

## NLC Responses to Hearing Action Points

Reference	Action	NLC Response
ISH1-AP9	Ascertain whether there is any further/more up-to-date traffic data for the A18 available, that is relevant to the Proposed Development site access on the A18 and would be useful to the Examination, and provide commentary as to whether this is reflective of original traffic levels pre-pandemic.	<p>NLC do not hold any recent data in the vicinity of the site access on the A18, so have looked at other areas in North Lincolnshire for comparable data. This has been restricted to A roads where comparable data is available. The data we have collected is primarily for speed monitoring purposes and although it includes 24/7 traffic data for a week, the surveys may sometimes be undertaken at what would be viewed as unsuitable months for standard traffic data collection. However, for these purposes it does provide some form of comparison, which we would otherwise not have. Whilst the traffic counts may not have been undertaken in exactly the same location, they are sufficiently close for this not to significantly affect traffic flows, for example there are no junctions between the sites.</p> <p>The data reviewed shows a variation across North Lincolnshire. In some cases traffic flows have reverted to pre-pandemic levels, whilst in others they are still significantly lower. It is therefore the opinion of the Local Highway Authority, that the approach adopted within the Transport Assessment is robust and does provide a worst case scenario for traffic flows.</p>
ISH1-AP10	Follow up with Highways colleagues and provide an update with regards to additional data submitted to NLC responding to its concerns about non-compliance with DMRB, especially around changes in speed limits vs DMRB standards.	The proposed arrangements have been reviewed by colleagues in the Highway's Projects Team, who have broadly accepted the departures in principle, but have raised a few points requiring clarification. These have been sent to the applicant for their consideration.
ISH1-AP14	Comment on whether NLC considers the TA covers HGV movements of waste carriers emanating from the site.	<p>The Waste Technical Note, which was produced in July 2021 provided additional information on the types and quantities of waste generated during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>The total volume of construction waste arisings is estimated at 137,741m<sup>3</sup>. The main bulk of this will be uncontaminated spoil, a total of 78,795 m<sup>3</sup>. This</p>

		<p>is broken down as 13,795m<sup>3</sup> from piling and 65,000 m<sup>3</sup> from earthworks, which accounts for 57% of the total waste volume.</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the Environmental Statement [APP-048] anticipated the export of 65,000 m<sup>3</sup> of soil and import of up to 130,000m<sup>3</sup> of soil, as part of the site enabling and preparation works. Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-053] and the Transport Assessment [APP-074], show months 7 and 8 of the construction programme are predicted to be when the main import/export of material occurs, although no detailed breakdown of vehicle numbers/movements are provided. Appendix A of the TA, provides the profile of construction traffic for staff and HGVs. This is a fairly flat profile for HGVs and would appear to give an approximate number of 50 two-way HGV movements for this period.</p> <p>It is apparent from this, that the export of spoil assessed in the TA is approximately half of the total waste expected to be generated during the construction period. Whilst I suspect that there will be sufficient capacity on the highway network to accommodate additional vehicle movements associated with waste disposal. It would therefore be useful for a more robust assessment to be undertaken on the number of HGV movements associated with removing construction waste from site and across what period, to confirm this opinion.</p>
ISH2-AP30	<p>The Applicant's response to NLC's response to the ExA's First Written Questions [REP3-20], especially Q1.16.53, is noted. No response to this has been received from NLC to date, but the ExA invited NLC to comment on its current stance with regard to Requirement 27 (Construction Hours). NLC to reflect on its position in this regard and to respond to the ExA accordingly.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to NLC's response to the ExA's First Written Questions [REP3-20] is noted. It is acknowledged that on such a large construction programme a restriction of construction hours could significantly extend the construction period; which in turn could have an adverse impact upon the amenity of local residents.</p> <p>It is further acknowledged that the construction hours proposed do not exceed those that were imposed upon the Keadby 2 Section 36 Consent and that they align with other similar projects. The construction of the Keadby 2 Power Station has been well managed and has not generated complaints to the local authority.</p>

		<p>The restriction of activities in the 30 minute start-up and shut-down periods is noted and this addresses NLC's concerns in this regard.</p> <p>For these reasons NLC are now content with the justification provided for the proposed construction hours set out in Requirement 27 and wish to raise no further concerns in this regard.</p> <p>With regards to the procedure for dealing with complaints NLC acknowledges the Applicant's comments in their response to the ExA's First Written Questions. It is noted that the Applicant already has a robust procedure for managing complaints and employs a dedicated Stakeholder Manager with responsibility for liaising with members of the local community. NLC has no objection to the proposed approach and think that including details of the complaints procedure within the Framework CEMP as suggested by the Applicant would be beneficial.</p>
--	--	---