relied upon the inform the assessment of construction traffic is robust.	The approach and methodology undertaken to inform the assessment of environmental effects arising from traffic and transport was discussed and agreed with the relevant highway authorities. **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6.4D (Volume 6.4)** details the consultation undertaken by the Applicant. Paragraphs 1.7.4 to 1.7.14 summarise discussions with CCC highway post S42 consultation and note that it had no objection to the traffic generation methodology. Paragraph 1.7.27 provides similar confirmation from National Highways.
Traffic and Transport	No justification has been provided for the 25:75 split routing north and south of the A47 respectively.	The approach and methodology undertaken to inform the assessment of environmental effects arising from traffic and transport was discussed and agreed with the relevant highway authorities. **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6.4D (Volume 6.4) [APP-075]** details the consultation undertaken by the Applicant. Paragraphs 1.7.4 to 1.7.14 summarise discussions with CCC highway post S42 consultation and note that it had no objection to the traffic generation and distribution

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		methodology. Paragraph 1.7.27 provides similar confirmation from National Highways.
Traffic and Transport	It is noted that the receptor sensitivity for a number of links e.g. links 6,7, and 8, is described as negligible in Table 6.24 of the ES. This is on the basis that the highway link is a two-way single lane carriageway with very few properties directly fronting the road and it has no footways. Link 7 is confirmed as having minimum congestion but no information is provided on links 6 and 8. However, Table 6.23 makes it clear that receptors of medium sensitivity to change in traffic flows include congested junctions. No information is provided on congestion and therefore it is not possible to determine whether the link sensitivity has been correctly described. As this receptor sensitivity is then used in the significance evaluation matrix in Table 6.26, a negligible receptor sensitivity will always result in a negligible impact, irrespective of the magnitude of change.	The sections of the A47 which form Link 6 (A47 between B198 Cromwell Road and Elm High Road) and Link 8 (A47 between B198 Cromwell Road and Guyhirn Roundabout) are component sections of the Strategic Road Network (Trunk Road network) and by nature are higher in capacity and resilient to increases in daily traffic flows. On this basis, using Table 6.23 to **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033]** the receptors have been determined to have negligible sensitivity. Junction modelling undertaken to inform the **Transport Assessment (ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4) [APP-073]** clarified that the A47/ B198 Cromwell Road roundabout junction which connects links 6 and 8 operates within capacity in the 2021 Base scenario (existing network conditions) and in the future with the development fully operational in the 2027+development scenario. The addition of operational site traffic in the AM network peak hour is expected to add 5 HGVs to Link 6 and 21 HGVs and 6 light vehicles to Link 8, in the PM network peak hour it is expected that the addition of operational traffic will add 2 HGVs to Link 6 and 7 HGVs and 2 light vehicles to Link 8. It is considered that the low levels of development traffic would not substantially increase congestion in the network peak hours on link 6 or 8.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Traffic and Transport	Paragraph 3.8.26 of the ES confirms that the material excavated from the waste bunkers would be re-used on site where possible or exported to a suitable licenced facility in the UK. As it is not clear what proportion (if any) of this excavated material will be used on site, clarification is required as to what assumptions have been made used in the transport assessment for excavated material.	**ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport Appendix 6B (Volume 6.4) [APP-073]** explains the derivation of the traffic numbers used in the assessment. It includes at Table 6B.10 EfW CHP Facility Cut and Fill and Demolition Daily Traffic Flows Per Month the number of vehicles considered necessary to export material from site during the construction phase. It confirms the maximum number as 35 two-way HGV movements in Month 5.
Noise	The ES suggests at paragraph 7.6.35 that changing the electrical load within a substation may cause additional noise from existing plant at the substation and in such circumstances, the operator and the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) would investigate, and, where a significant change in noise was identified, carry out mitigation works. No indication is provided on the likely magnitude of this increase in noise, or an indication of the mitigation works that might be necessary.	As set out in **Paragraph 7.6.34 of ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]**, the electrical infrastructure being added to Walsoken substation does not have any noise generating equipment, which would therefore entail a zero-magnitude of change. **Paragraph 7.6.35 of ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** refers to the unlikely event that the change in load and stress may give rise to unforeseen (and as such unquantifiable) noise, which would be the responsibility of the DNO to investigate and address as necessary. Therefore, the current approach is considered proportionate.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Noise	In terms of operational traffic noise, it is noted that the future year considered was 15 years after opening. It is not clear why the transport assessment was not undertaken on the same basis, rather the operational effects were limited to the scheme's opening year.	**Paragraph 7.6.39 of ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** states that "…long-term traffic data was unavailable.." and, as such, whilst qualitative consideration of future traffic noise impacts is provided, no quantitative assessment of future operational road traffic noise has been undertaken. The 15 year future assessment year is a function of the methodological approach of DMRB traffic noise impact assessment (LA111). This means that the noise assessment does not always coincide with the traffic impact assessment timescales. This does not infer that either the traffic assessment or noise assessment are incorrect because they use different assessment timescales. The year 2027 was selected for assessment because this would be the earliest time at which the maximum throughput of 625,600 tonnes would be reached, and is therefore representative of a worst case (because other traffic flows would be expected to grow after this time, whilst flows of traffic associated with the operation of the Proposed Development would remain constant).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Noise	The statement in paragraph 7.6.39 of the ES that the assessment of the future year scenario will likely indicate similar or reduced effects compared to those in the opening year, due to normal growth in traffic flows is questioned. This statement fails to take into account the rise in electric vehicles and therefore a potential reduction in the future noise baseline even with traffic growth. The predicted traffic noise increase as a result of the proposed EfW CHP facility would therefore be proportionately greater.	The assessment has been undertaken using standards and calculation methods endorsed by the DfT and the results of the assessment are in line with the standard methodology. The standards and guidance used to undertake the assessment are outlined in Table 7.9 of the **ES [APP-034].** It is possible that future road traffic noise levels may vary with an increase in Electric Vehicles (EVs). However, how traffic noise levels may vary in the future due to an increasing proportion of EVs is an emerging area of research. There are no nationally accepted policy and guidance documents or assessment tools that would facilitate assessment of future road traffic noise levels factoring in an anticipated increase in EVs. The methodology implemented in the assessment must therefore be relied upon until such time that an update to the guidance and assessment methods is necessary to account for any change that EVs may cause in road traffic noise levels. In consideration of the potential outcomes of reduced road traffic noise due to EVs, it is noted that the comment refers to a worst-case scenario where heavy vehicles are still powered by ICE. However, it is considered that if and when a modal shift to EVs occurs, heavy vehicles would also shift away from ICE, and hence the predicted traffic noise increase would likely remain in line with that predicted in the assessment, rather than causing an unexpected road traffic noise increase.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Noise	Table 7.16 fails to include any baseline noise levels and therefore it is difficult to validate the predicted increase in traffic noise.	The changes in the calculated Basic Noise Levels (BNLs) presented in Table 7.16 of the **ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** are based on traffic flow data provided by the transport consultant. The methodology used for the assessment of changes in road traffic noise levels, based on the guidance in CRTN & DMRB, is a standard approach for the assessment of traffic noise using methods endorsed by the DfT. The basis for the methodology was set out in paragraph 6.6.4 of the scoping report, and the methodology was agreed with PINS and the host authorities. Any increase in traffic noise cannot be validated against baseline noise levels, as the predicted increase in traffic noise is based on traffic flow data and is a theoretical increase independent of baseline conditions. The survey and monitoring plan **(provided in Appendix 7A [AS-010], Annex B),** including all baseline noise monitoring locations, was agreed in advance with the host authorities. To provide context, and to inform the assessment, a number of roadside baseline noise measurements were undertaken to evaluate ambient noise at receptor locations. These results were validated against the results of strategic noise mapping predictions and the results of the 2019 baseline surveying. The validation of the measured baseline sound levels is presented in **Appendix 7A [AS-010]** Section 4.1 and Section 4.3. Comparisons with the strategic noise mapping predictions and the 2019 baseline survey data indicated that the baseline data is valid for the purposes of the assessment. The results of the road traffic noise change calculations presented in Table 7.16 of the **ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** formed a screening exercise for the assessment of operational road traffic noise. The assessment of operational road traffic noise, presented in paragraphs 7.9.32 to 7.9.39 of the **ES [APP-034],** determined qualitatively that, due to the dominance of road traffic noise on Cromwell Road, impacts at R1 on New Bridge Lane would be not significant. An outline review of predicted absolute road traffic noise levels indicates that neither the predicted increase of road traffic noise at R1, or the estimated absolute sound level, would be likely give rise to any significant effects.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Noise	It is not clear how the 18-hour flow data has been factored from data using the Annual Average Daily Traffic flows. Further clarification is required.	The 18 hour flows for the baseline traffic have been based on automatic traffic count surveys (ATCs) that were undertaken between 08/10/21 and 21/10/21. The average 18 hour flow over the 2 week survey period was used for each of the count sites, disaggregated into total traffic and HGVs. Traffic growth to the future baseline was based on a TEMPro factor and committed development traffic. The peak construction traffic flow was assumed for the construction phase and anticipated daily traffic flow for the operational phase.
Noise	It is not clear how traffic noise levels on New Bridge Lane have been assessed. Paragraph 7.8.20 seems to suggest that Cromwell Road (where baseline flows of traffic are approximately 20 times greater than on New Bridge Road) is being used as a proxy for New Bridge Lane due to uncertainties as a result of low flow in the baseline year. Clarification is required.	Paragraph 7.8.20 of **the ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034]** explains that road traffic noise from vehicles on Cromwell Road are predicted to be dominant at R1 (2 New Bridge Lane). References to R2 in paragraph 7.8.20 are incorrect, these should reference R1. Receptors R2 and R3 (9 and 10 New Bridge Lane, respectively) are addressed in the subsequent paragraphs 7.8.21 to 7.8.23. With regard to the dominance of Cromwell Road at R1, Paragraph 7.8.20 of the ES [APP-034] states that (some text removed for clarity, and to remove incorrect reference to R2): *"…Predictions of traffic noise levels ….. indicate that the $L_{A10,18h}$ traffic noise level from Cromwell Road is around 5 dB above that from New Bridge Lane. As such, predicted noise increases … will be considered in the context that the dominant source of road noise is traffic on Cromwell Road, where significant flows of traffic are present. …"* There is no reference to using Cromwell Road as a proxy. The point being made is that, at R1, road traffic on Cromwell Road is dominant, and that any predicted changes in road traffic noise level at R1 from vehicles on New Bridge Lane will be considered in this context. For receptors R2 and R3 which are on New Bridge Lane, but are further away from Cromwell Road, predicted traffic noise levels have been derived using the haul road calculation method from British Standard 5228. It should be recognised that the Basic Noise Level approach used elsewhere on the project is inappropriate for the stretch of New Bridge

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		Lane where R2 and R3 are located, due to the existing and future predicted low flow and high percentage of HGVs as described in **ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration (Volume 6.2) [APP-034].**
Air Quality	It is noted that the applicant does not include anticipated improvements in air quality in the future baseline and baseline year background concentrations for all model scenarios as they are not guaranteed (paragraph 8.5.26). It is questionable as to whether this represents the worst case as if the baseline is improving, the impact of emissions from the EfW plant will be proportionally greater.	The Air Quality Assessment assesses significance of results against air quality objectives (AQOs) and Environmental Assessment Levels (EALs) for a respective pollutant. Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Table 8B2.4 reports the AQOs and EALs considered in the air quality assessment. The environmental concentration of the pollutant released into the air is referred to as the Process Contribution (PC). The PC of a particular pollutant emission to air from the development is first looked at against the respective AQO for this pollutant. The majority of the PC considered in the air quality assessment can be screened out as insignificant impacts, following the Environment Agency's guidance. If they cannot be screened out, then the air quality assessment looks at the Process Environmental Contribution (PEC) against the relevant AQO. The PEC includes the PC of a pollutant emissions and the background emissions. If we assume the future baseline is improving, this will mean that we have a lower PEC. When we then compare the PEC to the AQO or AQS, then we will show a reduced impact. Therefore we would not be representing a worse case. The Applicant's approach has assessed worse case. Furthermore, if we were to consider a reduced future baseline, the outcome of our assessment would not change, which is that the impacts from the development are not significant.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Air Quality	It is not clear why the scenarios set out at paragraph 8.6.18 include an assessment at 2024 with construction and with the proposed development. If the EfW plant is not due to open until 2026, clarification is required as to why it is included in the 2024 with construction scenario.	Please see Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Section 5: traffic emissions methodology details that the 2024 scenario is a with construction scenario. The 2027 scenario is a with development scenario which means this is the scenario containing operational traffic.
Air Quality	It is noted that the applicant has used the Best Available Techniques (BAT) Associated Emission Levels (AEL) as the basis for defining the pollutant emission concentrations in preference to the Emission Limit Value ELVs in Annex VI of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)(see paragraph 8.6.22). No information is provided on how these values relate to each other and therefore it is difficult to conclude on the appropriateness of this approach, particularly when the summary rationale included in Table 8.35 refers back to the fact that the plant will be designed to achieve defined ELVs.	Noted. Please refer to **paragraph 4.2.3 of** Rev 2 of the **Air Quality Technical Report (ES Appendix 8B Chapter 8 Air Quality Appendices) (Volume 6.4)** submitted at Deadline 1. Annex VI of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) provides Emission Limit Vales (ELVs) for consideration for a permit application. BAT-conclusions set out BAT Emission Assessment Levels (EALs). Article 14(3) of the IED establishes that the BAT Conclusions shall be the reference for setting permit conditions, whilst Article 15(3) establishes that Regulators should set limits on emissions that do not exceed emission levels associated with BAT. This is how the two related to each other. Important to note is that the BAT EALs can be updated periodically to reflect changes in BAT. This is the main difference between the BAT EALs and those found within Annex VI of the IED. This assessment utilises the EALs found within the BAT conclusions document for waste incineration from 2019. Therefore, the EALs from this BAT conclusion supersede the ELVs within Annex VI of the IED.
Landscape and Visual	Paragraph 3.8.26 of the ES confirms that the material excavated from the waste bunkers would be re-used on site where possible or exported to a suitable licenced facility in the UK. Information on the amount of excavated material is not provided in the ES (reference is made only to the base of the foundation slab being 12m below Finished Flood Level	Paragraph 3.8.48 of the ES Chapter 3 Description of Development states that approximately 70,000m3 of material would need to be removed and this has been factored into the traffic assessment. Construction traffic, excavation and re-profiling works have been considered as part of the overall ground/low level construction activity assessed in the landscape and visual chapter including the creation of the finished ground levels and visibility of construction plant, equipment and activity as set out in Table 3.3 of the ES including tracked excavators, dozers and articulated dump

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	(FFL), although paragraph 3.4.11 makes it clear that the maximum limit of deviation would allow for the bunkers to be constructed up to 14m below FFL. Clarification is required as to what, if anything, has been assessed.	trucks. These lower level construction activities are assessed during the construction phase as set out in Appendix 9G: Landscape Character Assessment Tables, Appendix 9H: Townscape Character Assessment Tables and Appendix 9J: Visual Assessment Tables (**Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Appendices [APP-079]**) and section 9.9 of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual [APP-036]**.
Landscape and Visual	Whilst the landscape assessment states in Table 9.1 that the full range of activities and components proposed, including the deposition of excavated waste materials, has been assessed in the LVIA, this cannot be the case if it is unclear what proportion (if any) of this excavated material will be used on site. Furthermore, as no information is provided on whether this material is likely to be contaminated, it is not possible to conclude on its suitability for use on site.	Paragraph 3.8.48 of the **ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030]** states that approximately 70,000m3 of material would need to be removed and this has been factored into the traffic assessment. Construction traffic, excavation and re-profiling works have been considered as part of the overall ground/low level construction activity assessed in the landscape and visual chapter including the creation of the finished ground levels and visibility of construction plant, equipment and activity as set out in Table 3.3 of the ES including tracked excavators, dozers and articulated dump trucks. These lower level construction activities are assessed during the construction phase as set out in Appendix 9G: Landscape Character Assessment Tables, Appendix 9H: Townscape Character Assessment Tables and Appendix 9J: Visual Assessment Tables (**Volume 6.4 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Appendices [APP-079]**) and section 9.9 of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual [APP-036]**. **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 13 Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land [APP-040]** sets out the baseline with regard to contamination with Table 13.15 detailing the embedded environmental measures. This states that "Contamination if found will be subject to appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, either removed, treated and/or mitigated as part of the Proposed Development. **The Outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) [APP-103],** includes an unexpected contamination protocol." The likelihood of encountering contaminated land is low.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Landscape	The landscape assessment refers to potential changes to the future landscape baseline (paragraph 9.5.53), including new wind energy schemes which may create visual landmarks on the predominantly flat landscape. It is not clear what role this potential future landscape has played in the assessment of landscape effects. Only schemes that are likely to be delivered should be considered as part of the future baseline.	Given the uncertainty as to future wind farm development within the LVIA Study Area, the assessment has been completed against a current baseline. Reference to development within allocated sites has been made where appropriate at Year 15 but again, the uncertainty in these schemes being delivered, means that they have not influenced the assessment. The landscape and visual cumulative assessment in **Chapter 18 of the ES Cumulative Effects Assessment (Volume 6.2) [APP-090]** sets out the schemes assessed in Table 18.9 which does not include wind energy schemes.
Landscape	Table 9.15 contains a summary of significance of adverse effects on landscape and townscape receptors. The way the information is presented makes it very difficult for the reader to understand the basis for the judgements on sensitivity, magnitude of change and significance. Reference is required to numerous appendices (of which there are 570 pages) to piece this information together.	The expanded LVIA Study Area requested by Cambridgeshire County Council's landscape advisors resulted in 117 landscape and visual receptors being considered in the LVIA. WSP's experience of undertaking LVIAs for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects indicates that a succinct summary in the Environmental Statement Chapter is the most accessible way to present the conclusions, with the evidence base and detailed assessments provided in appendices. These appendices demonstrate that a robust and transparent process in accordance with best practice guidance has been undertaken. Cross references have been provided throughout **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual [APP-036]** to direct the reader to the relevant appendix document.
Historic Environment	The policy tests in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) on the consideration of potential impacts are not properly addressed in the ES. Reference should be made to the balancing exercise required between harm and public benefit in undertaking the assessment as a key determinant of significance.	Table 10.5 of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037]** sets out the relevant provisions of the NPPF and where these are addressed within the ES chapter. The purpose of the ES chapter is to describe and assess the effects of the proposed development on the historic environment. The balancing exercise is provided in **Volume 7.1 Planning Statement [APP-091]**.
Historic Environment	It is not clear why the potential for sub-surface archaeology is limited to remains of agricultural activity and peat and estuarine deposits based on previous archaeological investigations within the study area alone. No information is provided on the extent or location of these previous investigations and therefore it is	Section 10.4: Data gathering methodology of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037]** sets out the basis for the study area pertaining to direct effects and the sources consulted including historic maps, historic environment record data, environment agency LiDAR data, previous archaeological investigations and walkover survey and sets out the basis for judging potential for archaeological survival from low to high. Section 10.5 provides a summary of the judgement on sub-surface archaeological potential within the areas of proposed development,

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	not possible to verify whether this assumption is reasonable.	including information on the location and extent of previous investigations (locations relative to the areas of proposed development are set out in the accompanying figures).
Historic Environment	Notwithstanding this, no indication is given as to the heritage significance of the peat and estuarine deposits. Paragraph 10.9.4 makes it clear that such deposits may be prehistoric in date, but it is not known if they are associated with human occupation or activity. Paragraph 10.9.8 continues by stating that 'while the heritage significance of these deposits is not known, this will be Not Significant'. This conclusion is unsubstantiated and should not be relied upon.	CCC's response states that "*Sections 10.9.5 to 10.9.9 estimate the impact to potential archaeological assets and paleoenvironmental contexts assuming the assets will be of low heritage significance and the impacts as not significant. In this context and due to the extant impacts of the current site's development and use impacts, we agree with this statement and approve the provision at 10.9.8 for monitoring and recording of the mixed freshwater and marine deposit sequence with the objective of seeking incipient soils indicative of drier land conditions able to host human activity and by researching the surfaces of roddonised prehistoric river channels, in accordance with the East of England Research Framework agenda: "Question: Multi 08 - How can we better realise the archaeological potential of the fenland?"* ". It is agreed with CCC that the **outline CEMP (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** will be updated to include the commitment for post consent geoarchaeological boreholes. This updated CEMP will be submitted during the Examination phase and the final CEMP would need to be approved by CCC as part of the discharge of the DCO requirements.
Historic Environment	The statement that archaeological remains are not expected to be present within the area of the access improvements also requires substantiation (paragraph 19.9.9).	See paragraph 10.5.5 of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037]** regarding the site of the access improvements. The location of the access improvements comprises an existing road (construction of which may be expected to have disturbed archaeological remains which may have been present within its footprint) and the sole known heritage record is the former March and Wisbech branch Railway (MCB19612). The access improvements are located on existing roads and are considered to have a low archaeological potential owing to previous development.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Historic Environment	The justification for the conclusion that the EfW CHP buildings and chimneys would result in an effect of Very Low magnitude on the Wisbech Conservation Area on the basis that it would be seen in the context of existing large scale industrial buildings is not accepted. The proposed facility is of an entirely different scale to the surrounding buildings. Paragraph 10.9.42 makes it clear that the upper parts of the tallest buildings and chimneys of the EfW CHP Facility would be clearly visible on the skyline from the Conservation Area. Even if a magnitude of Low is ascribed to the effect on the Conservation Area, based on the classification of effects set out at Table 10.16, this would lead to a moderate (probably significant) effect.	The significance of the conservation area, the nature of its setting and contribution to the same and the importance of particular views are set out in section 10.9 of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037]**. This includes a description of the individual character areas within the conservation area including the Brinks, with a photomontage from Elgood's Brewery on North Brink (**Figure 9.23b Viewpoint 7, Volume 6.3 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual Figures 9.17 to 9.24 [APP-058]**) showing the greatest extent of visibility from within the conservation area. Taking account of the heritage significance of the conservation area as a whole and the identified key views within and out from it, and the context of the existing industrial estate including large logistics buildings, the assessed level of Very Low is correct.
Hydrology / Biodiversity	The ES makes no assessment of the operation of the EfW CHP on the water environment. Chapter 12 confirms that there is hydrological connectivity between the site and the River Nene CWS via the HWIDB drains which flow to the south of the proposed development and then discharge into the River Nene. The CWS is designated for river habitat supporting scarce plant species.	Surface water runoff to ditches within the EfW CHP Facility Site will be managed by interceptors before discharge, and discharge will be to green-field run-off rates. For the majority of the River Nene CWS within 2km of the Proposed Development the river is canalised, with the riparian corridor contained within flood defence walls. Narrow strips of steep riverbank approximately 5-15m wide exist between the toe of the riverbank and the flood defence walls, and are mostly dominated by tall ruderal vegetation consisting of common and widespread plant species. The river channel within this area is tidal, with exposed mud along the channel edges at low tide, tidal scouring and highly turbid water, and is unlikely to support the main aquatic macrophyte interest features of the CWS (pondweed species). The interest features of the River Nene CWS are therefore not considered to occur within the zone of interest of the Proposed Development.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Paragraph 12.6.9 of Chapter 12 (Hydrology) states that potential effects on specific species and aquatic and riparian biodiversity are assessed within Chapter 11 (Biodiversity). However paragraph 11.8.15 states that as Chapter 12 does not identify any likely significant effects on the hydraulic regimes across designated biodiversity sites or ground water dependent terrestrial ecosystems due to the construction or operation of the proposed development, the ecological features that these designated biodiversity sites and habitats support will also not be subject to likely significant effects. Not only is this inconsistent with the statement in the hydrology chapter, it fails to take into account the potential for impacts on aquatic flora and fauna from impacts set out in the NPS for Renewable Energy EN-3. It notes that the design of water cooling systems for EfW stations will have additional impacts on water quality, abstraction and discharge (paragraph 2.5.84), including discharging water at a higher temperature than the receiving water affecting the biodiversity of aquatic flora and fauna.	The proposed water discharges from the operational EfW CHP Facility into the adjacent HWIDB drains is for surface water runoff collected across impermeable areas. Water from the cooling systems will not be discharged into HWIDB drains and therefore no impacts on biodiversity are predicted. **Section 3.4.37 ES chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Developments (Volume 6.2) [APP-030]** states; *"Emissions to Water* *In normal operation, the EfW CHP Facility would produce virtually no liquid effluent. Clean water such as boiler blowdown water or backwash water from the WTP [water treatment plant] (ID18) would be returned to the ash quench system on the boiler. However, some regeneration water from the WTP would be periodically discharged to the foul sewer via the neutralisation tank. Dirty water such as the run-off from the IBA conveying system would be returned to the ash quench system".* **Section 3.4.37 ES chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Developments (Volume 6.2) [APP-030]** states; *"Drainage…* *"During the operational phase, surface water runoff would be collected and attenuated underground with further attenuation occurring in SuDS features (swale, detention basin and filter strip) in the southern part of the site which would meet the treatment requirements set out in the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753. Surface water from the northern part of the site would need to be pumped into the attenuation tanks located in the southern part of the site. Attenuated and treated runoff would be discharged into the HWIDB network at greenfield runoff rates. Runoff from the car park will be attenuated beneath the permeable paved surfaced area, before discharging into the HWIDB drain at greenfield runoff rates.* ***Figure 3.12 Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.3)*** *illustrates the operational drainage strategy".*

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	The impacts of the deep waste storage bunker on ground water flows does not appear to have been considered and no assessment has been undertaken of the potential failure of the integrity of the concrete bunker due to ground movements or other factors.	During the Construction Phase, groundwater arising from the deep excavations will be pumped into the attenuation basins located in the TCC (ii) area, which have been sized to accommodate the anticipated groundwater flows, prior to discharge into the IDB drain. For the Operation Phase, the walls and base of the deep waste bunker will be tanked and designed to prevent water ingress and to resist uplift pressures to counter the effects of flotation caused by the potential high groundwater table. The foundation design type will be considered during the detailed design stage but will take into account lateral and uplift/buoyancy pressures caused by high groundwater levels. A perimeter drain will be installed adjacent to the walls of the bunker to relieve pore water pressures from the walls of the bunker.
Hydrology	Equally, no assessment appears to have been made of potential impacts of accidental fire or fire-fighting on the water environment.	More information on the management of contaminated fire-fighting water has been provided in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. In summary the EfW Facility will be designed to deal with water contaminated during a fire. The tipping hall and waste bunkers have a large capacity fort retaining fire-fighting water within the building footprint. The water will then be directed towards the waste reception pit for storage, treatment (if required) and appropriate disposal. The shut off valve to the surface water drainage system is connected to the alarm system and will close to prevent contaminated water being discharged into the drains. The water would be retained in the SuDS and underground tanks for treatment (if required) and appropriate disposal
Hydrology	Paragraph 12.5.40 of the ES confirms that the entirety of the EfW CHP site lies within Flood Zone 3. The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) makes it clear at paragraph 5.7.13 that preference should be given to locating projects in Flood Zone 1. If there is no reasonably available site in Flood Zone 1, then projects can be located in Flood Zone 2. If there is no reasonably alternative site in Flood Zones 1 or 2, then nationally significant energy infrastructure projects can be located in Flood Zone 3 subject to the Exception Test. Paragraph 5.7.9 states that in determining an application for development consent, the	Sequential Test The Applicant's consideration of the sequential test is set out within **the FRA (ES Chapter 12 Hydrology, Appendix 12A FRA (Volume 6.4) [APP-084]** and summarised within the **Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) [APP-091].** At the time the EfW CHP Facility Site was first identified and at the point the option agreement for the land comprising the majority of the EfW CHP Facility Site was signed in 2019, the EfW CHP Facility Site was allocated in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste and Minerals Development Plan Site Specific Allocations 2012 as a Waste Allocation

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	decision maker should be satisfied that where relevant the Sequential Test has been applied as part of site selection.	and Consultation Area (W1C inset map 39) as site allocation W1C (an allocation for waste recycling and recovery facilities (non-landfill) under Policy SSP W1. In view of national policy as set out in EN-1, Draft EN1, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance Flood Risk and Coastal Change there was no requirement upon the Applicant to undertake a sequential test at the time it selected the site, nor through the stages of scoping and period of non-statutory consultation (at which times it still comprised an allocation). In July 2021 (after the commencement of the statutory consultation period for the Proposed Development), the Development Plan was replaced by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021. This Plan does not allocate sites for waste management purposes instead identifying waste management areas (Policy 10 WMAs). WMAs are existing or committed waste management sites. The EfW CHP Facility Site is identified as a WMA 'existing or committed waste management facility' in the 2021 Minerals and Waste Local Plan and retained within the Fenland Local Plan 2014 as an allocated waste management site. Following the adoption of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021, and taking into account feedback received during statutory consultation, the Applicant re-evaluated its site selection process. As part of this re-evaluation, the Applicant undertook a sequential test which considered other WMAs in the Wisbech area (as set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084]). The FRA (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084]) records that the WMA which is located approximately 0.5km to the east of the EfW CHP Facility is too small to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility of the type and size proposed (3.5ha). The other WMA is located approximately 2.5km to the north and alongside the River Nene and is close to residential areas and does not benefit from proximity to larger users of heat.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		The Applicant did not identify any other available sites that met its essential site selection criteria, in particular the availability of potential CHP users, and that were located in either Flood Zone 1 or 2. Site layout Having applied the sequential test, the Applicant followed a sequential approach at the site level, consistent with NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.7.9, with the EA with the identification on compatible and non-compatible uses within the relevant flood zones. The definition of such uses was agreed with the EA at a meeting on 28/4/21 and with CCC on 26 October 2021. Essential infrastructure elements of the EfW CGHP Facility, CHP Connection and Grid Connection were required to pass Part 2 of the Exception Test. The Part 2 assessment is presented **in FRA (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084])** and provides further detail at Section 7.2 which demonstrates that the Proposed Development would be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, would reduce flood risk overall. It also demonstrates how the Essential Infrastructure located in Flood Zone 3a has been designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of flood.
Hydrology	The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A of the ES) states that there are no reasonably available alternative suitable sites at a lower risk of flooding and as such passes the Sequential Test. As the site selection process did not include an assessment of alternative sites at a lower risk of flooding (see Table 2.1 of the ES), as a matter of fact, the Sequential Test cannot have been met. Not only were alternative sites not considered, flood risk was not even identified as either an essential or desirable criterion in the site selection process. This is a significant omission.	Sequential Test The Applicant's consideration of the sequential test is set out within **the FRA (ES Chapter 12 Hydrology, Appendix 12A FRA (Volume 6.4) [APP-084]** and summarised within the **Planning Statement (Volume 7.1) [APP-091].** At the time the EfW CHP Facility Site was first identified and at the point the option agreement for the land comprising the majority of the EfW CHP Facility Site was signed in 2019, the EfW CHP Facility Site was allocated in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste and Minerals Development Plan Site Specific Allocations 2012 as a Waste Allocation and Consultation Area (W1C inset map 39) as site allocation W1C (an

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		allocation for waste recycling and recovery facilities (non-landfill) under Policy SSP W1. In view of national policy as set out in EN-1, Draft EN1, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance Flood Risk and Coastal Change there was no requirement upon the Applicant to undertake a sequential test at the time it selected the site, nor through the stages of scoping and period of non-statutory consultation (at which times it still comprised an allocation). In July 2021 (after the commencement of the statutory consultation period for the Proposed Development), the Development Plan was replaced by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021. This Plan does not allocate sites for waste management purposes instead identifying waste management areas (Policy 10 WMAs). WMAs are existing or committed waste management sites. The EfW CHP Facility Site is identified as a WMA 'existing or committed waste management facility' in the 2021 Minerals and Waste Local Plan and retained within the Fenland Local Plan 2014 as an allocated waste management site. Following the adoption of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021, and taking into account feedback received during statutory consultation, the Applicant re-evaluated its site selection process. As part of this re-evaluation, the Applicant undertook a sequential test which considered other WMAs in the Wisbech area (as set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084]). The FRA (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084]) records that the WMA which is located approximately 0.5km to the east of the EfW CHP Facility is too small to accommodate the EfW CHP Facility of the type and size proposed (3.5ha). The other WMA is located approximately 2.5km to the north and alongside the River Nene and is close to residential areas and does not benefit from proximity to larger users of heat.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		The Applicant did not identify any other available sites that met its essential site selection criteria, in particular the availability of potential CHP users, and that were located in either Flood Zone 1 or 2. Site layout Having applied the sequential test, the Applicant followed a sequential approach at the site level, consistent with NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.7.9, with the EA with the identification on compatible and non-compatible uses within the relevant flood zones. The definition of such uses was agreed with the EA at a meeting on 28/4/21 and with CCC on 26 October 2021. Essential infrastructure elements of the EfW CGHP Facility, CHP Connection and Grid Connection were required to pass Part 2 of the Exception Test. The Part 2 assessment is presented **in FRA (Appendix 12A FRA Volume 6.4 [APP-084])** and provides further detail at Section 7.2 which demonstrates that the Proposed Development would be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, would reduce flood risk overall. It also demonstrates how the Essential Infrastructure located in Flood Zone 3a has been designed and constructed to remain operational and safe in times of flood.
Geology	The potential to create new contaminant migration pathways, such as increasing the potential for surface water runoff and the increased likelihood of contaminants leaching or migrating in groundwater or surface water, causing deterioration in surface water quality is discussed in Chapter 13. It is noted that this cannot be ruled out, notably at the Wisbech Canal landfill. A moderate/low risk is assessed for impacts on surface water receptors from the grid connection (paragraph 13.8.67 of the ES).	The embedded measures in Table 13.15, **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 13 Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land [APP-040]** include a commitment to ensure suitable handling of excavated materials suspected or confirmed to be contaminated to prevent the migration of contaminants to ground or to surface water, through measures such as the use of impermeable sheeting, segregation of temporarily stored or stockpiled materials and construction drainage design. The commitment to reuse excavated materials in accordance with the Definition of Waste: Code of Practice (DoWCoP) via the use of a Materials Management Plan (MMP) means that excavated material must be confirmed to be suitable for use, through risk assessment, before it is reused within the Proposed Development. Implementation of these measures will ensure that the construction phase of the Proposed Development does not result in the creation of new contaminant migration pathways that could impact on

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		surface water receptors or other receptors such as human health or groundwater.
Geology	Without control, the installation of cable trenches could result in new contaminant pathways being formed which may result in pollution of controlled waters during the operational phase. Embedded mitigation measures are proposed, including a commitment to carry out a further Phase 2 intrusive investigation. Without the outcome of this further investigation, it is not possible to conclude that the risk level will stay at moderate/low and therefore the conclusion that the effect is negligible and not significant cannot be relied upon.	The embedded measures in Table 13.15, **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 13 Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land [APP-040]** include the commitment to reuse excavated materials in accordance with the Definition of Waste: Code of Practice (DoWCoP) via the use of a Materials Management Plan (MMP). This helps to minimise waste during construction, and reduces the requirement to import natural materials such as soil and rock. Where contamination is present, risk assessment is used to determine the specification for materials used on the site, relative to where the materials are to be used on the site, to confirm that there will be no unacceptable risks to (i) human health (ii) controlled waters and (iii) any other relevant receptors, as a result of the reuse of the material(s) following their reuse. As outlined in Table 13.15, **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 13 Geology, Hydrogeology and Contaminated Land [APP-040]**, the Applicant is committed to the Proposed Development being designed in compliance with the UK Government's Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) guidance, so that following development the land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Where contaminants are known to be present in soil or groundwater, as identified during Phase 2 ground investigation, or where unexpected contamination is encountered during construction, risk assessment will be used to assess the current risk to receptors and the risk following construction of the Proposed Development. If a new structure is to be constructed on, adjacent to, or within ground affected by contamination, the design will include measures to address the associated risks (including the possible creation of new contaminant migration pathways) accordingly. Where potentially unacceptable risks exist, design measures (or other measures such as land remediation) will be used to sufficiently lower the risk e.g., Where construction of a new service trench could create a contaminant migration pathway, the risk may be lowered through design by using materials impermeable to the contaminants present, or through remediation of pre-

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		existing contamination in soil or groundwater, in order to remove or sufficiently lower the risk of contaminant migration.
Climate	Climate change is considered in Chapter 14 of the ES. Paragraph 14.5.5 refers to national and regional/local market and policy trends that are likely to lead to carbon emissions reductions in the future which are beyond the control of the Proposed Development such as the reduction in the amount of food in municipal waste. To provide a 'like for like' comparison, the assessment is based on a comparison of the 'with Proposed Development' case to the 'without Proposed Development' case. The ES makes it clear that in both cases, the assumed market and policy trends are the same.	Comments noted.
Waste need	Following on from the above, paragraph 14.5.6 confirms that the future baseline includes the effect of national and regional/local market trends and assumes that, without the Proposed Development, residual waste arisings are landfilled over the same period as the development would be operational i.e. between 2026 and 2066. It is not clear what market trends have been taken into account and how they have influenced the final assessment. Without this information, it is not possible to determine the veracity of the conclusions of the climate change assessment.	Future residual waste requirements identified in the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** are drawn entirely from the evidence bases of extant and emerging Waste Local Plans. The data contained in these evidence bases has been collated by Waste Planning Authorities and been subjected to rigorous public examination. Furthermore, the data (and associated assumptions) has been validated by publicly available research papers and Regional Technical Advisory Body (RTAB) studies. As part of the Examination process, the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** will be updated to reflect the latest publicly available data.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Waste need	Notwithstanding the concerns regarding the application of the approach set out above, fundamentally the assumption that the current proportion of residual waste that is currently landfilled will continue to be so until 2066 is not credible. This would be contrary to policy trends (which purportedly have been taken into account) requiring waste to be managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy and only landfilled when all other options have been ruled out. If the Applicant is assuming a declining proportion of waste is landfilled to 2066, these assumptions need to be clearly set out and justified.	In 2020, ~11 million tonnes of residual HIC waste was disposed of to landfill, and 1.63 million tonnes was exported as RDF to Europe and beyond. The **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** has sought to forecast how much of this landfilled material is likely to continue to require diversion in the future. Indeed, by 2030, it is predicted that even if the Government's ambitious combined recycling target of 65% for municipal and 'municipal like' commercial and industrial waste is realised, there would remain a minimum shortfall of ~2.8 million tonnes of residual HIC capacity in the UK (rising to over 6 million tonnes if the Government's recycling target is undershot by 5%). There is, however, significant doubt on the achievability of this recycling target. In 2021, municipal waste recycling stood at 43.8% - a level which falls well below the achievement of the 2020 target of 50%. To achieve the Government's new, more stringent target of 65% by 2035, there needs to be an increase of over 21% in recycling in England over the next 14 years. In this regard, the WFAA has considered several recycling and waste reduction scenarios and under each - even the 'stretch' / aspirational targets, it is predicted that there would remain a need for the diversion of residual wate from landfill.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	Rather than assess greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) of the proposal against those produced by the existing waste and aggregate recycling facility and waste transfer station, i.e. the current environmental baseline as required by Schedule 4 (3) of the EIA Regulations, the proposals have been against the aforementioned future baseline scenario. This is stated as being a reasonable worst-case scenario. It is not the purpose of the EIA Regulations to seek to establish the worst-case baseline scenario against which to assess the proposals as to do so would underestimate the likely impact of the proposals.	The assessment in **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]** is based on a reasonable worst-case scenario (the 'with Proposed Development' case) and comparison with the future baseline scenario where waste continues to be sent to landfill (the 'without Proposed Development' case). The worst-case refers to the assessment of the Proposed EfW CHP Facility. This worst-case is then assessed against the reasonable alternative future baseline (i.e. waste is sent to landfill). This assessment is in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations and the IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions.
Waste need	The ES assumes that residual waste that is currently exported to continental Europe as Refuse Derived Fuel would be landfilled in the future baseline on the basis that the increase in the price of haulage makes this disposal route a less financially viable option. In support of this decision, the Applicant cites Government policy which is focussed upon applying the proximity principle i.e. management waste at a location as close as reasonably possible to where the waste is generated. This is completely contrary to the assumptions used in the WFAA which relies on waste being transported significant distances to the Medworth plant, when in many cases this will not represent the closest facility particularly with the new EfW plants that have recently come on stream or are due to before 2026 (the opening date of the proposed facility).	Waste markets in the UK are directly influenced by a range of factors including waste type, availability of management capacity and government fiscal, waste management and planning policies. Whilst waste should be managed as close as possible to its point of origin, the complex range of influencing factors inevitably means there is a flow of material across the country (and beyond). In this context, it is important to recognise that the Proposed Development is likely to draw in waste from a wider area, than say, simply Cambridgeshire, and that over the life of the Proposed Development, the area from which it will receive waste material is likely to change. The local analysis of need in the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** has been based on the area that the Proposed Development is most likely to draw waste in from. This has been defined as an area approximately a 2-hour drive time from the Proposed Development. It is generally commercially viable to transport non-hazardous household, industrial and commercial waste from up to around 2 hours away, over 2 hours the haulage cost becomes increasingly expensive.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	The data presented in the GHG assessment is not credible and has been manipulated by the Applicant and therefore the conclusions should not be relied upon.	Please refer to the Applicant's responses to specific comments raised by Wisbech Town Council. The assessment in **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]** is in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations and the IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions.
Waste need	Notwithstanding the above, further justification is required for the landfill baseline. There are other baseline scenarios that could be considered such as alternative thermal treatment technologies.	Defra's Guidance on applying the waste hierarchy (Guidance on Applying the Waste Hierarchy, June 2011) notes in section 1 (page 3) that 'other recovery' comprises: anaerobic digestion, incineration with energy recovery, gasification and pyrolysis which produce energy (fuels, heat and power) and materials from waste; some backfilling. However, the document also goes on to outline in section 2.2 that for residual 'black bag' (the waste stream which is the focus of the WFAA), 'recovery' waste management options comprise: • Solid recovered fuel derived from mechanical heat treatment (MHT) or mechanical biological treatment (MBT), where it replaces coal; • Energy Recovery, all technologies (Heat Only); • Energy Recovery, all technologies (CHP); • Energy Recovery, all technologies (Electricity Only); or • MBT or MHT outputs used as fuel (but do not replace coal). When considering existing recovery capacity within the study area and within England, it can be confirmed that the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** has included at all appropriate forms of recovery capacity.
Waste need	The amount of waste available as fuel for the proposed EfW CHP facility is grossly exaggerated in the Waste Fuel Availability Assessment and therefore reliance on this document as an input to the climate change assessment will significantly over estimate the carbon savings of the proposed facility in comparison with the landfill baseline.	The **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** is a robust assessment which: 1. Is based on publicly available waste data from a range of sources including DEFRA, the Environment Agency, evidence bases from relevant Waste Local Plans and published research papers; 2. Looks at the national (UK) and a more local need for the residual waste management capacity that the Project offers; and 3. For both analysis - considers the availability of only those waste streams that would be suitable for treatment at the proposed Project, and which is currently disposed of by landfill or export. This comprises household, industrial and commercial (HIC) waste predominantly from the European Waste Classification (EWC) chapter 19 (that is waste from waste management facilities) and chapter 20 (that is household waste and similar commercial, industrial and institutional wastes).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		As part of the Examination process, the **WFAA (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]** will be updated to reflect the latest publicly available data.
Climate	It is not clear what assumptions have been made regarding CHP given that the Proposed Development does not include CHP connections to individual premises and therefore there can be no certainty to what extent this element of the project will be delivered. Table 14.15 suggests the provision of CHP is an embedded measure influencing the assessment.	The Proposed Development has been conceived and designed with CHP in mind. Sensitivity testing for emissions avoided from the potential export of steam from the EfW CHP facility is included in **Appendix 14C – Sensitivity analysis (Volume 6.4) [APP-088**]; however, for the main GHG assessment a worst-case scenario is assessed and therefore this benefit of export from the CHP has not been accounted for as an embedded measure in the assessment.
Climate	As the reprocessing of IBA and any other waste products into recycled materials is not carried out at the EfW CHP Facility site, the Applicant has scoped out the GHG emissions from the assessment as they are not considered attributable to the Proposed Development (Table 14.17). The management of IBA and APCr are an intrinsic part of the operation of an EfW plant and should be assessed. The suggestion that they are not attributable to the proposed development is absurd	As stated in Table 14.17 of **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]**, the reprocessing of IBA and any other waste products into recycled materials is not carried out at the EfW CHP Facility Site and GHG emission benefits are therefore not considered attributable to the Proposed Development, and so have not been calculated as part of the assessment. In accordance with the GHG Protocol, the emissions from the reprocessing of IBA and any other waste products are attributable to the user of the recycled materials and not the producer of the waste.
Climate	Notwithstanding the above, the suggestion that anything not carried out at the proposal site should not be considered in the assessment is completely contrary to the baselineGHG assessment which assumes residual waste is landfilled at sites throughout the Study Area, i.e. not at the EfW CHP Facility site.	Clarification on the boundary of the assessment of IBA provided above. The scope of the 'with Proposed Development' (Table 14.17) and 'without Proposed Development' (Table 14.18) scenarios are clearly defined within the assessment in **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]**. The determination of the spatial scope for each scenario is in accordance with the latest IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions and the infrastructure life-cycle modules set out in PAS 2080: Carbon Management Infrastructure.
Climate	No information is included on the transport assumptions associated with the management of IBA and APCr. It is not clear where this material will be processed. Similarly no information is included on the transport assumptions associated with the import of consumables necessary to operate the facility.	As stated in paragraph 14.9.29 of **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041],** the assessment for the transport of IBA is based upon the BEIS 2021 emissions conversion factor for the recycling of commercial and industrial waste, which includes transport to a reclamation facility (as per the boundary defined above in line with the GHG Protocol). For APCr, emissions are based upon the BEIS 2021

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		emissions conversion factor for the landfill of aggregates, which includes collection, transportation and landfill emissions.
Climate	The climate change assessment is both flawed and incomplete and should not be relied upon.	Please refer to the Applicant's response to specific comments raised. The assessment in ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041] is in accordance with the requirements of the EIA Regulations and the IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions.

Table 3.3 Applicant's Comments on the Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Relevant Representation [RR-011]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Compulsory Acquisition	This is the section 56 representation of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (Network Rail) provided in respect of Medworth CHP Limited's (Applicant's) application for a Development Consent Order (Order) which seeks powers to enable the construction of the Medworth Energy from Waste Combined Heat and Power Facility (Scheme). Network Rail is a statutory undertaker and owns, operates and maintains the majority of the rail infrastructure of Great Britain. The Book of Reference (BoR) identifies 13 plots (Plots) as land owned by Network Rail including 12 plots in respect of which compulsory acquisition powers to acquire new rights are sought. The compulsory acquisition powers sought are described in the BoR as being compulsory acquisition and temporary use of land and acquisition of new rights (including restrictions) (Compulsory Powers).	At Procedural Deadline A, the Applicant submitted an agreed Draft SoCG [PDA-002] that summaries the pre and post DCO Application submission engagement and current status of discussions with Network Rail. In summary; The Order limits of the Proposed Development include the disused March to Wisbech Railway infrastructure which crosses New Bridge Lane and runs along the north-west boundary of the EfW CHP Facility along the CHP Connection Corridor. Network Rail own this disused Railway. To introduce the Proposed Development and commence the Business and Technical Clearance process, the Applicant first contacted Network Rail in November 2019. Post statutory consultation, in September 2021 the Applicant and Network Rail established a monthly progress meeting to recommence the Business and Technical Clearance process and commence discussions relating to Protective Provisions. To date, the Applicant has secured Business Clearance with Network Rail and is currently in discussions about the Technical Clearance.
Safety	Network Rail notes that the Compulsory Powers are sought in relation to operational railway land forming part of the disused but operational railway being the March to Wisbech Line. (Line). Although the Line is currently not in use, Network Rail intends to reopen the Line in the near future. The Applicant proposes running an overground pipeline (Pipeline) along the eastern edge of the Line and claims that the Scheme has been designed so as not to prevent the	

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	reopening of the Line. Network Rail has concerns around the safety aspect of running the Pipeline alongside an operational railway.	Draft Heads of Terms are being discussed relating to a potential bridge or other form of crossing in the event that the March to Wisbech Railway is brought back into use in the future. The Applicant's solicitors are also negotiating Protective Provisions and a Framework Agreement with Network Rail's solicitors.
Compulsory Acquisition	The Applicant also proposes that the currently disused level crossing on New Bridge Lane will form part of the main site access for the Scheme. Network Rail and the Applicant are in discussions to secure Scheme access if the Line is reopened. Network Rail objects to the inclusion of the Plots in the Order and to the acquisition of Compulsory Powers in respect of it. The Plots constitutes land acquired by Network Rail for the purpose of its statutory undertaking and, accordingly, this representation is made under section 56 and sections 127 and 138 of the Planning Act 2008. Network Rail considers that there is no compelling case in the public interest for the acquisition of the Compulsory Powers and Network Rail considers that the Secretary of State, in applying section 127 of the Planning Act 2008, cannot conclude that new rights and restrictions over the railway land can be created without serious detriment to Network Rail's undertaking; no other land is available to Network Rail which means that the detriment can be made good by them.	The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of Network Rail in Part 8 of Schedule 11 to the **Draft DCO (Volume3.1) [APP-013].** The Protective Provisions will ensure that there will not be any serious detriment to Network Rail's undertaking as a result of the Proposed Development. The parties are currently negotiating a framework agreement and property agreements relating to the land and rights required for the Proposed Development and any crossing should the March to Wisbech Railway be reopened in the future. The Applicant intends to include a provision in the Protective Provisions contained in Part 8 of Schedule 11 to the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1)** that would prohibit the use of compulsory acquisitions powers in respect of Network Rail's land and interests without the prior consent of Network Rail. However, in order to ensure the deliverability of the Proposed Development, the Applicant can only agree to such a restriction on its compulsory acquisition powers if the parties enter into a voluntary agreement to grant the Applicant the land and rights necessary to deliver the Proposed Development.
	Network Rail also objects to all other compulsory powers in the Order to the extent that they affect, and may be exercised in relation to, Network Rail's property and interests.	
Compulsory Acquisition	In order for Network Rail to be in a position to withdraw its objection Network Rail requires: (a) agreements with the Applicant that regulate: (i) the manner in which rights over the Plots and any other railway property are acquired and the relevant works are carried out including terms which protect Network Rail's statutory undertaking and agreement that compulsory acquisition powers will not be exercised in	

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	relation to such land; and (ii) the carrying out of works in the vicinity of the operational railway network to safeguard Network Rail's statutory undertaking;	
Compulsory Acquisition	In order for Network Rail to be in a position to withdraw its objection Network Rail requires:… (b) agreement that Compulsory Powers will not be exercised;	
Compulsory Acquisition	In order for Network Rail to be in a position to withdraw its objection Network Rail requires:… (c) the inclusion of protective provisions in the DCO for its benefit.	
Compulsory Acquisition	Network Rail welcomes the fact that there are protective provisions for its benefit in the draft Order and, if necessary, will provide detailed comments on, and amendments to, the protective provisions when it submits its detailed Written Representation.	
Compulsory Acquisition	To safeguard Network Rail's interests and the safety and integrity of the operational railway, Network Rail objects to the inclusion of the Compulsory Powers and any other powers affecting Network Rail in the Order. Network Rail requests that the Examining Authority treat Network Rail as an Interested Party for the purposes of the Examination.	

Table 3.4 Applicant's Comments on the Royal Mail Group Limited Relevant Representation [RR-012]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Comment	Royal Mail Group Limited (RM) supports this proposed Energy from Waste CHP facility, but is seeking to secure mitigations to protect its road based operations during the construction phase. Under section 35 of the Postal Services Act 2011 (the "Act"), RM has been designated by Ofcom as a provider of the Universal Postal Service. RM is the only such provider in the United Kingdom. The Act provides that Ofcom's primary regulatory duty is to secure the provision of the Universal Postal Service. Ofcom discharges this duty by imposing regulatory conditions on RM, requiring it to provide the Universal Postal Service. The Act includes a set of minimum standards for Universal Service Providers, which Ofcom must secure. The conditions imposed by Ofcom reflect those standards. RM is under some of the highest specification performance obligations for quality of service in Europe. Its performance of the Universal Service Provider obligations is in the public interest and should not be affected detrimentally by any statutorily authorised project. RM's postal sorting and delivery operations rely heavily on road communications. RM's ability to provide efficient mail collection, sorting and delivery to the public is sensitive to changes in the capacity of the highway network. RM is a major road user nationally. Disruption to the highway network and traffic delays can have direct consequences on RM's operations, its ability to meet the Universal Service Obligation and comply with the regulatory regime for postal services thereby presenting a significant risk to RM's business. Wisbech Delivery Office is approximately 500 metres to the north of the DCO application site. The proposed CHP connection corridor runs less than 100m to the east of Wisbech Delivery Office. In exercising its statutory duties, RM vehicles use the A47, the A1101 and all of the adjacent local roads on a daily basis. New Bridge Lane, Enterprise Way, Salters Way, Cromwell Road, Algores Way, Weasingham Lane and Churchill Road / Elm High Road are all used daily by RM and are important to access in to and out from Wisbech Delivery Office to from	Comments noted. At Deadline 1, the Applicant submitted an updated **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Volume 6.4). Section 7.4.32 to 7.4.35** of the updated Outline CTMP maintains the Applicant's commitments to Royal Mail.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	the A road network and for deliveries. Any congestion on these roads has potential to adversely affect RM operations. The nearby section of the A47, particularly between Wisbech and Ring's End is a strategically important distribution route for RM services. Following submission of RM's section 46 consultation response in August 2021, RM has had helpful contact with MVV UK as a result of which wording has been included within the applicant's Environmental Statement Appendix 6A Outline CTMP paragraphs 7.4.29 and 7.4.30 which is in line with RM's section 46 consultation requests. The applicant has accepted this wording as a commitment, which if fully implemented, will provide RM with satisfactory advance consultation, liaison and information on works that affect the highway network. However, RM is registering be an Interested Party to the Examination in order to protect its position and ensure that Outline CTMP paragraphs 7.4.29 and 7.4.30 remain unchanged during the Examination and take effect during the construction phase	

Table 3.5 Applicant's Comments on the East of England Ambulance Trust Relevant Representation [RR-013]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Assessment approach - general	Insufficient scoping work has been undertaken to date - to determine a suitable study area, baseline assessment & approach to identify the likely environmental, social & cumulative effects of the development on EEAST's operations.	Following receipt of the relevant representation the Applicant met with EEAST and its partner organisations to discuss the issues raised. The meeting provided an opportunity to discuss the project and likely outcomes for EEAST's service both during the construction and operation phases. The Applicant subsequently produced a Technical Note which was submitted to EEAST. The note included information on incident rates experienced by MVV at its other UK facilities and commitments to provide EEEAST with site familiarisation visits and advanced warnings of certain works which might otherwise have the potential to affect EEASTs operations.
Mitigation	Insufficient measures are proposed to avoid, reduce, mitigate & compensate for the likely Scheme impact on EEAST's operations (summarised below) during the construction phase of the development	The Applicant has subsequently provided commitments to provide EEEAST with site familiarisation visits and advanced warnings of certain works which might otherwise have the potential to affect EEASTs operations. These commitments are recorded within a revision to the submitted **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4)[APP-072] submitted at Deadline 1.**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Development Consent Orders	Omission to include suitable DCO Requirements &/or Heads of Terms of Agreement, either via a Section 106 planning obligation or Deed of Obligation - to provide funding & new facilities provision, as required, to increase the capacity, response capability & Project Preparedness for EEAST's staff, vehicle fleet and estate assets to mitigate & manage the impacts arising	The Applicant has subsequently met with EEAST to explain the project and has provided a technical note which information, including the number of construction workers expected at site and the means by which the Applicant will seek to encourage a local workforce with reference to application documents such as **ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.3) [APP-043]**. The information also provides the incidents rates experienced at other MVV facilities in the UK. The Applicant is aiming to agree SoCG with the Trust and relevant partners.
Mitigation	Omission to include suitable Terms of Reference, Membership or a Communications Strategy for a Transport, Community Safety, Health & Wellbeing Working Group to be set up - to inform & assist the management of relevant aspects of the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Scheme requiring a coordinated response from health & blue light partners, including EEAST, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care System (CPICS) Cambridgeshire Constabulary & Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service.	The omission was discussed with EEAST and partners at a subsequent meeting. The Applicant is willing to commit to providing advanced notice of relevant construction activities and to provide site familiarisation visits. These commitments are recorded within a revision to the submitted **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4)[APP-072] submitted at Deadline 1.**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Mitigation	EEAST, together with the CPICS, Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Service, is therefore keen to work with Medworth CHP Ltd (MCL) to address these omissions and agree and secure suitable mitigation and management measures either as a DCO Requirement and/ or a Section 106 planning obligation (or Deed of Obligation) and reflect this position within a Statement of Common Ground by commencement of (or at an early stage during) the forthcoming Examination.	The meeting held with EEAST and partners subsequent to the submission of the relevant representation discussed the scope and means by which suitable measures could be provided. It was agreed that a SoCG would be prepared and submitted to the examination.
Assessment approach - general	Review of the Medworth CHP Ltd (Applicant's) environmental statement and related DCO documentation, indicates that the Scheme's potential effects (impacts) on EEAST's operational capacity, efficiency and resources (namely staff, vehicle fleet and estate assets) have not been baselined or sufficiently assessed to date.	This matter was discussed in the meeting held subsequent to the submission of the relevant representation. The project was explained to EEAST and partners who also explained the current baseline situation relative to their operations. The Applicant agreed to produce a technical note to summarise the relevant information reported within the application documents and to provide additional information in relation to other comparable MVV facilities operating in the UK. reference was also made to submitted documentation such as **ES Chapter 16 Health (Volume 6.3) [APP-043].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Traffic	It is evident that new and reconfigured existing access arrangements, localised road widening measures, road closures and route diversions along with significant HGV, LV (and an unspecified number of additional/ AIL led) traffic movements are envisaged, as part of the major 36 - month construction phase to implement the proposed Energy from Waste Combined Heat & Power proposals (the Scheme). Information to determine the effects arising from the construction phase of the Scheme and its likely impact on EEAST's operational capacity, efficiency and resources (including the likely highway disruption and delay) is currently absent from the DCO documentation and its related mitigation measures. This information therefore needs to be presented and assessed, with any necessary mitigation and management measures secured and implemented through DCO Requirements, and/ or via a Section 106 planning obligation or Deed of Obligation, as part of any Development Consent Order approval.	The information necessary to understand the potential for effects upon all highway users is provided within **ES Chapter 6 Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2) [APP-033]** and relevant technical appendices, most notably the **Appendix 6B Transport Assessment (Volume 6.4) [App-073]**. Mitigation measures in the form of advance notice of relevant construction activities and site familiarisation visits have been discussed with EEAST and agreement will be confirmed within a SoCG. These mitigation commitments are recorded within a revision to the submitted **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4)[APP-072]** submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Major Accidents and Disasters	It is evident that a significant level and duration of construction phase work reliant on the use of large-scale plant, heavy and specialist machinery/ equipment, producing noise, vibration and dust (with work carried out during potentially adverse weather conditions) is likely to present construction site hazards and dangers. Working on uneven ground, with moving machinery lifting and transporting materials, and working at depth, including the potential for trench collapse, for example, underlines the risks associated with the construction related activities – requiring both urgent and other medical interventions and transport conveyance to be appropriately planned for and provided. Indeed, HSE's construction publications (for Great Britain) indicate that work related incidents involving serious injury and fatalities, are statistically significantly higher for the construction industry as compared to the 'all industry' rate. Information to determine the effect of the construction phase and its impact on EEAST's operational capacity, efficiency and resources is currently absent from the DCO documentation, and its related mitigation measures.	This matter was discussed in the meeting held subsequent to the submission of the relevant representation. The Applicant agreed to provide information on the incidents rates experienced during the construction of similar facilities to provide EEAST and its partners with an understanding of the potential for incidents to occur in the form of a technical note. The Applicant also agreed to provide information on the first aid measures which it would have on site to respond to possible incidents. The technical note was provided on 11 January 2023 and EEAST commented via email to the Applicant on 25 January that the 'Technical Note is fine'.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Major Accidents and Disasters	The processes and procedures developed by MCL, and any outsourced construction organisations, should refer to legislation and technical guidance which places a duty on MCL to have its own response and medical mitigation to take the patient to a place of 'normal access' and handover to EEAST crews. EEAST would expect any trench collapse to fall under the confined space regulations and MCL, the construction company and/or contractor(s) should have access to a confined space trained team that could extricate a casualty safely.	This advice is noted.
Major Accidents and Disasters	Plans and contingencies for facilitating emergency access, on-site triage, medical assessment, patient identification, stabilisation, clinical information, safe and efficient handover to EEAST responders, whilst sustaining operationally optimal attendance times (noting the likely delay factors above) which in urgent cases may require Helicopter Emergency Medical Services (HEMS) access, is therefore considered to be necessary.	The Applicant has subsequently agreed with EEAST that it will host site familiarisation visits, employ a nominated first aid/emergency responder and maintain a first aid room where patients can be accommodated whilst awaiting handover to EEAST responders should this be necessary.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Major Accidents and Disasters	The incidence and impact of major accidents (and disasters) on EEAST and its HEMS partner operational capacity, efficiency and resources (including EEAST hazardous area response teams - HART) needs to be presented and assessed, with any necessary mitigation and management measures secured and implemented through DCO Requirements, and/ or via a Section 106 planning obligation or Deed of Obligation, as part of any Development Consent Order approval.	Information provided to EEAST subsequent to the submission of the relevant representation indicates that the EfW construction industry experiences very low rates for reportable accidents with similar low levels experienced during the operation of MVV's other UK facilities. The Applicant has committed to site familiarisation, first aid presence, incident recording, to prior warning of potentially disruptive activities and to liaison meetings with EEAST and its partners. These mitigation commitments are recorded within a revision to the submitted **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4)[APP-072] and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103].** Revisions to both documents are submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Health	Information to determine the nature of the construction workforce, their home origin, health status, clinical dependencies, location of any temporary accommodation, which are factors likely to directly impact on EEAST's operational capacity, efficiency and resources, including its co-ordinated response with healthcare partners, is currently insufficiently dealt with in the DCO documentation. This information therefore needs to be presented and assessed, with any necessary mitigation and management measures secured and implemented through DCO Requirements, and/ or via a Section 106 planning obligation or Deed of Obligation, as part of any Development Consent Order approval.	It is not possible to accurately predict the home origin of the future construction workforce as this will be dependant upon the contractor appointed. The Applicant has provided a technical note which explains the measures which it is seeking to put in place to encourage a local workforce and this was provided to EEAST subsequent to the receipt of the relevant representation. The Applicant also explained within the note the likely profile of the workforce, with regard to the numbers to be employed and potential contract lengths to indicate that few are likely to register with local health suppliers. The technical note was provided on 11 January 2023 and EEAST commented via email to the Applicant on 25 January that the 'Technical Note is fine'.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Mitigation	In the light of the above, EEAST recommend that appropriate Terms of Reference, Membership and a Communications Strategy for a Transport, Community Safety, Health and Wellbeing Working Group is established, potentially in advance of the Examination. This would help to inform and assist the management of relevant aspects of the Scheme requiring a coordinated response from 'health and blue light partners', incorporating representatives from EEAST, CPICS Cambridgeshire Constabulary and Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service.	The Applicant is proposing regular communication with EEAST and the provision of advanced warning of any activities that EEAST and partners may require. The Applicant also proposes the establishment of a liaison group to ensure that the commitments it makes are delivered. These mitigation commitments are recorded within a revision to the submitted **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4)[APP-072] and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Assessment conclusion	EEAST considers that the Scheme is likely to give rise to significant effects on its operational capacity, efficiency and resources (incorporating its staff, vehicle fleet and estate assets) which have not been baselined or sufficiently assessed by the Medworth Scheme to date. The Scheme is therefore considered to adversely affect EEAST's ability to meet and deliver its targets and priorities (statutory duties) as a key healthcare and emergency services provider. Identified impacts arising from the development should therefore be addressed by employing appropriate mitigation and management measures - to be secured and implemented through DCO Requirements, and/ or via a Section 106 planning obligation or Deed of Obligation, as part of any Development Consent Order approval.	This matter was discussed in the meeting held subsequent to the submission of the relevant representation. The project was explained to EEAST and partners who also explained the current baseline situation relative to their operations. The Applicant agreed to produce a technical note to summarise the relevant information reported within the application documents and to provide additional information in relation to other comparable MVV facilities operating in the UK. The technical note was provided on 11 January 2023 and EEAST commented via email to the Applicant on 25 January that the 'Technical Note is fine'. Mitigation and management measures have been included within revisions to the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4) [APP-072] and Outline Operational Traffic Management Plan (Volume 7.15) [APP106] submitted at Deadline 1.
Statement of Common Ground	This approach ought to be reflected in a Statement of Common Ground to clarify the position reached and inform the forthcoming Examination process.	The Applicant has prepared a SoCG with EEAST and its partners for submission at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Mitigation	The measures ought to include a process to assist EEAST and its health and blue light partners to plan for and implement co-ordinated responses to construction phase (and any operational and decommissioning phase) Scheme impacts and incidents, to optimise patient outcomes.	The Applicant has committed to site familiarisation, first aid presence, incident recording, to prior warning of potentially disruptive activities and to liaison meetings with EEAST and its partners. These mitigation commitments are recorded within a revision to the submitted **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Volume 6.4)[APP-072] and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103].**

Table 3.6 Applicant's Comments on the Environment Agency Relevant Representation [RR-014]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
General	We do not have outstanding concerns to highlight within this Relevant Representation. We have reviewed the submitted documents and have provided below a summary of matters where we consider that further clarification is required to ensure that the proposal has no detrimental impact on the environment. These matters include flood risk, water management and environmental permitting. We reserve our right to add to or amend the matters set out in this Relevant Representation and will update the Examining Authority on any amendments to our position at the appropriate point during the examination of the DCO.	The Applicant notes that the Environment Agency do not currently have any outstanding concerns in relation to matters falling within their statutory remit.
Hydrology	Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Hydrology We have reviewed Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Hydrology, including Appendix 12A: Flood Risk Assessment and the Outline Flood Emergency Plan (OFEP). We are satisfied that the submitted flood risk information is sufficient to provide the Examining Authority with the correct flood risk information to inform their decision making.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	We note that potential flood depths of between 0.1 and 0.6m are expected on the access road. The applicant should ensure that the appropriate emergency planners are aware of this matter, and that it is incorporated into the OFEP.	The requirement to notify the appropriate emergency planners of the residual flood risk and depths of the access road during breach of the flood defences will be included in the next iteration of **Outline Flood Emergency Plan (Volume 7.9 of the ES) [APP-100].**
Hydrology	Outline Water Management Plan We have reviewed the Outline Water Management Plan and advise that the use of hay bales as a pollution prevention measure can increase ammonia levels in a watercourse as they decompose. We suggest that the hay bales are replaced regularly, or an alternative solution is found.	Agreed. The requirement for regular replacement of hay bales or use of an alternative solution to manage runoff during the construction phase of the EfW CHP Facility has been provided in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Permit	Environmental Permitting The Environment Agency acts as the Competent Authority and regulates relevant activities under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. The applicant has submitted a permit application, and assessment is underway. The following issues are considered under the permit application.	Comments noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Permit / Air Quality	Air Quality The air quality impact of the emissions from the proposed facility will be assessed in detail as part of the environmental permit determination but only for the operational phase of the project and not the construction phase.	Noted.
CHP	Combined Heat and Power Assessment The outcome of the assessment is noted. The action plan should be followed through to assess the feasibility and maximise the utilisation of surplus heat to local business. An assessment of the energy efficiency of the plant will be carried out as part of the permit determination.	Requirement 23 of the **Draft DCO [APP-013]** secures the need for the Applicant to update the CHP assessment and demonstrate how the action plan will be delivered.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Landscape and Visual	Visual Impact During periods of unfavourable meteorological conditions there will be visible steam plumes from both stacks. Steam plumes will increase the visual impact of the plant and may pass over the top of local receptors depending on the wind direction.	This is reflected in **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual [APP-036]** which considers the landscape and visual effects of the plume under the maximum potential parameters (height and frequency). The assessment recognises that the infrequent presence of the occasional visible plume (if meteorological conditions were suitable) may draw receptors' attention and emphasise the presence of the chimneys. However, the detailed analysis of its potential scale and periods of visibility leads to the conclusion that the very infrequent, often small-scale and temporary presence of the plume on its own (i.e. in the absence of any visibility with the EfW CHP Facility) would not give rise to significant visual effects, nor would it tip the balance and lead to a not significant visual effect becoming a significant visual effect for those receptors with views of the proposed EfW CHP Facility.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Noise	Noise We would highlight the noise impact from the two ID fan cabins. These are situated at the front end of the plant and there is open ground in front of these over which the noise emitted will travel. The design incorporates enclosures around the ID fans and these should be of a type that can attenuate the noise effectively and reduce tonal aspects. We would also highlight the noise impact from the air-cooled condensers on receptors in the vicinity of these.	The ID fan cabins and air-cooled condenser were included within the assessment. Source level data for these items are provided in the **ES, Appendix 7C Operational Noise Assessment [AS-010].** The principle of controlling any tonal noise emissions at source is agreed. The detailed design will account for the locations of specific sources and nearby NSRs. The suggested approach to the design of the ID fan cabins accords with the noise management measures set out in Table 5.1 of the **Outline Operational Noise Management Plan [APP-077]** which states that *"Where possible, noise generating equipment will be installed within a building or, where that is not possible, will be housed in suitable enclosures (e.g., fan enclosures) to provide additional attenuation."* The results of the assessment indicate that, with the additional mitigation measures outlined in the Section 7.10 of **ES Chapter 7 Noise and Vibration [APP-034],** significant effects will be avoided.

Table 3.7 Applicant's Comments on the Historic England Relevant Representation [RR-016]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Historic Environment	1. Introduction The applicant has provided a full Environmental Statement, which includes historic environment chapters and our written representation will comment more fully on the ES.	Comments noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Historic Environment	2. Historic Environment We are aware the proposed development lies in a highly sensitive area for the historic environment. Although there are no designated heritage assets within the actual site, there are various heritage assets in relative proximity whose settings may be affected. Our records indicate that within 2km there are : 2 conservation areas; 1 registered park and garden; 286 listed buildings and 2 scheduled. It was agreed during the pre-application process that detailed assessment of the historic environment would be required for the application, and a number of the specific measures were recommended and undertaken. This including a Desk Based Assessment, an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the settings of heritage assets, as well as geophysical survey and trial trenched evaluation. The information provided is of a high standard and we broadly accept the conclusions and, further detailed comments will also be provided in our written representation.	Comments noted.
Historic Environment	3. Impacts on designated and non designated heritage assets Notwithstanding this our primary consideration is the impact of the proposal on views out from the southern part of the Wisbech Conservation Area (Brinks/Riverside Area), and also from the upper floors of historic buildings within the conservation area -in particular the grade II* listed Queen's School . Historic England are keen to ensure the avoidance of significant impacts to these heritage assets however, we have had discussion with the applicant on this point and understand that this is has now been subject to further assessment in the ES for which we are grateful. Further advice will therefore be offered through our Written Representation in relation to these assets as well as commentary on other highly graded and designated heritage assets affected by the scheme.	Wisbech Conservation Area: It is noted that the principal interest for Historic England with regard to effects on the historic environment is the setting of, and specifically views out from Wisbech Conservation Area. The significance of the conservation area, the nature of its setting and contribution to the same and the importance of particular views are set out in section 10.9 of **Volume 6.2 ES Chapter 10 Historic Environment [APP-037].** This includes a description of the individual character areas within the conservation area including the Brinks. This was the subject of consultation with Historic England and as a result of this, a photomontage was prepared from the southern part of the conservation area (Figure 9.23b Viewpoint 7, in **Volume 6.3 of the ES, Chapter 9, Landscape and Visual Figures 9.17 – 9.24 [APP-058]).** While there is a historic relationship to the surrounding countryside derived from the role of the town as a commercial centre, there are relatively few visual connections between the conservation and the surrounding countryside which contribute to the significance of the asset. This is reflected in the 'positive views' identified in Wisbech Conservation Area Appraisal which are almost entirely internal views within the conservation area.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		The area of the Brinks character area most likely to be affected by the proposed EfW CHP facility is the southern end of North Brink at the Grade II-listed Elgood's Brewery (LB1229756). Elgood's Brewery and five associated buildings (LB1126616, 1331659, 1229505, 1126617, 1331660) are located on an eastward curve of the River Nene and is the first large structure entering the town along North Brink. The brewery building itself has a distinct character from the remainder of North Brink, being industrial in design and contemporary use as opposed to the residential, civic and commercial buildings north and east and it is felt that longer views from the upper floors toward the south do not greatly contribute to an appreciation or understanding of the significance of the building, or this particular part of the conservation area. The buildings' orientation is directly southeast serve to orient views from the upper floor of Elgood's Brewery across the River Nene toward the mixed residential and light industrial outskirts of Wisbech, with views south toward the proposed EfW CHP facility being secondary. The contribution of setting to this asset is through the brewery's relationship with buildings along the Brinks and its relative scale and character to them. Views outward to the south and southeast take in a contrasting environment defined, in part, by the River Nene and by low-lying residential outskirts of Wisbech, tree cover and industrial outskirts. This gives a general impression of more open views in contrast to the town centre but is not considered to be essential to the appreciation and understanding of the conservation area. Upper floor views, focusing on Grade II*- listed 15 South Brink (formerly Queens School, LB1229902): At the ground level the building represents a distinct architectural style but part of the coherent, consistent historic streetscape of the South Brink, which forms the setting of the listed building. Viewed from Somers Road, 65m to the south, 15 South Brink appears as a distant, screened element behind Somers Court Sheltered Housing and interspersed tree cover. Views outward from the building to the north, east and west are largely focused on views across to North Brink, and to some extent up and down the River Nene though this is limited by the building's set back position. A directly oriented view across the Nene takes in an arc of other listed buildings of particular prominence, from the Grade I-listed Peckover House (LB1331632) in the northeast to the Grade II-listed 26 and 27 North Brink (LB1126644) at the west. Views to the south from 15 South Brink take in the two-storey Somers Court

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		Sheltered Housing and 20th century housing estates beyond, with views to the southwest characterised by low-lying residential development and Somers Court giving way to the industrial estate of the Nestle Purina facility in the far distance. The closest distance views in these directions are focused on the walled garden at the south of the building and adjoining lawn spaces with interspersed tree cover. In common with other individual listed buildings in the centre of Wisbech Conservation Area, the setting of 15 South Brink is considered to be defined by its presence and association with the South Brink Street frontage and River Nene. While the EfW CHP facility may add a new visual component in far views from the upper floors beyond existing industrial estates to the southwest these views do not contribute to an appreciation or understanding of the significance of the asset. The introduction of new visual elements represented by the EfW CHP facility would result in an effect of Very Low Magnitude toward this asset, which would be not significant. The nature of this building's setting is typical of many listed buildings within Wisbech Conservation Area, with longer views as experienced from upper floors not forming a key part of the setting of these individual assets, and this limits the extent to which the EfW CHP facility may affect the setting of these assets. We will review and respond as required to any Written Representation which may be submitted by Historic England.

Table 3.8 Applicant's Comments on the Hundred of Wisbech Internal Drainage Board Relevant Representation [RR-017]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	General Comment f. Members of the Commissioners staff and the Boards Works Committee have engaged in pre- application discussions with MVV and its agents to ensure that the final submission takes account of initial concerns around the information and methodologies required to be able to fully assess the proposals. It is pleasing to note that this advice has largely been followed. However, there are still some matters that need to be addressed to allow the Board to fully understand the impacts of the scheme and to determine whether any mitigation measures proposed are sufficient. The Board requests engagement in respect of these matters to ensure that these are resolved ahead of any consents or approvals being given to the proposal.	The Applicant notes that the extensive consultation which has been undertaken with HWIDB during pre-application has effectively addressed the key concerns and ensured that final submission takes account of initial concerns around the information and methodologies required to be able to fully assess the proposals. Consultation remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. This has included discussion of stand off distance from drains, crossing of drains and water discharges into drains. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].** The Applicant is working to produce Statements of Common Ground with HWIDB and KLIDB which will be submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	General Comment g. The Board reserves the right for it and its agents to undertake further engagement with the applicant and its agents in order to review the design, construction and completion of environmental, water level and flood risk management works, prior to certification that such works are acceptable and the provision of a reasonable maintenance period during which time the Board or its agents can require the applicant or its agents to resolve any defects in the completed works.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the HWIDB and KLIDB during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].** The Applicant is working to produce a Statement of Common Ground with HWIDB and KLIDB which will be submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	4. Potential influences on the existing drainage arrangements in the South Bridge Field and New Bridge Field area. In addition to the Incinerator proposal there are several aspirational matters of a strategic nature which could influence the Boards network of watercourses in the area but these are subject to funding and other external pressures outside of the Board's control which may influence their implementation. Until these are known the Board is reluctant to act at the expense of the rate payer and/or government funding. These projects include the Wisbech Area Transport Study, the Wisbech Rail Project, and the District Councils South Wisbech Broad Concept Plans and if these aspirations are realised a link is formed to a new roundabout on the A47 in close proximity to the existing culvert under the A47 at Point 50.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with National Highways during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].** The Applicant has considered the Wisbech Access Strategy's aspirational development including a new roundabout on the A47 onto New Bridge Lane near HWIDB drainage Point 50. During discussions held with National Highways, they confirmed that they would not support a new roundabout on the A47 in this location (**Appendix 6D: Stakeholder Consultation (Volume 6.4) of the ES [APP-075]).** Notwithstanding this, the Proposed Development would not prevent this project from coming forward.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Environmental Statement Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport Operational Design Case – New Bridge Lane (Pages 6.54-6.57) Road Culvert at Point 31 Currently New Bridge Lane to the south east of the junction with Salters Way is a rarely used single track which is unlikely to have been built to modern highway standards and is understood to simply be served by a gulley drainage system	The Proposed Development includes a highway improvement scheme along New Bridge Lane which will provide the main access to the EfW CHP Facility. Details are provided in **Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2 of the ES) [APP-030].** The road widening and access arrangements will be designed in accordance with the relevant Design Manual of Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and will be agreed in consultation with HWIDB during detailed design stage.
Hydrology	Road Culvert at Point 31 The Boards Cromwell Road Drain is culverted under the Lane to the north west of the crossing with the "mothballed" railway (Point 31). This watercourse forms an important part of the Boards network serving the urban area generally bound by the River Nene, Weasenham Lane, the railway and New Bridge Lane. This culvert was installed several years ago and is approaching the end of its life. In view of this and the increased HGV Traffic loading it is considered that this culvert should be replaced with a new structure.	A HWIDB culvert and associated headwall are located under the existing New Bridge Lane and will be replaced with a culvert to the same size requirements, to accommodate the works. Details are shown on **Figure 3.18i-vi: IDB Culvert general arrangement (Volume 6.3 of the ES) [APP-049].** Further details on the culvert design will be agreed in consultation with HWIDB during detailed design stage as per the **Construction Environmental and Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP-103]** (which is secured by Requirement 10 of the d**raft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	New Bridge Lane Drain (Points 31 – 43 – 44 – 50) The watercourse on the southern side of the Lane to the south east of Point 31 is a Boards Drain which currently serves as a higher level interconnection with the system near the A47 (Point 50). This watercourse is currently of lesser importance but will become increasingly more important as the planned growth in the area occurs. Currently access to it is largely unrestricted and the Board can undertake routine maintenance on this watercourse relatively easily from the field and roadside. Unfortunately, the increased volume of traffic using the Lane together with the proposed street lighting, chicane and acoustic fencing to a property on the southern side of the Lane, would make future maintenance operations more difficult increasing the risk of conflict and accidents; will reduce safety of the Boards employees/contractors and other road users; and require alternative methods of working with potential increased costs on the rate payer and possibly delaying vehicles entering and leaving the facility.	As detailed in **Chapter 6: Traffic and Transport (Volume 6.2 of the ES) [APP-033],** the majority of vehicle movements along New Bridge Lane would on be weekdays, with reduced movements at weekends, similar to the surrounding Industrial Estate. Option to reduce the potential conflicts on maintenance activities highlighted by the HWIDB include: re-programming maintenance works by HWIDB to the weekend; and use of removable structures in the final design of the street lighting chicane. Whilst the acoustic fence might reduce access from the southern back of the ditch fronting 10 New Bridge Lane, it is understood that ditch maintenance might be currently undertaken from the north side and therefore not resulting in significant access issues.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	The vibration resulting from the increased traffic may lead to failure of the channel profiles which increases costs in undertaking remedial works and could, in the correct circumstances, lead to blockages restricting flows within the channel increasing flood risk.	The banks of the channel will be subject to a slope stability assessment during the detail design stage which will indicate whether any mitigation works will be required to reduce any potential failure. The road widening and access arrangements will be designed in accordance with the relevant Design Manual of Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and will be agreed in consultation with HWIDB during detailed design stage. The Protective Provisions for the protection of the IDB would include a requirement to secure that the efficiency of drainage work for flood defence and land drainage purposes is not impaired and that the risk of flooding is not otherwise increased by reason of any works for the Proposed Development (**draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]).** The impairment or damage must be made good by the undertaker as soon as reasonably practicable.
Hydrology	The proposed development will significantly increase the traffic in the immediate area and the Board are concerned about the adverse impacts and loading imposed upon the local environment and water level and flood risk management systems, particularly given the nature of the weak soft soils, both at the site and along the traffic route. Assets such as road structures, highway drainage systems and culverts may need appropriate strengthening and upgrading to meet these impacts.	The road widening, access arrangements, highway drainage systems and culverts will be designed in accordance with the relevant Design Manual of Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and will be agreed in consultation with HWIDB during detailed design stage as per the **Construction Environmental and Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP-103]** (which is secured by Requirement 10 of the d**raft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Other issues There is also a watercourse on the northern side of the highway which will require repositioning if the proposed widening of the Lane occurs.	It is not clear which specific ditch this comment is referring to. If these comments relate to the ditch connecting to the culvert to be replaced, then these works are included within the Proposed Development. Detailed designs to be agreed with the IDB in due course as per the **Construction Environmental and Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP-103]** (which is secured by Requirement 10 of the d**raft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]).**
Hydrology	Other issues No reference is made to the drainage system serving the widened road or any adverse impacts upon it given that the County Council do not currently adopt SuDS features and that the Boards system is considered to be close to capacity and will require all discharges to be attenuated to greenfield rates of run off.	As detailed in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1, it is proposed that surface water runoff from the improved section of New Bridge Lane and new entrance into the EfW CHP Facility Site will discharge into the HWIDB drain south of New Bridge Lane, subject to the approval of HWIDB. New trapped gullies will be installed along the southern carriageway of the improved section of New Bridge Lane, which will ensure the settlement of solids prior to discharge into the HWIDB drain. Surface water runoff from the bell-mouth of the new access into the EfW CHP Facility Site will be conveyed via a series of trapped gullies and carrier drains before discharging into the HWIDB drain at an agreed location. Flows from the bell-mouth will be attenuated within the new pipework, before passing through a penstock valve chamber and entering the HWIDB drain. It is not proposed to attenuate the flows to the access from Algores Way as the net increase in impermeable area will be small. Attenuation requirements will be agreed in consultation with HWIDB during detailed design stage.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Other issues The impacts of widening Newbridge Lane in relation to the adjacent watercourses and culverts and proximity to the highway in terms of construction, operation and safety will require greater clarity and detail in due course.	The road widening and access arrangements will be designed in accordance with the relevant Design Manual of Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and will be agreed in consultation with HWIDB during detailed design stage as per the **Construction Environmental and Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP-103]** (which is secured by Requirement 10 of the d**raft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]).**
Historic Environment	Environmental Statement Chapter 10: Historic Environment The Board note the inclusion and contents of this document. Whilst the historic environment is outside of the Boards remit it would encourage the retention of suitable water level and flood risk management structures and features provided that they do not detrimentally affect the Boards statutory environmental, water level and flood risk management functions, for example, the penstock and headwall on the Boards former discharge channel, now filled in, adjacent to the Redmoor Lane roundabout.	The Applicant does not propose to undertake any works which could potentially affect the former discharge channel adjacent to the Redmoor Lane roundabout.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity / HRA	Environmental Statement Chapter 11: Biodiversity - Species If the qualifying species are "teal, curlew, redshank and hen harrier" they will also need to be considered in the FLL. Why has the consideration to NSE been confined to geese and swans?	The Proposed Development Site provides no suitable habitat for these species. Section 4.2.7 of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (Volume 5.3) [AS-007]** states "*Results from the desk study and winter bird surveys in 2019/20 (Appendix C: Winter Bird Survey Report 2019/20) (the study area for which was the larger 2019/2020 Grid Connection Corridor) provide no evidence to indicate that farmland within 500m of the Order limits is utilised on a regular basis by any of the aforementioned qualifying bird species or constitutes FLL associated with any European Site*." This included teal, curlew, redshank and hen harrier.
Biodiversity	Species Spined Loach (an EPS) has been considered in the context of air quality. Spined Loach is a freshwater fish so will impact on water quality will need to be considered rather than air quality.	The SAC sites where spined loach are qualifying features are not hydrologically linked to the Proposed Development. Air quality was considered due to potential for impacts on water quality within the zone of influence of the Proposed Development.
Biodiversity	Species Surveys undertaken by the IDB indicate that water vole have been recorded as present in the local area in 2022. More information can be made available on request.	Noted. The Applicant will contact the HWIDB to obtain this information.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	Habitats The management plan set out in 4.2.2 of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan suggests that after 2 years the wet woodland would be left to self-manage. If the habitat is to continue as a wet woodland, some management will be required to manage succession. Particularly if blackthorn is used which can be invasive.	Noted. The **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) (Volume 7.7) [APP-098]** (secured by Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (**Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**) includes monitoring of wet woodland habitat in years 1, 2, 5 and every 3 years thereafter, which would identify any ongoing management requirements which would be implemented.
Biodiversity	Habitats If the attenuation pond is to be connected to the drainage channels, it will need to be managed regularly. A long-term management plan for the pond will be needed to ensure that its capacity is maintained in order for it to remain functional as an attenuation pond. If the pond is to be connected to the surface water drainage system i.e., to the IDB drainage channels, thorough and on-going assessment of the quality of water entering the pond and discharging into the channels will need to take place. The design of the ponds and the discharge point will depend on the contaminants and quality of the water entering it and the type of remediation proposed i.e., phytoremediation, bio filters etc.	Noted. The long-term management of the habitat types associated with the Sustainable Urban Drainage System is set out in the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (Volume 7.7) [APP-098]** (secured by Requirement 5 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**). As set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1, the proposed SuDS components have been determined in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 to provide the required pollution control prior to discharge of surface water runoff into the HWIDB drains. In addition, a water quality monitoring programme will be agreed with the Environment Agency and implemented during construction and operation phases. The indicative proposals for SuDS components will be confirmed at the detailed design stage. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	Habitats While the drainage channels at the times of survey were found to be dry, this is likely to be due to the permeability of the surrounding land, and they do hold some water at certain times of the year. If the proposed site land were to be sealed by development and therefore permeability reduced, surface run-off would increase and the channels would be needed to convey away greater volumes of water to reduce flood risk. Access from at least one side of the channels will be needed, in line with IDB bylaws, to allow the IDB to undertake channel maintenance activities to maintain the capacity of the channel and to keep it free from obstruction.	Noted. The Applicant has committed to maintain access to allow management/maintenance to take place through the protective provisions with the HWIDB as part of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**. During the construction and operational phases, ground disturbance and development of hardstanding areas across parts of the Proposed Development area have the potential to increase the overall extent of lower permeability surfaces within the Proposed Development. As agreed through consultation with HWIDB and CCC and set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) submitted at Deadline 1**, surface water runoff will be stored in attenuation ponds and discharged into the HWIDB drains at the equivalent of greenfield runoff (therefore ensuring no increase in flood risk). As agreed with HWIDB, access to the maintained drains during the scheduled maintenance will be provided by the Applicant (e.g. by providing alternative access routes to the drains or relocating temporarily the bridges). Alternatively, the Applicant (or their Contractor) could undertake the required maintenance works at specific drains. This will be discussed and agreed with HWIDB at the detailed design stage and will be secured via the **Construction Environmental and Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP-103]** (which is secured by Requirement 10 of the d**raft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
HRA	It is stated that: "Therefore, due to the precautionary approach taken to the screening process and identification of LSEs for the Proposed Development, in-combination effects will only need to be considered if it is found that the proposed development is likely to result in LSE on the European sites being considered and detailed within the HRA Report." This is not the Board's understanding. In-combination effects must be considered regardless of whether LSE has been established for the proposed development. WSP to comment	In combination effects were considered in respect to impact pathways associated with traffic emissions within a 15km zone of influence (See Section 4.3.5 of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (Volume 5.3) [AS-007]**). In-combination effects on European sites from emissions to air, including associated nitrogen and acid deposition, were considered negligible. On the basis of available evidence, LSEs to European sites were discounted. As such there would be no threat to the ability of the European site to achieve its conservation objectives or maintain its integrity as a result of the Proposed Development, in combination with other committed developments based on the modelled scenarios. There was no evidence to indicate that the farmland within 500m of the Order limits was utilised by the SPA qualifying features and therefore does not form FLL. Given the minimal predicted effects for the Proposed Development, there were assessed to be no LSE for in-combination effects within this zone of influence.
HRA	There are proposed plans to build a large potable water supply reservoir (Fens Reservoir) approximately 18 km to the south west of the proposed site. The in-combination effects of this development with the proposed reservoir will need to be considered.	Table 3.3 of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (Volume 5.3) [AS-007]** outlines a High Level Screening Table which details zones of influence (ZOI) in respect to a variety of potential effects. At 18km from the Proposed Development, this is outside any of the ZOIs associated with potential effect pathways, including that associated with emissions sources which is 15km. Consequently, this would not trigger requirement to undertake in combination assessment with this scheme.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	Biodiversity Net Gain In terms of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), if the watercourses through the site are over 5m then it must be assessed for BNG with the rivers & stream metric not using the linear ditches function of the terrestrial BNG metric. The Board shall be pleased if this could be confirmed.	Ditches within the Site are <5m wide, and were assessed using the area habitat 'Ditches' condition sheet in accordance with section 1.31 of the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.0 Technical Supplement (Natural England Joint Publication JP039).
Biodiversity / HRA	The environmental assessments reviewed to date (HRA & ES) do not consider the potential impacts, as set out in Appendix A of the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Energy National Policy Statements Review, particularly with concern to downstream hydrological impacts on EPS: Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Energy National Policy Statements Review (publishing.service.gov.uk)	With reference to Table 3.3 of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (Volume 5.3) [AS-007]**, no European sites were identified within a ZOI of the Order limits with respect to pollution pathways associated with the Proposed Development. This geographic parameter is based on professional judgement following a review of the Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidance PPG5 (which suggests control of impacts can be managed within a distance of 50m). No European sites are considered hydrologically connected with the Proposed Development.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Environmental Statement Chapter 12: Hydrology Export Grid, Import Water and Export CHP Connections Various sections of this document assert that the provision and location of the grid, water and CHP connections will not have an adverse impact on the either the environment, water level and flood risk management systems or increase flood risk. Unfortunately, this is not the case as the poor location and installation of such utilities can have a significant effect on the maintenance and operation of the Boards system. Poorly backfilled trenches and burst water mains have previously resulted in the failure of channel slopes which increases work load, costs in undertaking remedial works and could, in the correct circumstances, lead to blockages within the channel restricting flows and increasing flood risk.	The Applicant has undertaken extensive consultation with HWIDB and National Highways during pre-application which remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application and through to detailed design to ensure no significant effects result from the Proposed Development.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Export Grid, Import Water and Export CHP Connections The presence of such utilities would make future maintenance operations more difficult increasing the risk of conflict with dangerous infrastructure, of accidents and will reduce the safety of the Boards employees and contractors. The delay in contacting the appropriate "provider" and meeting its requirements often needing alternative and costly solutions can all constrain and delay the undertaking of essential maintenance operations with potential increased costs on the rate payer and increasing flood risk. Both the Hundred of Wisbech IDB and a neighbouring Board have had to pay significant sums of money in order to simply negotiate adopted water mains when undertaking channel and structure improvement schemes.	The Applicant has undertaken extensive consultation with HWIDB and National Highways during pre-application which remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application and through to detailed design to ensure no significant effects result from the Proposed Development. As agreed, access to the maintained drains during the scheduled maintenance will be provided by the Applicant (e.g. by providing alternative access routes to the drains or relocating temporarily the bridges). Alternatively, the Applicant (or their Contractor) could undertake the required maintenance works at specific drains. This will be discussed and agreed with HWIDB at the detailed design stage and will be secured via the Construction Environmental and Management Plan (which is secured by Requirement 10 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1 [APP-013]**).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Connections adjacent to Point 50 Of prime concern to the Board is the culvert under the A47 at Point 50 which is of strategic importance as it is the main point of discharge for the large urban area of southern Wisbech. It is the confluence of several Boards Drains and is currently constrained by a combination of poor geometry of the watercourses and culverts and the gas main that dog legs across the Board systems in the area the presence of which necessitated that pipeline on the north eastern side of New Bridge Lane being installed at a less than ideal level. The proposed electricity grid and water connections add to these existing constraints.	The Applicant has undertaken extensive consultation with HWIDB and National Highways during pre-application which remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application and through to detailed design to ensure no significant effects result from the Proposed Development.
Hydrology	Concern about the water connection has been discussed and whilst it is not the ideal location the Board would prefer an open cut trench across the A47 rather than the HDD connection to the north east of Point 50 as this will further constrain an increasingly important location which may be subject to significant changes if the aspired roundabout is built nearby.	The Applicant has undertaken extensive consultation with HWIDB and National Highways during pre-application which remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application and through to detailed design to ensure no significant effects result from the Proposed Development. The Applicant's preference is for open cut trench crossing of the A47 subject to agreement with National Highways.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water resources Item 12.5.3 quite correctly advises that the site is within some of the driest areas in the country and the extreme hot weather events experienced during the summer and the on going drought situation have confirmed that the town is an area of serious water stress and this will increase as further impacts due to growth and climate change occurs.	Comment noted.
Hydrology	Water resources Whilst it will no doubt be contended that the recent announcement for the Fens Reservoir reduces any local concern it will be several years before this is operational and it is still considered appropriate to alleviate this problem and in respect of responses to Strategic Policy documents the Commissioners and associated Boards have lobbied for several years that future growth must consider the whole water cycle process, giving serious consideration to reducing water usage and irreparable damage to the water sources including chalk streams and other watercourses enabling more water for other uses.	Noted. The design of the EfW CHP Facility has considered the water cycle process and water usage reduction/re-use. Re-use of water and provision of rainwater harvesting systems will be provided where practicable (e.g. permeable paving in car park and area surrounding switch compound, rainwater harvesting and green roof for weighbridge, re-use runoff from office building).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water resources The impact of the volume of water detailed in the proposed abstraction application does not appear to have been assessed. The Nene catchment Abstraction Strategy suggests that there is a lack of consistency in the availability of water for abstraction from the catchment and restricted water available for any new abstraction therefore new abstraction applications may be restricted (CAMS-Nene-Catchment-Abstraction- Management-Strategy.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk)).	As detailed in **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES)) [APP-039]**, the potable water demand for the EfW Facility appears high because it allows for the full CHP steam supply with zero condensate return as a worst-case scenario. In practice, there is limited demand for reuse of surface water runoff in the process (which would also need pre-treatment). For the wider development, reuse of water and provision of rainwater harvesting systems will be provided where practicable (e.g. permeable paving in car park and area surrounding switch compound, rainwater harvesting and green roof for weighbridge, reuse of runoff from office building). Matters concerning potable water supply for the Proposed Development are being progressed by the Applicant and Anglian Water. These discussions include considering any additional demands the Proposed Development may place on local water resources. Submitted at Deadline 1, the Statement of Common Ground between Medworth CHP Limited and Anglian Water (Volume 9.10), summarises progress on this matter.
Hydrology	Water resources Therefore, the Commissioners and associated Boards promote water neutrality by minimising the use of potable water and encouraging the use of recycling and rainwater harvesting to enable the better use of a limited and decreasing resource.	As detailed in **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES)) [APP-039],** the potable water demand for the EfW Facility appears high because it allows for the full CHP steam supply with zero condensate return as a worst-case scenario. In practice, there is limited demand for reuse of surface water runoff in the process (which would also need pre-treatment). For the wider development, reuse of water and provision of rainwater harvesting systems will be provided where practicable (e.g. permeable paving in car park and area surrounding switch compound, rainwater harvesting and green roof for weighbridge, reuse of runoff from office building).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water Quality Water quality and pollution control is generally a matter for the Environment Agency and the local Environmental Health Department; however, the Board is facing the increasing challenge of having to dispose of polluted and contaminated soil from its network due to the poor water quality as the result of pollution incidents within the area.	Contaminated soil will be managed during construction in line with the Outline Soil Management Plan (Appendix C of the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) Rev 2** submitted at Deadline 1 which will be secured via Requirement 10 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** Any temporary onsite storage of excavated materials suspected or confirmed to be contaminated will be stored on impermeable sheeting, covered over and with adequate leachate/runoff drainage to prevent migration of contaminants from the stockpile. These materials will be segregated where possible to prevent cross-contamination occurring and will be treated or disposed off-site appropriately.
Hydrology	Water quality Whilst the proposed development will be subject to Environmental Permitting Regulations, which are outside of the Boards control, and it is appreciated that both water resources and quality are mainly matters for the Environment Agency (EA), the Board are concerned about the consequences, both physical and financial, of a pollution incident that effects some of the most fertile agricultural land in the area, the urban development, and aquatic environment either directly or indirectly and the implications that this could have on these	The proposed embedded environmental measures to prevent water pollution and pollution incidents affecting agricultural land are set out in Table 12.10 of **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039]**. These measures include implementing good working practices and adherence to the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP-103];** in addition to specific measures relating to minimum stand-off distance between the works and the edge of the HWIDB drains, the provision of oil interceptors and trapped gullies, appropriate storage of chemicals, fuel and oil including implementation of an accident response protocol, development of a detailed Drainage Management Plan and Drainage Strategy (on the basis of **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES [APP-086])**), implementation of a water quality monitoring programme, and the development and implementation of a Materials Management Plan to manage soil stockpiles and excavated materials. As set out in the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086**], SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment to reduce the discharge to greenfield runoff rates and prevent pollution of the HWIDB drains. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water quality Also, the quality of water discharge from the site, during all phases does not appear to have been considered. Given the ecological sensitivity of the hydraulically-linked EPS particularly to water levels and quality, the Board would expect the development to be able (or be required) to demonstrate 'water and nutrient neutrality' if it is to avoid an adverse impact upon the integrity of the sites, under the Habitats Regulations.	As set out in the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086],** SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment of the water discharge from the site. This aims to reduce the discharge to greenfield runoff rates and prevent pollution of the HWIDB drains. The proposed SuDS components have been determined in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 to provide the required pollution control prior to discharge into the HWIDB drains. The indicative proposals for SuDS components will be confirmed at the detailed design stage. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).
Hydrology	Water quality The Board is concerned about items of airborne waste, primarily plastic, card and paper, entering its system and collecting on weedscreen grills or entrances to culverts and increasing flood risk as is the increasing microplastics entering the aquatic environment.	The likelihood of airborne waste entering the HWIDB drainage system is very low as waste will be delivered in enclosed vehicles and all processes will take place inside buildings.
Hydrology	Water quality Increased pollution caused by chemical spills during normal operating procedures or the likely significant effect of an emergency response, such as large volumes of water applied during firefighting and where that water may go.	The proposed embedded environmental measures to prevent water pollution caused by chemical spills during normal operating conditions are set out in Table 12.10 of **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039].** These measures include implementing good working practices and adherence to the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP-103];** in addition to specific measures relating to minimum stand-off distance between the works and the edge of the HWIDB drains, the provision of oil interceptors and trapped gullies, appropriate storage of chemicals, fuel and oil including

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		implementation of an accident response protocol, development of a detailed Drainage Management Plan and Drainage Strategy (on the basis of **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES [APP-086])),** implementation of a water quality monitoring programme. As set out in the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086],** spent fire water will be collected in the surface water drainage system. In the event of a fire, the discharge to the HWIDB drains ceases and the spent fire water (together with any surface runoff) will be tankered off site.
Hydrology	Water quality The interception and containment of fire-fighting run-off will need to be of a significant volume. Fire-fighting operations which have become necessary after fire suppression systems have been unable to extinguish the fire may operate for a number of days, delivering 1000's of litres of water per minute. If the surface water run-off interception ponds are to be used to store such run-off, they will have to be off-line from the wider surface water drainage network in the area.	More information on the management of contaminated fire-fighting water has been provided in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. In summary the EfW Facility will be designed to deal with water contaminated during a fire. The tipping hall and waste bunkers have a large capacity fort retaining fire-fighting water within the building footprint. The water will then be directed towards the waste reception pit for storage, treatment (if required) and appropriate disposal. The shut off valve to the surface water drainage system is connected to the alarm system and will close to prevent contaminated water being discharged into the drains. The water would be retained in the SuDS and underground tanks for treatment (if required) and appropriate disposal
Hydrology	Water Quality The Boards system is not subject to water abstraction requiring a licence or permit but the neighbouring Waldersey IDB district does include several abstractions for crop irrigation purposes.	The proposed embedded environmental measures to prevent water pollution are set out in Table 12.10 of **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039].** Potential receptors assessed include water abstractions within the study area.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water Quality In order to reduce any detrimental impacts resulting in the deterioration in the water quality during the lifetime of the proposed development including the construction, operational and decommissioning phases, the Board requests that appropriate systems are installed and implemented to ensure that no building and constructional materials, foreign debris or polluting matter is discharged or becomes deposited into an open watercourse by any means. This may require the installation of a suitable pollution retention device or devices to contain any foreign debris or polluting matter that enter the adjacent open watercourses.	As set out in the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086],** SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment of the water discharge from the site. The proposed SuDS components have been determined in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 to provide the required pollution control prior to discharge into the HWIDB drains. The drainage strategy and indicative proposals for SuDS components will be confirmed at detailed design stage and agreed in consultation with HWIDB. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).
Hydrology	Water Quality In addition, the Board expects that adequate provision is made to retain any harmful pollutants or contaminated water on the site for disposal to a suitably permitted location and not allowed to discharge into the local aquatic network.	As set out in the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086]**, SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment of the water discharge from the site. The proposed SuDS components have been determined in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 to provide the required pollution control prior to discharge into the HWIDB drains. The drainage strategy and indicative proposals for SuDS components will be confirmed at detailed design stage and agreed in consultation with HWIDB. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water Quality An IDB has a statutory duty to, whilst considering applications for consent to undertake any activity on an IDB drain, have regard for the objectives of the RBMP (Water framework directive) of the connected River Nene. The Board is unlikely to grant consent for any activity which would be in conflict with the RBMP objectives.	In setting the scope of the assessment consideration has been given to PINS Advice Note 18, which sets out the approach to the WFD Assessment. It is important to note that the Proposed Development is not within a reportable surface water body WFD area and is also not within a WFD Groundwater Management Catchment. The nearest WFD surface waterbodies (North Level Main Drain and River Great Ouse Relief Channel) are either not downstream of the Proposed Development or lie are outside of the study area and are therefore not affected by Proposed Development. Therefore, a separate WFD assessment has not been produced to support the ES. However, as the Proposed Development is intersected by numerous HWIDB and KLIDB drains, water quality and hydromorphology effects on these aquatic environment receptors were considered within **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039]** in a manner which mirrors the WFD approach, to ensure that consideration is paid to the overall objectives of the WFD as transposed into UK law.
Hydrology	Development within the floodplain During 1978 areas of the town suffered directly or dealt with the consequences following the overtopping of the River Nene defences following a tidal surge. The defences were subsequently raised in the early eighties and again circa 2010-2015 to allow for the impacts of climate change. However, these defences were severely tested by a tidal surge in January 2013.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the Environment Agency during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. The **Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 6.4 of the ES) [APP-084]** has assessed the impacts of climate change in line with the current National Guidance (Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) updated July 2020) and using the latest Environment Agency flood modelling for the area (2011 Nene Tidal Hazard mapping). Based on the 40 year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the Environment Agency has confirmed that the **Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 6.4 of the ES) [APP-084]** is appropriate.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Development within the floodplain The comments about the Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire Tidal Breaching Hazard Mapping are noted but this is understood to date from 2011 and it is questioned whether this meets current design standards particularly in respect of subsequent changes to climate change allowances.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the Environment Agency during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. The **Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 6.4 of the ES) [APP-084]** has assessed the impacts of climate change in line with the current National Guidance (Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) updated July 2020) and using the latest Environment Agency flood modelling for the area (2011 Nene Tidal Hazard mapping). Based on the 40 year lifetime of the Proposed Development, the Environment Agency has confirmed that the **Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 6.4 of the ES) [APP-084]** is appropriate.
Hydrology	Development within the floodplain The final paragraph on page 43 of the FCERM strategy states that one of the broader range of actions for achieving climate change resilience includes "avoiding inappropriate development in the floodplain" and the Board questions if the incinerator is built within the floodplain where will the flood water that would have occupied this area be transferred to and would it increase flood risk elsewhere?	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the Environment Agency during pre-application regarding the assessment of flood risk at the site and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. The **Flood Risk Assessment (Volume 6.4 of the ES) [APP-084]** was produced on the basis that floodplain compensation is not required for the Proposed Development as agreed with the Environment Agency. The loss of floodplain storage is less likely to be a concern in areas benefitting from appropriate flood risk management infrastructure or where the source of flood risk is mainly tidal. The Wisbech flood defences are designed to a 0.5% (1 in 200 year) level. The Environment Agency has produced Hazard Mapping for the Wisbech area, which shows no overtopping of defences for the 2115 0.5% annual event probability and the 0.1% (plus climate change scenario).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Page 36 of the FCERM Strategy document advises that the Environment Agency's long-term investment scenarios team commissioned experts at the University of Oxford to examine the impacts of flooding from rivers and the sea on transport and utilities infrastructure including: road, rail, electricity, gas and water. This research found over two-thirds of properties in England are served by infrastructure sites and networks located in, or dependent on others located in, areas at risk of flooding. Many infrastructure owners have invested to improve infrastructure resilience, as outlined in the National Flood Resilience Review (Cabinet Office, 2016). As a result, some infrastructure on the floodplain is resilient to a very high level of protection. In this respect the Board requests that the proposal design provides a high degree of resilience.	The Proposed Development will remain entirely dry during the design flood event (overtopping of the Nene flood defences plus climate change) but is at risk of flooding during a residual risk event (breach of the Nene flood defences plus climate change) and/or a particularly severe overtopping event in excess of the design flood. The proposed embedded environmental measures to address the residual risk of flooding of the Proposed Development are set out in Table 12.10 of **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039]** and were agreed with the Environment Agency through extensive consultation during pre-application. These measures include raising the ground levels of sensitive infrastructure (1 in 1000 year plus climate change tidal breach flood level) and implementing an appropriate Flood Emergency Management Plan, secured via a DCO Requirement consistent with the **Outline Flood Emergency Management Plan (Volume 7.9 of the ES) [APP-100].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology / Hydrogeology	The Board has previously given initial advice concerning surface water disposal during normal operating conditions, as follows: The provision of suitable filter strips beside any open watercourse will be required together with the following: (i) During the Construction and Decommissioning Phases: • Any excavated, imported or exported soils and materials are regularly tested to ensure it meets the appropriate standards. • No soils or materials, particularly those which are potentially contaminated, are placed within 20m of an open watercourse. • Any water, including groundwater, discharging into an open watercourse must meet regularly tested to ensure it meets the appropriate standards.	The Outline Water Management Plan and Outline Soil Management Plan (Appendix B and Appendix C, respectively, of the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) Rev 2,** both updated at Deadline 1, set out working methods to manage excavated soils, pumped groundwater and surface runoff during the construction phase to prevent contamination of the HWIDB drains. This includes soil testing, appropriate management of any contaminated soils, storage of soil stockpiles outside 20m buffer from open watercourses, water quality monitoring programme and provision of filter strips besides open drains, where required (exact details to be confirmed at the detailed design stage). These will be secured via Requirements 8 and 10 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology / Hydrogeology	(ii) During operation: • Any water discharging into an open watercourse must be regularly tested to ensure it meets the appropriate standards. • No waste materials, particularly those which are potentially contaminated, are placed within 20m of or allowed to enter an open watercourse.	The Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1, sets out working methods to manage surface runoff during the operational phase to prevent contamination of the HWIDB drains. This includes treatment of the surface runoff in SuDS prior to discharge into the HWIDB drains and a water quality monitoring programme. All waste materials will be delivered in enclosed vehicles and all processes will take place inside buildings.
Hydrology	Groundwater Table/Infiltration Whilst the Commissioners and associated Boards generally promote the use of the drainage hierarchy, there is substantial evidence that during periods of wet weather or high rainfall events, particularly during the winter months, the local ground water table can rise close to the ground surface thus precluding the use of infiltration based systems. It is suggested that the water table may be higher than the figures shown on the Groundwater Contours plans. The poor infiltration is inferred in the Site Walkover photographs which suggests a saturated site.	As set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1**,** discharge of surface water runoff via infiltration is not proposed during the construction and operation of the EfW CHP Site and during construction of the Walsoken Substation. The proposed use of infiltration at the Walsoken Substation (operational phase) will be subject to further investigation undertaken prior to construction, through consultation with NCC and KLIDB and by undertaking a soakaway testing exercise. If infiltration into the ground is not a viable solution at the Walsoken Substation, then runoff would be attenuated prior to discharge into a nearby drain .

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations The Board accepts that there are agreed standard methods of designing surface water systems and, in this respect the Board would normally request that the respective surface water systems should be designed for the worst case 1% AEP (Annual Exceedance Probability), a 1 in 100 year storm, and must consider a range of durations to determine the maximum volume required with an allowance for the impact of climate change, normally 40% but could be greater, and siltation should be included within the calculations.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with CCC during pre-application regarding the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-086]** and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. As agreed with CCC, the drainage design calculations used a climate change allowance of 20% for the construction phase and 40% for the operational phase and considered the 1% AEP storm event as well as the 3.3% AEP storm event. The climate change allowances used in the hydraulic modelling are in line with the latest Environment Agency guidance. The 1% AEP storm event result was used in the sizing of the attenuation tanks and basins as a worst-case scenario. Any effects on the drainage system due to siltation will be assessed at detailed design stage, and if required, mitigation will be proposed.
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations It is suggested that a 100% impermeability factor is used for the design of the water level and flood risk management systems. This will allow for future development, extensions to buildings etc to be accommodated and/or depreciation in efficiency of the systems, lack of maintenance etc.	Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes an additional allowance of 10% for urban creep in the modelling calculations for the sizing of SuDS, which will allow for some future expansion of the EfW CHP Facility.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations It is understood that the surface water disposal system is reliant on pumping systems. It is considered that with some careful design and re-evaluation there may be an alternative and more sustainable solution which reduces a significant residual risk which is prone to failure during extreme events, is easier to maintain and a more appropriate solution.	The proposed management of surface water drainage for the EfW CHP Facility (construction and operational phases) is described in detail in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 and supporting Figures 4.1 and 4.2. During the construction phase of the EfW CHP Facility, there is a requirement for pumping surface water runoff from the northern area into the temporary drainage network in the southern area and into the HWIDB drainage system. The pumping of surface water runoff is also required from the underground attenuation tank located in the TCC. Pumping is required because topographic levels do not permit a gravity outfall from the temporary drainage network into the IDB drainage network. At the request of CCC, the impact of a potential pump failure has been assessed for both the northern area of the EfW CHP Facility and the TCC. The calculations are presented in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations The widespread flooding impacts seen on and after 23rd December 2020, particularly within north Cambridgeshire were as a consequence of heavy rainfall on December 23rd, in excess of the Long term Average (LTA), falling on an already saturated catchment which was especially sensitive to intense rainfall. Whilst no instances of flooding were reported to the LLFA, the Boards system was under extreme pressure for several days.	Noted and discussed in extensive consultation with HWIDB during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations Current design standards do not allow for such circumstances or the special drainage arrangements within the Fens where it may take several days for the flows to be dealt with. Because of this the normal requirements concerning half drain times within a twenty four hour period are unlikely to be achieved particularly given the size of the proposed facility.	The calculations presented in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 indicate that the half drain times exceed 24h within the system. Following consultation with CCC, additional calculations were undertaken to confirm that the system has suitable capacity to receive a follow up 1 in 10-year storm after 24h.
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations Such situations are not normally accommodated within accepted design and the Commissioners are currently reviewing its position concerning this aspect.	The calculations presented in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 indicate that the half drain times exceed 24h within the system. Following consultation with CCC on 24/10/22, additional calculations were undertaken to confirm that the system has suitable capacity to receive a follow up 1 in 10-year storm after 24h. It is noted that the Commissioners are currently reviewing this information.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Long term ownership, funding and maintenance of environmental water management systems In order to alleviate any adverse impact upon the respective systems; the Boards; the Councils' ratepayers and the natural, built and aquatic environment; it is considered appropriate that the Board ensures that adequate arrangements are made for the long-term ownership, funding, management and maintenance arrangements for the upkeep of any environmental, water level and flood risk management systems, whether on or off site, in perpetuity. These requirements may be in addition to those imposed by planning conditions or required by the LLFA and that details of the works to be carried out by the occupier/land owner, adopting authority, the "Management Company" or other responsible person/authority, together with the costs attached, are included in the "Operators Manual" and any Deed of Sale.	For the lifetime of the development, the Drainage Strategy secured by Requirement 8 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** will be maintained. This includes maintenance of the proposed surface water drainage network infrastructure in accordance with the Maintenance Plan included in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. The Decommissioning Plan, which will be secured by DCO requirement 25 (**draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013**], will address the removal of the plant infrastructure. Protective Provisions will also be provided in the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** that provide for the undertaker at its own expense to construct protective works at its own expense. The Applicant is working to produce a draft Statement of Common Ground with HWIDB which will be submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Climate The Board acknowledges the increased risk that climate change creates on its remit including water level and flood risk management, habitats and species and other environmental and biodiversity concerns, water neutrality and a managing a decreasing resource, water quality specifically pollution control and nutrient neutrality.	Noted. **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]** includes an assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on climate change (through release of GHG emissions) and an assessment of the resilience of the Proposed Development to projected climate change impacts. Both assessments conclude no significant effects.
Climate	Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Climate As a competent authority the Board recognises its role and generally encourages the societal change and principles contained within international, national and local climate change policy with the challenge of achieving net zero. It is working with the Association of Drainage Authorities (ADA) and other relevant partners to achieve the most economic and environmentally acceptable standard.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Climate Whilst the Board recognises that EfW operations have the potential to reduce the overall GHG emissions by redirecting waste from landfill, a significant source of methane release into the atmosphere (https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ar4-wg3-chapter10-1.pdf) the Board request further information on how this has been assessed. The assessment must include the location of the waste materials source, how they will be transported etc. and the associated modelling. The Board would like to see how the proposed facility will help to contribute towards the Governments' legal obligation, though the Climate Change Act 2008 to cut greenhouse gas emissions by at least 68% by 2030.	The assessment described in **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]** Section 14.9 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. Relative to the 'without Proposed Development' scenario (where waste is landfilled), the Proposed Development has lower GHG emissions which will support the UK Government in meeting its carbon budgets/targets. The approach to quantifying GHG emissions from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development has been undertaken in line with the latest IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions and the infrastructure life-cycle modules set out in PAS 2080: Carbon Management Infrastructure. The assessment includes emissions from operational transport, considering the likely origin of the residual waste as assessed in the **Waste Fuel Availability Assessment (Volume 7.3) [APP-094]**. Assumptions (see Appendix 14B - Assumptions and limitations **(Volume 6.4) [APP-088])** remain in line with published material and the guidance documents.
Climate	Environmental Statement Chapter 14: Climate In this respect the Board encourages the use of appropriate Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) facilities and appropriate sustainable after uses and carbon reduction measures associated with the proposal as a whole.	As stated in Table 14.15, **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]**: "*The Proposed Development will be carbon capture retrofit ready with land set aside for a CCS facility. However, the Application does not include the construction and operation of the carbon capture technology within the Proposed Development.*" The Applicant is undertaking a feasibility study of CCS technology and is in the process of agreeing a DCO Requirement to demonstrate commitments to CCS.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
MADS	Environmental Statement Chapter 17: Major Accidents and Disasters The contents of the points previously raised, identified in error as the Middle Level Commissioners, are noted but remain a significant concern.	Comment noted.
MADS	Environmental Statement Chapter 17: Major Accidents and Disasters As discussed elsewhere access to a suitable water supply, the impacts of that supply on the environment and the discharge of polluted materials into the aquatic environment are of particular concern to the Board.	The assessment of impacts on water resources and of discharges to the water environment are described in **Chapter 7 Hydrology of the ES (Volume 6.2) [APP-039],** and determines that all anticipated effects are Not Significant.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Combined Heat and Power Assessment Whilst the Board were consulted by Carter Jonas concerning land around the existing Nestle Purina Facility off Coalwharf Road no other engagement has been made concerning the route of the CHP Steam export pipeline. It was previously understood that this export pipeline would be buried but the submission documents show the pipeline to be elevated above the ground surface within the boundaries of the currently "mothballed" railway line. Having received a copy of the Boards GIS shapefiles identifying the location of the Boards network and associated assets, MVV will be aware that the northern section of its system that serves the Cromwell Road area is aligned parallel with the railway between Points 32 – 47- 103 - 36. For this reason, the Board would prefer the CHP to be located on the south eastern side of the railway. However, the adverse impacts of piled foundations to support the CHP are a concern.	The CHP Connection Corridor will run along the south-eastern edge of the disused March to Wisbech Railway. The detailed design of the CHP Connection would be subject to agreement with the relevant planning authority as per Requirement 2 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** A description of the construction works associated with the CHP Connection is provided in Section 3.8 of **ES Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030].** Paragraph 3.8.37 confirms that the foundation installation of the CHP Connection is unlikely to require piling. Any changes to this assumption would be discussed with the HWIDB.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Combined Heat and Power Assessment In addition, the Boards System is culverted under the railway lines at Points 33 and in the vicinity of Points 61 - 62 - 63 adjacent to the current scrapyard and the building occupied by Crown Holdings Inc./ Eviosys Packaging (ex- Metal Box) and possibly Point 34 but the latter needs to be confirmed.	Discussed in extensive consultation with HWIDB during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. The applicant has confirmed that the construction works would not affect the access roads in this area and the design near the culvert at Points 62 and 63 comprises foundations located in reasonable positions to be agreed in consultation with HWIDB.
Hydrology	Combined Heat and Power Assessment The above systems all serve an extensive area of the urban area of Wisbech and for the reasons discussed above the failure to adequately maintain these watercourses would lead to significant areas of flooding in the catchments served.	Discussed in extensive consultation with HWIDB during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. As agreed with HWIDB, access to the drains during the scheduled maintenance will be provided by the Applicant (e.g. by providing alternative access routes to the drains). The Applicant has confirmed that the construction works would not affect access for maintenance of the drains along the CHP route. In addition, the design near the culvert at Points 62 and 63 comprises foundations located in reasonable positions to be agreed in consultation with HWIDB which will not affect access for maintenance of the drains. This will be agreed with HWIDB at the detailed design stage and will be secured via the Construction Environmental and Management Plan (which is secured in Requirement 10 (Construction environmental management plan of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]**).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
CHP	Combined Heat and Power Assessment None of the documents submitted appear to advise on the adverse implications of working in close proximity to the export pipeline where pressures up to 20 bar (290 psi) and 213 degrees centigrade may be experienced. A brief review of readily available health and safety documents does not identify a guidance/safe working practice document specific to CHP pipelines.	There are no specific standard procedures for working in the vicinity of CHP pipelines, normal safe working practices applicable to working near any utilities should be applied, with a suitable and sufficient risk assessment and appropriate method statement. The CHP pipeline is a high integrity thermally insulated pipeline of all welded construction designed, constructed, maintained and operated in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations and HSE guidance including the Pressure Systems Safety Regulations 2000. During construction, welds are subject to non-destructive testing and the entire system is subject to pressure testing and ongoing regular inspection under a Written Scheme of Examination (required by the Pressure Systems Safety Regulations 2000).
CHP	Combined Heat and Power Assessment Could the Board please be advised who will be responsible for the long term ownership, funding and maintenance of this steam export pipeline? Whether there is a specific Health & Safety document covering steam pipelines? Is this infrastructure covered by other similar documents such as National Grids "Specification for safe working in the vicinity of National Grid high pressure gas pipeline and associate installations"? What are the implications on the Board and its rate payers?	The Applicant will own the CHP Connection and be responsible for its funding and maintenance. There are no specific standard procedures for working in the vicinity of CHP pipelines, normal safe working practices applicable to working near any utilities should be applied, with a suitable and sufficient risk assessment and appropriate method statement. The CHP pipeline is a high integrity thermally insulated pipeline of all welded construction designed, constructed, maintained and operated in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations and HSE guidance including the Pressure Systems Safety Regulations. During construction welds are subject to non-destructive testing and the entire system is subject to pressure testing and ongoing regular inspection under a Written Scheme of Examination (required by the Pressure Systems Safety Regulations 2000). The Applicant is not aware of any significant implications to the Board or its rate payers, however, suggest this is discussed in further detail with the Board.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Development Consent Order	Development Consent Order – Protective Provision It has been agreed following discussions with MVV that a protective provision for the Board is appropriate. The Board consider that such a provision may act to alleviate potential conflict between the planning process and the Boards regulatory powers and consenting process providing reassurance that its interests and the ability to undertake its statutory functions are protected and subject to due consideration.	Part 6 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** contains protective provisions for the protection of the IDB.

Table 3.9 Applicant's Comments on the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board Relevant Representation [RR-012]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	The development area is partially within the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and the Board are the regulator for several elements of the proposed works which require consent as per the Land Drainage Act, 1991 (including the Board's Byelaws). The Board is therefore an interested party due to the potential impact of the project on the Board's ability to carry out its statutory functions.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with KLIDB during the pre-application stage and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application.
Hydrology	The following works will likely require the Boards consent: Watercourse crossings: The applicant intends to cross 3 Board maintained watercourses (DRN145P1116, DRN145P1101 and DRN145P1123), and potentially run parts of the cable perpendicular to and within 9m of these same watercourses. The status of a 'Board Maintained Watercourse' is an acknowledgement by the IDB that the	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with KLIDB during the pre-application stage and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. This has included discussion of stand off distance from drains, crossing of drains and waste discharges into drains. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].** The Applicant is

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	watercourse is of arterial importance to the IDD and will normally receive maintenance from the IDB in accordance with water level management requirements.	working to produce a Statement of Common Ground (SoC) with KLIDB. A draft SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Several watercourse crossings will require consent from the Board.	Agreed. It was confirmed as part of the extensive consultation undertaken with KLIDB during pre-application, and which remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application, that a consent from KLIDB is required under Section 23 for the proposed watercourse crossings. The Applicant is working to produce a Statement of Common Ground with HWIDB and KLIDB which will be submitted during the DCO examination.
Hydrology	Surface water discharge: The applicant intends to discharge surface water from the construction phase for the Walsoken substation to a watercourse within the IDD. Contrary to references within doc ref: APP-086 this would also require temporary consent from the Board under Byelaw 3.	Agreed. It was confirmed as part of the extensive consultation undertaken with KLIDB during pre-application, and which remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application, that a consent from KLIDB is required for the proposed water discharge from the site into the drains under Byelaws 3 and 10 (for maintained drains) or Byelaw 3 (for non maintained drains). At the request of NCC, further details on the proposed drainage strategy for Walsoken substation will be submitted as a Technical Note to NCC and KLIDB in early February 2023. Where relevant, this information has been included in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. The Applicant is working to produce a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with KLIDB. A draft SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 1.
Hydrology	Development Consent Order – Protective Provision: Following discussions with the applicant, it has been agreed that a protective provision for the IDB would be appropriate. We consider that such a provision may act to avoid conflict between the planning process and the Board's regulatory regime and consenting process (as per the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws) while assuring the Board that their interests and ability to undertake their statutory functions are safeguarded and subject to due consideration.	Agreed. Part 6 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** contains protective provisions for the protection of the IDB. The Applicant is working to produce a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with KLIDB. A draft SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 3.10 Applicant's Comments on the Anglian Water Relevant Representation [RR-020]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Anglian Water is the statutory undertaker for water services in the application area. Consultation with the Applicant has taken place regarding several matters, critically on Protective Provisions and the Discharge of Requirements for a Drainage Strategy.	Comment noted.
Development Consent Order	We note that Anglian Water's requirement to be a consultee to the discharge of the requirement regarding the drainage strategy is set out in Schedule 2, Requirement 8 and confirm that we are content with the wording in the Draft DCO.	Comment noted.
Development Consent Order	The Protective Provisions for Anglian Water are set out in Schedule 11, Part 7 and these were agreed with Anglian Water prior to the submission of the application for DCO.	Since these protective provisions were inserted into the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013],** Anglian Water have provided an updated set of protective provisions. These will be included in the updated draft DCO submitted at Deadline 1.
Statement of Common Ground	Anglian Water is working with the Applicant in respect of a Statement of Common Ground and look forward to being able to submit this to the Examining Authority shortly.	The draft SoCG with Anglian Water will be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1.

Table 3.11 Applicant's Comments on the National Highways Relevant Representation [RR-021]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Compulsory Acquisition	National Highways objects to the Project for the following reasons. National Highways is a statutory undertaker and is appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport to operate and maintain the strategic road network ("SRN") in England. The book of reference as submitted by the Applicant identifies 42 plots of land owned by or occupied by National Highways ("Plots") in respect of which compulsory	At Deadline 1, the Applicant has submitted a Draft SoCG that summaries the pre and post DCO Application submission engagement and current status of discussions with National Highways (**Volume 9.15**). In summary; • National Highways are a prescribed consultee and statutory undertaker in relation to the DCO application. They are

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	acquisition powers to acquire new rights are sought. The compulsory acquisition powers sought are described in the book of reference as being the creation and compulsory acquisition of new rights over land and the temporary possession of land ("Compulsory Powers"). National Highways understands that the Applicant proposes to route cabling and water pipes beneath the A47 raising a number of geotechnical concerns due to ground conditions. To safeguard National Highways' interests and the safety and integrity of the SRN, National Highways objects to the inclusion of the Plots in the Order and to Compulsory Powers being granted in respect of them. The Plots constitute land acquired by National Highways for the purpose of its statutory undertaking and, accordingly, this representation is made under section 56 and sections 127 and 138 of the Planning Act 2008. National Highways considers that there is no compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Powers and that the Secretary of State, in applying section 127 of the Planning Act 2008, cannot conclude that new rights and restrictions over the Plots can be created without serious detriment to National Highways' undertaking and no other land is available to National Highways to make good the detriment. National Highways also objects to all other compulsory powers in the Order that affect, and may be exercised in relation to, National Highways' property and interests.	responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN). The A47 which runs through the DCO Order limits, is under the jurisdiction of National Highways. The Applicant proposes to run the underground grid connection cables and a new water main following the verge of and under of the A47 respectively. • To introduce the project and discuss matters relating to the Strategic Highway Network, the Applicant first contacted National Highways (previously Highways England) in December 2019. In October 2021 National Highways and the Applicant reached agreement to install the Grid Connection following the verge of the A47 between New Bridge Lane and Broadend Road. • In November 2021 the Applicant and National Highways commenced discussions on the method of construction to install the potable Water Connections across the A47; either open cut or horizontal directional drilling (HDD). These negotiations are ongoing, therefore both options are included in the DCO Application. • In February 2022 the Applicant, National Highways, and the Water Management Alliance (King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board) met to discuss and agree an approach to install the Grid Connection following the verge of the A47 at points where it crosses IDB drains. • The Applicant has included Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Highways in Schedule 11 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** The form of Protective Provisions is currently being discussed with National Highways.
Compulsory Acquisition	In order for National Highways to be in a position to withdraw its objection, National Highways requires: (a) the inclusion of protective provisions in the Order for its benefit; and (b) agreements with the Applicant that regulate (i) the manner in which rights over the Plots are acquired and the relevant works are carried out including terms which protect National Highways' statutory undertaking and agreement that compulsory acquisition powers will not be exercised in relation to such land; and (ii) the carrying out of works in the vicinity of the SRN to safeguard National Highways' statutory undertaking.	

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		Protective Provisions for the benefit of National Highways have of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].** The form of Protective Provisions is currently being discussed with National Highways. The Applicant has included a provision in the protective provisions contained at paragraph 46 of Part 5 of Schedule 11 to the draft DCO that would prohibit the use of compulsory acquisitions powers and temporary use powers in respect of National Highways' land and interests without the prior consent of National Highways.
General	National Highways reserves the right to produce additional grounds of concern if further details of the impact to National Highways' assets become available.	Comment noted. The Applicant will review any further submissions made by National Highways into the Examination.

Table 3.12 Applicant's Comments on the Natural England Relevant Representation [RR-022]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	Natural England is satisfied that the Environmental Statement and Habitats Regulations Assessment confirm that the proposed scheme is unlikely to have any adverse effect on key matters within Natural England's statutory remit, including designated sites.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity Net Gain	However, there is the significant matter of Biodiversity Net Gain that needs to be resolved. To overcome our concerns, a feasibility assessment is needed for offsite Biodiversity Net Gain before the Development Consent Order requirement. We recommend consulting with the Local Planning Authority and county ecologists regarding offsite Biodiversity Net Gain.	Noted. The Applicant is committed to delivering 10% biodiversity net gain through the Proposed Development, as set out in the **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [AS-009]** (to be secured via **DCO Requirement 6 Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013]**). The potential for BNG has been maximised for on-site land under the Applicant's control. **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M** sets out the requirement for off-site habitat enhancements/creation to achieve the target of 10% BNG and provides examples of appropriate habitat enhancement and creation options which would meet this target and meet the BNG trading rules. The Applicant is exploring delivery options for off-site BNG habitat compensation during the Examination period and will organise a meeting with the named parties to identify potential opportunities.
Biodiversity	We are satisfied with the parameters of the Construction Environment Management Plan, Outline Ecological Mitigation Strategy and Landscape Environment Management Plan.	Comment noted.
Biodiversity	The Environmental Statement explored the reasonable alternatives of this proposal and we are satisfied that these were addressed.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
HRA	Issues that are unlikely to result in an adverse effect on the integrity of internationally designated sites: • Loss of Functionally Linked Land used by qualifying species. • Impacts to air quality from emissions during construction and operation of the facility. • Impacts to air quality from increased traffic, vehicles and generators. • Impacts from dust deposition during construction and operation.	Comment noted.
HRA	All issues have been appropriately evidenced through survey efforts and obtaining historic records. Natural England are in agreement with the conclusions of the HRA.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	Natural England are satisfied that this development will not result in direct impacts to protected species. This conclusion was reached based on the following evidence: • There is no evidence of protected species present on the development site. • Seven trees were noted as having bat roost potential, however no species were observed to use these trees and there was no evidence of roosting. • Extensive surveys were carried out for all protected species, including bird surveys to determine use by qualifying species from internationally designated sites. These found no presence of protected species, with one exception, being water vole. • There was evidence of a low presence of water voles but no evidence of them using any potential burrows during the survey.	Comments noted.
Biodiversity	Natural England are of the position that no mitigation is necessary to address the impacts to protected species	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	However, we do have some concerns regarding the presence of water voles on site. We recommend that, prior to the commencement of works, a qualified ecologist surveys the areas of high suitability for water voles to determine if the protected species is present on site. If so, the applicant should contact Natural England for a protected species licence and a subsequent Letter of No Impedement. The Construction Environment Management Plan proposes that preconstruction ecological surveys will be conducted to update baseline data. This addresses our recommendations, thus we have no concerns regarding protected species.	Noted. The Applicant's commitment to undertaking pre-construction surveys for protected species, and to consult Natural England regarding licensable mitigation if impacts are unavoidable, are set out in the **Outline Construction Environment Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103]** (secured via DCO requirement **10 Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013]**).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
BNG	Natural England's position regarding provision of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is summarised below. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given in Part II. At present, the development will result in a Biodiversity Net Loss of -9.98% in Habitat Units, -21.56% in Hedgerow Units and -11.85% of River Units. The applicant has ensured that as much habitat creation as possible is delivered on site, including: • Incorporation of wet woodland into the SUDs • Native species rich hedgerows and shrubs • Species-rich, wet grassland • Species-rich, neutral grassland • Installation of brown roofs on administration buildings to mimic brownfield land • Installation of a green wall on the administration building.	Noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
BNG	Natural England are of the position that, with consideration of future statutory requirements set forth by The Environment Act 2021 for mandatory BNG for NSIPs in 2025, at present the applicant has not yet gone far enough to address loss of biodiversity.	While it is not yet mandatory, the Applicant has made a voluntary commitment to providing 10% BNG for the Proposed Development as set out in the **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [AS-009]** (to be secured via DCO requirement 6 of the Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013]). The **potential** for BNG has been maximised for on-site land under the Applicant's control through habitat creation/enhancement measures shown on **Figure 3.14 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** (to be secured via DCO requirement 5 of the **Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013]**). **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M** sets out the requirement for off-site habitat enhancements/creation to achieve the target of 10% BNG, and provides examples of appropriate habitat enhancement and creation options which would meet this target and meet the BNG trading rules. The Applicant is exploring delivery options for off-site BNG habitat compensation during the Examination period, and will organise a meeting with relevant local planning authorities and NGOs to explore potential delivery opportunities.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
BNG	We recommend the applicant consult Natural England on their offsite Biodiversity Net Gain provision as more detailed plans emerge. It is noted that this application is in its early stages and as such no detailed designs have been developed. The key consideration for offsite BNG is feasibility and how potential options will be delivered. We are in agreement that Biodiversity Metric V3.0 was appropriate to use for this development.	Noted. The Applicant is exploring delivery options for off-site BNG habitat compensation during the Examination period, and will organise a meeting with relevant local planning authorities and NGOs to explore potential delivery opportunities. The Applicant will consult with Natural England on their offsite Biodiversity Net Gain once delivery options have been identified.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	The main issue raised by this application are: • Overall Biodiversity Net Loss from the development. The applicant will need to meet trading rules with the loss of medium distinctiveness habitat in terms of what they provide. The applicant must provide habitat of the same broad type with at least a medium distinctiveness or above	While it is not yet mandatory, the Applicant has made a voluntary commitment to providing 10% BNG for the Proposed Development as set out in the **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [AS-009]** (to be secured via DCO requirement 6 of the Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013]). The **potential** for BNG has been maximised for on-site land under the Applicant's control through habitat creation/enhancement measures shown on **Figure 3.14 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** (to be secured via DCO requirement 5 of the **Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013]**). **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M** sets out the requirement for off-site habitat enhancements/creation to achieve the target of 10% BNG, and provides examples of appropriate habitat enhancement and creation options which would meet this target and meet the BNG trading rules. The Applicant is exploring delivery options for off-site BNG habitat compensation during the Examination period.
HRA	Natural England has no outstanding concerns to the project impacting designated sites for the following reasons: The applicant has submitted a thorough Environmental Statement which we are satisfied demonstrates beyond reasonable scientific doubt that there would be no significant effect on the integrity of any European site.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
HRA	Natural England is satisfied that the project is unlikely to have a significant impact on the nearby internationally designates sites Ouse Washes SPA, SAC and Ramsar, Nene Washes SPA, SAC and Ramsar, The Wash SPA and Ramsar and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC	Comment noted.
Biodiversity	The project site currently supports habitats of negligible ecological interest and all protected species issues (including any licensing requirements under the Habitats Regulations or the 1981 Act) can be addressed by the proposed draft DCO requirements: • During ecological surveys prior to commencement of works, should a protected species be identified on site, the appropriate mitigation licence will be sought from Natural England.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
BNG	Natural England welcomes the onsite BNG proposed as set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan which will have a positive effect on the natural environment by providing local priority habitats, implementing a Sustainable Urban Drainage System and providing artificial habitats for protected species (including bat boxes, bird boxes, hedgehog boxes, invertebrate hotels, refugia and hibernacula. This is in accordance with the principles set out in paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Natural England notes that this commitment is reflected in proposed Requirement Work No. 10 (j) of the draft DCO. Natural England therefore advises that this requirement should be secured by a suitably worded requirement in the DCO, if the project is approved.	Noted. The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan is secured in Requirement 5 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013],** and the BNG strategy is secured in Requirement 6.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
BNG	Please note that Natural England has outstanding concerns relating to the delivery of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain as a result of this development. This is not a fundamental reason of principle for why the project should not be permitted, but rather a consideration for the subsequent submissions from the applicant.	Comments noted.
BNG	The application site does not include any irreplaceable habitat or very high distinctiveness habitat. It is recommended that offsite options for BNG delivery should feed into local strategic delivery. We note the applicant's consideration of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's Habitat Opportunity Mapping and Natural Cambridgeshire's Developing with Nature Toolkit. Our advice is to consult with Local Planning Authorities to determine the options that are available for offsite BNG.	Noted. The Applicant is exploring delivery options for off-site BNG habitat compensation during the Examination period, and will organise a meeting with relevant local planning authorities to explore potential delivery opportunities.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
BNG	Natural England were pleased to see the recognition of BNG good practice principles and the applicant's considerations in their design around connectivity, resilience and strategic significance. We also note the use of the Habitat Priority Index to identify priority habitats that have been integrated into onsite BNG design, as well as the intention to secure BNG habitat for 30 years.	Comments noted.
BNG	In summary, aside from the issue raised above in relation to BNG and protected species, Natural England have no other concerns relating to this planning application. We are available to make oral representations at an issue specific hearing or open floor hearing, should the Planning Inspectorate deem it necessary.	Comments noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Biodiversity	Protected Species - Further assessment work required. Survey to be undergone prior to the commencement of works to determine the presence of protected species on site. A Water Vole survey should be completed, including a survey of potential burrows. A qualified ecologist should undergo the appropriate protected species surveys prior to commencement of works. This is included in the CEMP but we recommend this is secured in the DCO to address our concerns.	The CEMP is secured in Requirement 10 of the **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
BNG	Offsite BNG delivery strategy to address the overall net loss of biodiversity from the proposed development. Provide a detailed design for offsite Biodiversity Net Gain as part of the appropriate compensation for habitat loss onsite, including feasibility for delivery. Include offsite BNG delivery strategy to provide the appropriate compensation for biodiversity units lost onsite It is necessary to include this in the DCO to ensure this is delivered to meet the future requirements set forth by The Environment Act 2021. The applicant will need to meet trading rules with the loss of medium distinctiveness habitat in terms of what they provide. The applicant must provide habitat of the same broad type with at least a medium distinctiveness or above.	The Applicant's current approach to providing 10% BNG for the Proposed Development is set out in the **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [AS-009]** (to be secured via DCO requirement 6 of the **Draft DCO Volume 3.1 [APP-013]**). The potential for BNG has been maximised for on-site land under the Applicant's control through habitat creation/enhancement measures shown on **Figure 3.14 Outline Landscape and Ecology Strategy (Volume 6.3) [APP-049]** (to be secured via a DCO requirement). **Volume 6.4 Appendix 11M** identifies the requirement for off-site habitat enhancements/creation to achieve the target of 10% BNG, and provides examples of appropriate habitat enhancement and creation options which would meet this target and meet the BNG trading rules. The Applicant is exploring delivery options for off-site BNG habitat compensation during the Examination period. The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment for the Proposed Development will be updated once an appropriate mechanism for delivering off-site BGN has been identified, in order to demonstrate the strategy for providing a 10% BNG which meets the BNG trading rules (i.e., providing habitat of the required level of distinctiveness), and will be agreed with Natural England in line with Requirement 6 of the **draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013].**

Table 3.13 Applicant's Comments on the UK Health Security Agency Relevant Representation [RR-023]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Health	Thank you for your consultation regarding the above development. The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) welcomes the opportunity to comment on your proposals at this stage of the project. Please note that we request views from the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (OHID) and the response provided is sent on behalf of both UKHSA and OHID.	Comment noted.
Health	We can confirm that: With respect to Registration of Interest documentation, we are reassured that earlier comments raised by us on 17 August 2021 have been addressed.	Comment noted.
Health	In addition, we acknowledge that the Environmental Statement (ES) has not identified any issues which could significantly affect public health. UKHSA/OHID is satisfied with the methodology used to undertake the environmental assessment.	Comment noted. The Applicant is in the process of producing a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the UKSHA to record this agreement. A draft SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 1.
Health	Following our review of the submitted documentation we are satisfied that the proposed development should not result in any significant adverse impact on public health.	Comment noted. The Applicant is in the process of producing a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the UKSHA to record this agreement. A draft SoCG will be submitted at Deadline 1.
Health	On that basis, we have no additional comments to make at this stage and can confirm that we have chosen NOT to register an interest with the Planning Inspectorate on this occasion. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.	Comment noted.

Table 3.14 Applicant's Comments on the Waldersey Internal Drainage Board Relevant Representation [RR-024]

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	General Comment f. Members of the Commissioners staff have engaged in pre-application discussions with MVV and its agents to ensure that the final submission takes account of initial concerns around the information and methodologies required to be able to fully assess the proposals. It is pleasing to note that this advice has largely been followed. However, there are still some matters that need to be addressed to allow the Board to fully understand the impacts of the scheme and to determine whether any mitigation measures proposed are sufficient. The Board requests engagement in respect of these matters to ensure that these are resolved ahead of any consents or approvals being given to the proposal.	There has been no direct engagement with Waldersey IDB as the Proposed Development and associated hydrology study area (defined in **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039])** do not fall within the IDB district and therefore the Proposed Development is not predicted to impact on the Waldersey IDB drains. As noted, extensive consultation has been undertaken with HWIDB and KLIDB during pre-application, as the Proposed Development and hydrology study area fall within the HWIDB and KLIDB districts. It is noted that the Middle Level Commissioners (MLC) who represent the HWIDB, also act on behalf of Waldersey IDB. It is pleasing to know that this extensive consultation with the MLC has effectively addressed the key concerns and ensured that final submission takes account of initial concerns around the information and methodologies required to be able to fully assess the proposals. Consultation remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. This has included discussion of stand off distance from drains, crossing of drains and water discharges into drains. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	General Comment g. The Board reserves the right for it and its agents to undertake further engagement with the applicant and its agents in order to review the design, construction and completion of environmental, water level and flood risk management works, prior to certification that such works are acceptable and the provision of a reasonable maintenance period during which time the Board or its agents can require the applicant or its agents to resolve any defects in the completed works.	There has been no direct engagement with Waldersey IDB as the Proposed Development and associated hydrology study area (defined in **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039])** do not fall within the IDB district and therefore the Proposed Development is not predicted to impact on the Waldersey IDB drains. As noted, extensive consultation has been undertaken with HWIDB and KLIDB during pre-application, as the Proposed Development and hydrology study area fall within the HWIDB and KLIDB districts. It is noted that the Middle Level Commissioners (MLC) who represent the HWIDB, also act on behalf of Waldersey IDB. It is pleasing to know that this extensive consultation with the MLC has effectively addressed the key concerns and ensured that final submission takes account of initial concerns around the information and methodologies required to be able to fully assess the proposals. Consultation remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. This has included discussion of stand off distance from drains, crossing of drains and water discharges into drains. A summary of the consultation undertaken to date is set out in **Appendix 12B (Stakeholder Engagement) of the ES [APP-085].**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
HRA	It is stated that: "Therefore, due to the precautionary approach taken to the screening process and identification of LSEs for the Proposed Development, in-combination effects will only need to be considered if it is found that the proposed development is likely to result in LSE on the European sites being considered and detailed within the HRA Report." This is not the Board's understanding. In-combination effects must be considered regardless of whether LSE has been established for the proposed development.	In combination effects were considered in respect to impact pathways associated with traffic emissions within a 15km zone of influence (See Section 4.3.5 of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (Volume 5.3) [AS-007]**). In-combination effects on European sites from emissions to air, including associated nitrogen and acid deposition, were considered negligible. On the basis of available evidence, LSEs to European sites were discounted. As such there would be no threat to the ability of the European site to achieve its conservation objectives or maintain its integrity as a result of the Proposed Development, in combination with other committed developments based on the modelled scenarios. There was no evidence to indicate that the farmland within 500m of the Order limits was utilised by the SPA qualifying features and therefore does not form FLL. Given the minimal predicted effects for the Proposed Development, there were assessed to be no LSE for in-combination effects within this zone of influence.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
HRA	There are proposed plans to build a large potable water supply reservoir (Fens Reservoir) approximately 18 km to the south west of the proposed site. The in-combination effects of this development with the proposed reservoir will need to be considered.	Table 3.3 of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (Volume 5.3) [AS-007]** outlines a High Level Screening Table which details zones of influence (ZOI) in respect to a variety of potential effects. At 18km from the Proposed Development, this is outside any of the ZOIs associated with potential effect pathways, including that associated with emissions sources which is 15km. Consequently, this would not trigger requirement to undertake in combination assessment with this scheme.
Biodiversity	Biodiversity Net Gain In terms of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), if the watercourses through the site is over 5m then it must be assessed for BNG with the rivers & stream metric not using the linear ditches function of the terrestrial BNG metric. The Board shall be please if this could be confirmed.	Ditches within the Site are <5m wide, and were assessed using the area habitat 'Ditches' condition sheet in accordance with section 1.31 of the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Technical Supplement (Natural England Joint Publication JP039).
Biodiversity / HRA	The environmental assessments reviewed to date (HRA & ES) do not consider the potential impacts, as set out in Appendix A of the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Energy National Policy Statements Review, particularly with concern to downstream hydrological impacts on EPS: Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Energy National Policy Statements Review (publishing.service.gov.uk)	With reference to Table 3.3 of the **Habitat Regulations Assessment NSER (Volume 5.3) [AS-007]**, no European sites were identified within a ZOI of the Order limits with respect to pollution pathways associated with the Proposed Development. This geographic parameter is based on professional judgement following a review of the Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidance PPG5 (which suggests control of impacts can be managed within a distance of 50m). No European sites are considered hydrologically connected with the Proposed Development.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water resources Item 12.5.3 quite correctly advises that the site is within some of the driest areas in the country and the extreme hot weather events experienced during the summer and the on going drought situation have confirmed that the town is an area of serious water stress and this will increase as further impacts due to growth and climate change occurs.	Comment noted.
Hydrology	Water resources Whilst it will no doubt be contended that the recent announcement for the Fens Reservoir reduces any local concern it will be several years before this is operational and it is still considered appropriate to alleviate this problem and in respect of responses to Strategic Policy documents the Commissioners and associated Boards have lobbied for several years that future growth must consider the whole water cycle process, giving serious consideration to reducing water usage and irreparable damage to the water sources including chalk streams and other watercourses enabling more water for other uses.	The design of the EfW CHP Facility has considered the water cycle process and water usage reduction/re-use. As set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1, re-use of water and provision of rainwater harvesting systems will be provided where practicable (e.g. permeable paving in car park and area surrounding switch compound, rainwater harvesting and green roof for weighbridge, re-use runoff from office building).
Hydrology	Water resources The impact of the volume of water detailed in the proposed abstraction application does not appear to have been assessed. The Nene catchment Abstraction Strategy suggests that there is a lack of consistency in the availability of water for abstraction from the catchment and restricted water available for any new abstraction therefore new	As detailed in **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES)) [APP-039],** the potable water demand for the EfW Facility appears high because it allows for the full CHP steam supply with zero condensate return as a worst-case scenario. In practice, there is limited demand for reuse of surface water runoff in the process (which would also need pre-treatment). For the wider development, reuse of water and provision of rainwater harvesting systems will be provided where practicable (e.g. permeable paving in car park and area surrounding switch

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
	abstraction applications may be restricted (CAMS-Nene-Catchment-Abstraction- Management-Strategy.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk)).	compound, rainwater harvesting and green roof for weighbridge, reuse of runoff from office building). Section 3.4.67 of **ES Chapter 3 Description of the Proposed Development (Volume 6.2) [APP-030]** states that is noted that the water demand of the EfW CHP Facility appears high because it allows for the full 63t/h CHP steam supply with zero condensate return as a worst-case scenario. In typical operating conditions without any CHP steam supply, the water demand is significantly lower, in the approximate range of 2.5t/h to 5t/h, and there is limited demand for reuse of rainwater in the process (as collected by the proposed surface water drainage system and rainwater harvesting for the weighbridge gatehouse and administration building). With CHP steam supply this range would increase by an amount approximately equal to the mass flow of steam supplied, e.g., 10t/h CHP steam supplied would increase the EfW CHP Facility water demand by approximately 10t/h. Furthermore, it should be noted that any increased demand due to CHP steam supply is likely to be met by an equal reduction in water demand from the receiving CHP steam customer, i.e., the net increase in local water demand due to CHP steam supply is likely to be zero."]
Hydrology	Water resources Therefore, the Commissioners and associated Boards promote water neutrality by minimising the use of potable water and encouraging the use of recycling and rainwater harvesting to enable the better use of a limited and decreasing resource.	As detailed in **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES)) [APP-039],** the potable water demand for the EfW Facility appears high because it allows for the full CHP steam supply with zero condensate return as a worst-case scenario. In practice, there is limited demand for reuse of surface water runoff in the process (which would also need pre-treatment). For the wider development, reuse of water and provision of rainwater harvesting systems will be provided where practicable (e.g. permeable paving in car park and area surrounding switch compound, rainwater harvesting and green roof for weighbridge, reuse of runoff from office building).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water Quality Water quality and pollution control is generally a matter for the Environment Agency and the local Environmental Health Department; however, the Board is facing the increasing challenge of having to dispose of polluted and contaminated soil from its network due to the poor water quality as the result of pollution incidents within the area.	Contaminated soil will be managed during construction in accordance with the **Outline Soil Management Plan (Appendix C of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12) [APP-103)** which **will be secured in Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 10 (Construction environmental management plan). Any temporary onsite storage of excavated materials suspected or confirmed to be contaminated will be stored on impermeable sheeting, covered over and with adequate leachate/runoff drainage to prevent migration of contaminants from the stockpile. These materials will be segregated where possible to prevent cross-contamination occurring and will be treated or disposed off-site appropriately.
Hydrology	Water quality Whilst the proposed development will be subject to Environmental Permitting Regulations, which are outside of the Boards control, and it is appreciated that both water resources and quality are mainly matters for the Environment Agency (EA), the Board are concerned about the consequences, both physical and financial, of a pollution incident that effects some of the most fertile agricultural land in the area, the urban development, and aquatic environment either directly or indirectly and the implications that this could have on these	The proposed embedded environmental measures to prevent water pollution and pollution incidents affecting agricultural land are set out in Table 12.10 of Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039]. These measures include implementing good working practices and adherence to the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP -103];** in addition to specific measures relating to minimum stand-off distance between the works and the edge of the HWIDB and KLIDB drains *(*the Proposed Development does not fall within the Waldersey IDB district) , the provision of oil interceptors and trapped gullies, appropriate storage of chemicals, fuel and oil including implementation of an accident response protocol, development of a detailed Drainage Management Plan and Drainage Strategy (on the basis of Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1), implementation of a water quality monitoring programme, and the development and implementation of a Materials Management Plan to manage soil stockpiles and excavated materials. As set out Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1, SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment to reduce the discharge to greenfield runoff rates and prevent pollution of the HWIDB and KLIDB drains only. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013] Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).**

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water quality Also, the quality of water discharge from the site, during all phases does not appear to have been considered. Given the ecological sensitivity of the hydraulically-linked EPS particularly to water levels and quality, the Board would expect the development to be able (or be required) to demonstrate 'water and nutrient neutrality' if it is to avoid an adverse impact upon the integrity of the sites, under the Habitats Regulations.	As set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1, SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment of the water discharge from the site. This aims to reduce the discharge to greenfield runoff rates and prevent pollution of the HWIDB and KLIDB drains. The Proposed Development does not fall within the Waldersey IDB district. The proposed SuDS components have been determined in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 to provide the required pollution control prior to discharge into the HWIDB drains. The indicative proposals for SuDS components will be confirmed at the detailed design stage. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP 013] Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).**
Hydrology	Water quality The Board is concerned about items of airborne waste, primarily plastic, card and paper, entering its system and collecting on weedscreen grills or entrances to culverts and increasing flood risk as is the increasing microplastics entering the aquatic environment.	The likelihood of airborne waste entering local open watercourses in the vicinity of the EfW CHP Facility (HWIDB, KLIDB drains) is very low as waste will be delivered in enclosed vehicles and all processes will take place inside buildings.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water quality Increased pollution caused by chemical spills during normal operating procedures or the likely significant effect of an emergency response, such as large volumes of water applied during firefighting and where that water may go.	The proposed embedded environmental measures to prevent water pollution caused by chemical spills during normal operating conditions are set out in Table 12.10 of Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039]. These measures include implementing good working practices and adherence to the **Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Volume 7.12 of the ES) [APP -103]**; in addition to specific measures relating to minimum stand-off distance between the works and the edge of the HWIDB and KLIDB drains (the Proposed Development does not fall within the Waldersey IDB district), the provision of oil interceptors and trapped gullies, appropriate storage of chemicals, fuel and oil including implementation of an accident response protocol, development of a detailed Drainage Management Plan and Drainage Strategy (Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1), implementation of a water quality monitoring programme. As set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1**,** spent fire water will be collected in the surface water drainage system. In the event of a fire, the discharge to the HWIDB drains ceases and the spent fire water (together with any surface runoff) will be tankered off site. WIDB drains would be unaffected.
Hydrology	Water quality The interception and containment of fire-fighting run-off will need to be of a significant volume. Fire-fighting operations which have become necessary after fire suppression systems have been unable to extinguish the fire may operate for a number of days, delivering 1000's of litres of water per minute. If the surface water run-off interception ponds are to be used to store such run-off, they will have to be off-line from the wider surface water drainage network in the area.	Information on the management of contaminated fire-fighting water has been included in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1. In summary the EfW Facility will be designed to deal with water contaminated during a fire. The tipping hall and waste bunkers have a large capacity fort retaining fire-fighting water within the building footprint. The water will then be directed towards the waste reception pit for storage, treatment (if required) and appropriate disposal. The shut off valve to the surface water drainage system is connected to the alarm system and will close to prevent contaminated water being discharged into the drains. The water would be retained in the SuDS and underground tanks for treatment (if required) and appropriate disposal

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water Quality The Boards system is not subject to water abstraction requiring a licence or permit but the neighbouring Waldersey IDB district does include several abstractions for crop irrigation purposes.	The proposed embedded environmental measures to prevent water pollution are set out in Table 12.10 of **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039].** Potential receptors assessed include water abstractions within the study area.
Hydrology	Water Quality In order to reduce any detrimental impacts resulting in the deterioration in the water quality during the lifetime of the proposed development including the construction, operational and decommissioning phases, the Board requests that appropriate systems are installed and implemented to ensure that no building and constructional materials, foreign debris or polluting matter is discharged or becomes deposited into an open watercourse by any means. This may require the installation of a suitable pollution retention device or devices to contain any foreign debris or polluting matter that enter the adjacent open watercourses.	There has been no direct engagement with Waldersey IDB as the Proposed Development and associated hydrology study area (defined in Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039]) do not fall within the IDB district and therefore the Proposed Development is not predicted to impact on the Waldersey IDB drains. As noted, extensive consultation has been undertaken with HWIDB and KLIDB during pre-application, as the Proposed Development and hydrology study area fall within the HWIDB and KLIDB districts. As set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1, SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment of the water discharge from the site. The proposed SuDS components have been determined in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 to provide the required pollution control prior to discharge into the adjacent HWIDB drains. The drainage strategy and indicative proposals for SuDS components will be confirmed at detailed design stage and agreed in consultation with HWIDB. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Water Quality In addition, the Board expects that adequate provision is made to retain any harmful pollutants or contaminated water on the site for disposal to a suitably permitted location and not allowed to discharge into the local aquatic network.	As set out in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1**,** SuDS principles will be utilised for attenuation storage and treatment of the water discharge from the site. The proposed SuDS components have been determined in accordance with The CIRIA SuDS Manual C753 to provide the required pollution control prior to discharge into the HWIDB and KLIDB drains (the Proposed Development does not fall within the Waldersey IDB district). The drainage strategy and indicative proposals for SuDS components will be confirmed at detailed design stage and agreed in consultation with HWIDB and KLIDB. This is secured in **Draft DCO (Volume 3.1) [APP-013]** Requirement 8 (Drainage Strategy).
Hydrology	Water Quality An IDB has a statutory duty to, whilst considering applications for consent to undertake any activity on an IDB drain, have regard for the objectives of the RBMP (Water framework directive) of the connected River Nene. The Board is unlikely to grant consent for any activity which would be in conflict with the RBMP objectives.	In setting the scope of the assessment consideration has been given to PINS Advice Note 18, which sets out the approach to the WFD Assessment. It is important to note that the Proposed Development is not within a reportable surface water body WFD area and is also not within a WFD Groundwater Management Catchment. The nearest WFD surface waterbodies (North Level Main Drain and River Great Ouse Relief Channel) are either not downstream of the Proposed Development or lie are outside of the study area and are therefore not affected by Proposed Development. Therefore, a separate WFD assessment has not been produced to support the ES. However, as the Proposed Development is intersected by numerous HWIDB and KLIDB drains, water quality and hydromorphology effects on these aquatic environment receptors were considered within **Chapter 12: Hydrology (Volume 6.2 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039]** in a manner which mirrors the WFD approach, to ensure that consideration is paid to the overall objectives of the WFD as transposed into UK law.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations The Board accepts that there are agreed standard methods of designing surface water systems and, in this respect the Board would normally request that the respective surface water systems should be designed for the worst case 1% AEP (Annual Exceedance Probability), a 1 in 100 year storm, and must consider a range of durations to determine the maximum volume required with an allowance for the impact of climate change, normally 40% but could be greater, and siltation should be included within the calculations.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with CCC during pre-application regarding the Outline Drainage Strategy (**Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES) [APP-013]** and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. As agreed with CCC, the drainage design calculations used a climate change allowance of 20% for the construction phase and 40% for the operational phase and considered the 1% AEP storm event as well as the 3.3% AEP storm event. The climate change allowances used in the hydraulic modelling are in line with the latest Environment Agency guidance. The 1% AEP storm event result was used in the sizing of the attenuation tanks and basins as a worst-case scenario. Any effects on the drainage system due to siltation will be assessed at detailed design stage, and if required, mitigation will be proposed.
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations It is suggested that a 100% impermeability factor is used for the design of the water level and flood risk management systems. This will allow for future development, extensions to buildings etc to be accommodated and/or depreciation in efficiency of the systems, lack of maintenance etc.	Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 includes an additional allowance of 10% for urban creep in the modelling calculations for the sizing of SuDS, which will allow for some future expansion of the EfW CHP Facility.
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations It is understood that the surface water disposal system is reliant on pumping systems. It is considered that with some careful design and re-evaluation there may be an alternative and more sustainable solution which reduces a significant residual risk which is prone to failure during extreme events, is easier to maintain and a more appropriate solution.	The proposed management of surface water drainage for the EfW CHP Facility (construction and operational phases) is described in detail Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 and supporting Figures 4.1 and 4.2. During the construction phase of the EfW CHP Facility, there is a requirement for pumping surface water runoff from the northern area into the temporary drainage network in the southern area and into the HWIDB drainage system adjacent to the site. The Proposed Development does not fall within the Waldersey IDB district. The pumping of surface water runoff is also required from the underground attenuation tank located in the TCC,

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
		since levels do not permit a gravity outfall into the HWIDB drainage network. The pumping of surface water runoff is also required from the underground attenuation tank located in the TCC. Pumping is required because topographic levels do not permit a gravity outfall from the temporary drainage network into the IDB drainage network. At the request of CCC, the impact of a potential pump failure has been assessed for both the northern area of the EfW CHP Facility and the TCC(i). The calculations are presented in the Response Technical Note to CCC and are included in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations The widespread flooding impacts seen on and after 23rd December 2020, particularly within north Cambridgeshire were as a consequence of heavy rainfall on December 23rd, in excess of the Long term Average (LTA), falling on an already saturated catchment which was especially sensitive to intense rainfall. Whilst no instances of flooding were reported to the LLFA, the Boards system was under extreme pressure for several days.	Noted and discussed in extensive consultation with HWIDB during pre-application and remains ongoing following the submission of the DCO application. The Proposed Development does not fall within the Waldersey IDB district and will not be affected by the Proposed Development.
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations Current design standards do not allow for such circumstances or the special drainage arrangements within the Fens where it may take several days for the flows to be dealt with. Because of this the normal requirements concerning half drain times within a twenty four hour period are unlikely to be achieved particularly given the size of the proposed facility.	The calculations presented Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 indicate that the half drain times exceed 24h within the system. Following consultation with CCC, additional calculations were undertaken to confirm that the system has suitable capacity to receive a follow up 1 in 10-year storm after 24h. Details of these calculations are provided in the Response Technical Note to CCC and are included in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Hydrology	Hydraulic Calculations Such situations are not normally accommodated within accepted design and the Commissioners are currently reviewing its position concerning this aspect.	The calculations presented in Rev 2 of the **Outline Drainage Strategy (Volume 6.4, Appendix 12F of the ES)** submitted at Deadline 1 indicate that the half drain times exceed 24h within the system. Following consultation with CCC on 24/10/22, additional calculations were undertaken to confirm that the system has suitable capacity to receive a follow up 1 in 10-year storm after 24h. It is noted that the Commissioners are currently reviewing this information.
Climate	The Board acknowledges the increased risk that climate change creates on its remit including water level and flood risk management, habitats and species and other environmental and biodiversity concerns, water neutrality and a managing a decreasing resource, water quality specifically pollution control and nutrient neutrality.	Comment noted.
Climate	As a competent authority the Board recognises its role and generally encourages the principles contained within international, national and local climate change policy with the challenge of achieving net zero. It is working with the Association of Drainage Authorities (ADA) and other relevant partners to achieve the most economic and environmentally acceptable standard.	Comment noted.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Climate	Whilst the Board recognises that EfW operations have the potential to reduce the overall GHG emissions by redirecting waste from landfill, a significant source of methane release into the atmosphere (https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ar4-wg3-chapter10-1.pdf) the Board request further information on how this has been assessed. The assessment must include the location of the waste materials source, how they will be transported etc. and the associated modelling. The Board would like to see how the proposed facility will help to contribute towards the Governments' legal obligation, though the Climate Change Act 2008 to cut greenhouse gas emissions by at least 68% by 2030.	The assessment described in **ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]** Section 14.9 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. Relative to the 'without Proposed Development' scenario (where waste is landfilled), the Proposed Development has lower GHG emissions which will support the UK Government in meeting its carbon budgets/targets. The approach to quantifying GHG emissions from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development has been undertaken in line with the latest IEMA guidance for assessing GHG emissions and the infrastructure life-cycle modules set out in PAS 2080: Carbon Management Infrastructure. Assumptions (see Appendix 14B - Assumptions and limitations **(Volume 6.4) [APP-088])** remain in line with published material and the guidance documents.
Climate	In this respect the Board encourages the use of appropriate Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) facilities and appropriate sustainable after uses and carbon reduction measures associated with the proposal as a whole.	As stated in Table 14.15**, ES Chapter 14: Climate Change (Volume 6.2) [APP-041]:** "*The Proposed Development will be carbon capture retrofit ready with land set aside for a CCS facility. However, the Application does not include the construction and operation of the carbon capture technology within the Proposed Development.*" The Applicant is undertaking a feasibility study of CCS technology and is in the process of agreeing a DCO Requirement to demonstrate commitments to CCS.

Topic	Point raised	Applicant's comments
Major Accidents and Disasters	The contents of the points previously raised, identified in error as the Middle Level Commissioners, are noted but remain a significant concern.	Comment noted.
Major Accidents and Disasters	As discussed elsewhere access to a suitable water supply, the impacts of that supply on the environment and the discharge of polluted materials into the aquatic environment are of particular concern to the Board.	The assessment of impacts on water resources and of discharges to the water environment are described in **Chapter 7 Hydrology of the ES (Volume 6.2) [APP-039].** No significant effects are identified in this Chapter.

4. Conclusion

4.1.1 The Applicant's comments on the Local Authority and 3(a) Statutory Party relevant representations have been provided in this document and were submitted to the Examining Authority for Deadline 1 (10 March 2023).