



**Application by North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park Limited for North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park]  
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ3)  
Issued on 17 April 2023**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information – ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annexe B to the Rule 6 letter of 18 October 2022. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 3(indicating that it is from ExQ3) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q3.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [NorthLincolnshireGreenEnergyProject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:NorthLincolnshireGreenEnergyProject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park ExQ3' in the subject line of your email.

**Responses are due by Deadline 8: 28 April 2023.**

**DELETE THIS BOX BEFORE FINALISING**

Instructions on the template numbering for this document can be found in *SD03 – Using MS for Office*.



**Abbreviations used:**

<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008	<b>LBMMP</b>	Landscape and Biodiversity Management and Monitoring Plan
<b>ABP</b>	Associated British Ports	<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report
<b>Art</b>	Article	<b>LPA</b>	Local planning authority
<b>ALA 1981</b>	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	<b>MP</b>	Model Provision (in the MP Order)
<b>ALC</b>	Agricultural land Classification	<b>MP Order</b>	The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009
<b>AP</b>	Affected Person	<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>BAT</b>	Best Available Technique	<b>NLC</b>	North Lincolnshire Council
<b>BMV</b>	Best and Most Versatile	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>NR</b>	Network Rail
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>NRA</b>	Navigation Risk Assessment
<b>CBMF</b>	Concrete Block Manufacturing Facility	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>CCUS</b>	Carbon Capture Utilisation and Storage	<b>OEMP</b>	Operational Environmental Management Plan
<b>CoCP</b>	Code of Construction Practice	<b>ORR</b>	Office of Road and Rail
<b>CPO</b>	Compulsory purchase order	<b>PPG</b>	Planning Practice Guidance
<b>DAS</b>	Design and Access Statement	<b>PRoW</b>	Public Right of Way
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft DCO	<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency	<b>RDF</b>	Refuse Derived Fuel
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>SAC</b>	Special Areas of Conservation
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>SI</b>	Statutory Instrument
<b>ExA</b>	Examining authority	<b>SoCG</b>	Statement of Common Ground
<b>FRA</b>	Flood Risk Assessment	<b>SoR</b>	Statement of Reasons
<b>GCN</b>	Great Crested Newt	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>GHG</b>	Greenhouse Gas	<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>HRA</b>	Habitat Regulations Assessment	<b>TP</b>	Temporary Possession
<b>HSE</b>	Health and Safety Executive	<b>tpa</b>	Tonnes per annum



### **The Examination Library**

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

[EN010116-000436-North Lincs Energy Park EL.pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

### **Citation of Questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ3 1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



<b>Index</b>	<b>17. Waste .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1. General and Cross-topic Questions .....</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>2. Agriculture .....</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>3. Air Quality and Emissions .....</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>4. Alternatives.....</b>		<b>6</b>
<b>5. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)) .....</b>		<b>6</b>
5.1 Habitats regulation assessment .....		6
<b>6. Climate Change .....</b>		<b>12</b>
<b>7. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations .....</b>		<b>13</b>
7.1 Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) .....		14
7.2 Electricity Connections and Other Utility Infrastructure.....		14
<b>8. Ground Conditions, Contamination and Hydrogeology .....</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>9. Historic Environment.....</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>10. Landscape and Visual Effects and Design.....</b>		<b>14</b>
10.1 Lighting .....		14
<b>11. Major Accidents and Hazards .....</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>12. Noise and Vibration.....</b>		<b>15</b>
<b>13. Other Strategic Projects and Proposals .....</b>		<b>15</b>
<b>14. Policy .....</b>		<b>15</b>
<b>15. Socio-economic Effects .....</b>		<b>15</b>
<b>16. Transportation and Traffic .....</b>		<b>15</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>1. General and Cross-topic Questions</b>		
Q1.0.1	The Applicant, NLC, The Environment Agency	<p><b>Vermin Control</b></p> <p>(i) In light of the ongoing concerns identified by AB Agri in their D7 objection and the expectation that appropriate vermin control would be in place as set out in NPS EN-3 paragraphs 2.5.59 – 2.5.63. Can each party respond setting out their position on whether the DCO and supporting mitigation documents provide the necessary controls, or whether any additional measures should be secured?</p> <p>(ii) Is there a justification for additional controls as paragraph 2.5.63 of NPS-EN3 suggests might be appropriate? If this is considered appropriate, how should the DCO or mitigation measures be adjusted to resolve any concerns?</p>
<b>2. Agriculture</b>		
Q2.0.1	The Applicant	No further questions at this time.
<b>3. Air Quality and Emissions</b>		
Q3.0.1	North Lincolnshire Council, The Environment Agency	<p><b>Plumes:</b></p> <p>In light of the comments made by Mr Nicholson on behalf of Residents Against Incinerators (RAIN) in [REP4-045] and the Applicant's response in [REP6-033] could each party provide an update of their position in respect of the issues raised and the response provided by the Applicant and the further detail provided by Mr Nicholson at Deadline 7.</p>
Q3.0.2	Applicant, NLC, The Environment Agency	<p><b>Odour Control</b></p> <p>AB Agri maintain their objection in their D7 submission to the proposal. They continue to explain the potential for negative pressure not to be maintained. The ExA understands the operating regime proposed by the Applicant, but to date there has not been as far as we are aware an explanation of what could happen in the event of a failure of a system, a malfunction, or some other unplanned event.</p> <p>(i) Can each party please respond setting out how they expect that this should be dealt with, and what process should be in place to manage such an eventuality.</p> <p>(ii) Can the Environment Agency explain whether an Environmental Permit would be expected to have controls in place to cover such eventualities, or if in their view this should be controlled through a mechanism within the DCO.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) If it is to be managed/controlled through the DCO, can each party explain what the control mechanism is and whether they consider this to be appropriate
<b>4. Alternatives</b>		
Q4.01		No further questions at this time
<b>5. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))</b>		
	The Applicant, Natural England, The Environment Agency	<b>Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES):</b> Within the RIES a series of questions were raised which are duplicated below in the event they have not been identified earlier by the relevant parties. The numbering from the RIES is included within the question for ease of reference. In the event responses have already been prepared to answer these questions, it is not necessary to duplicate that response, but it would be helpful if confirmation is given where the response can be found.
<b>5.1 Habitats regulation assessment</b>		
Q5.1.1	Natural England (NE)	Q2.1.1 Can NE confirm that all relevant European sites and or European site features that could be affected by the project have been identified by the Applicant?
Q5.1.2	Natural England	Q2.5.1 Can NE confirm that it is satisfied with the Applicant's approach to use air quality modelling results for the Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) in respect of the Humber Estuary Ramsar?
Q5.1.3	Environment Agency (EA)	Q2.5.2 Can the EA comment on whether it considers that the use of Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) performance data 2021 Incineration Monitoring Reports is a reasonable proxy for the expected emissions' limits for Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) and Ammonia (NH3) that would be established through a future environmental permitting process?
Q5.1.4	Applicant	Q2.5.3 Can the Applicant define the term HCl.
Q5.1.5	Applicant	Q2.5.4 Can the Applicant explain why the reasonable case emissions' values for NOx and NH3 (set out in Table 2.1 of Appendix 1 to [AS-016]) cannot be secured in the Development Consent Order (DCO)? What would be the implications if they were?

**ExQ3: 17 April 2023****Responses due by Deadline 8: 28 April 2023]**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q5.1.6	Applicant	Q2.5.5 Can the Applicant confirm whether the Reasonable Operating Case (ROC) still assumes a worst case of 100% of material movements during operation being by road? If not, what has been assumed about the number of traffic movements?
Q5.1.7	Applicant	Q2.5.6 In response to the Examining Authority's second written questions (ExQ2) (Q2.5.1.2) the Applicant [REP6-032] stated it 'would not be appropriate to secure any one parameter, as at any one time one parameter might exceed the value used in the reasonable operating case, while another may be below the value.' The Examining Authority (ExA) remains unclear as to how this approach would ensure that the assessed parameters are not exceeded, potentially giving rise to Likely Significant Effects (LSE) that have not been assessed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), noting that the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP6-004] limits effects by reference to the ES (not the Report to Inform HRA) and that the Environmental Statement (ES) has not been updated to reflect the ROC modelling. Can the Applicant provide further explanation? In its response, it should comment on whether any of the parameters could be secured in the DCO and what the implications would be if they were secured. It should also explain why ES Chapter 5 [REP4-009] has not been updated and submitted into the Examination.
Q5.1.8	Natural England	Q2.5.7 Can NE comment on the acceptability of the ROC modelling parameters as a basis for assessment and identification of LSE from operational emissions to air, given that these parameters are not proposed to be secured in the DCO?
Q5.1.9	Applicant	Q2.5.8 The Applicant is requested to submit the detailed air quality modelling at Deadline 8.
Q5.1.10	Applicant	Q2.5.9 Can the Applicant provide further clarification as to why the use of the revised standard for short term NOx emissions is appropriate given that the original standard represents the critical level as identified in Air Pollution Information System (APIS)?
Q5.1.11	Natural England	Q2.5.10 Can NE comment on the use of the revised standard for short term NOx emissions and whether it considers this to be appropriate as a standard to measure air quality impacts?
Q5.1.12	Applicant	Q2.5.11 Can the Applicant clarify its conclusion for nitrogen deposition in combination to the Humber Estuary SPA, as paragraph 4.6.3.15 of [AS-016] suggests that the combined Process Contributions (PC) is 0.9 – 1.02% (minimum), ie potentially above the 1% critical level.

**ExQ3: 17 April 2023**

**Responses due by Deadline 8: 28 April 2023]**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q5.1.13	Natural England	Q2.5.12 Can NE confirm if it is content with the Applicant’s revised screening conclusions in [AS-016] in respect of operational emissions to air from the Proposed Development alone and in-combination? If not, please explain for which pollutants and qualifying features there are outstanding concerns.
Q5.1.14	Natural England	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.1 - Construction phase traffic emissions</b></p> <p>Q. Following review of [AS-016], can NE either</p> <p>(i) confirm whether it is content that there is no impact pathway and as such the potential for LSE does not need to be considered or, if not,</p> <p>(ii) confirm the qualifying features for which it considers this potential impact pathway to be relevant.</p> <p>If this includes qualifying features of the Humber Estuary SPA, can NE explain why it considers this potential impact pathway to also be relevant to the SPA, noting the distance between it and the Proposed Development.</p>
Q5.1.15	Natural England	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.2 - Operational phase traffic emissions</b></p> <p>Q. Following review of [AS-016], can NE either</p> <p>(i) confirm whether it is content that there is no impact pathway and as such the potential for LSE does not need to be considered or, if not,</p> <p>(ii) confirm the qualifying features for which it considers this potential impact pathway to be relevant.</p> <p>If this includes qualifying features of the Humber Estuary SPA, can NE explain why it considers this potential impact pathway to also be relevant to the SPA, noting the distance between it and the Proposed Development.</p>
Q5.1.16	Natural England	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.3 – Construction phase dust</b></p> <p>Q. Does NE consider that LSE has been identified for the correct qualifying features for this impact pathway?</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q5.1.17	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.4 – Noise and vibration impact to migrating river and sea lamprey - construction</b></p> <p>Q. Following review of [AS-016], can NE confirm that it is content that there is no impact pathway and as such the potential for LSE does not need to be considered?</p> <p>Q. If NE considers that this impact pathway should be assessed at appropriate assessment stage, can it advise what additional information it requires as part of the assessment and clarify whether comments about mitigation in (Q2.5.1.6 in [REP6-041]) apply to lamprey qualifying features?</p> <p>Q. Can the Applicant explain how use of percussive/ impact piling would be controlled through the DCO to ensure that it would only be used exceptionally and for a duration of a few hours.</p> <p>Q. Can the Applicant explain on what basis the ExA can be satisfied that LSE to lamprey from use of percussive/ impact piling can be excluded, given that an assessment of impacts has not been provided.</p>
Q5.1.18	Natural England	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.5 - Noise and vibration impact to migrating river and sea lamprey –vessel movements</b></p> <p>Q. Does NE agree with the Applicant regarding impacts on migrating sea and river lamprey from vessel movements? Is it content a LSE can be screened out?</p>
Q5.1.19	Natural England	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.7 - Noise/ vibration/ light disturbance to bird features</b></p> <p>Q. Following review of [AS-016], can NE confirm that it is content that there is no impact pathway and as such the potential for LSE does not need to be considered, other than for mallard as part of the assemblage feature?</p> <p>Q. If not content, can NE confirm for which other qualifying interest features/ criterion of the Humber Estuary Ramsar site it has concerns and in relation to which impact pathway?</p>
Q5.1.20	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.7 - Noise/ vibration/ light disturbance to bird features</b></p> <p>Q. With this in mind, can the Applicant and NE comment on whether a LSE should be screened in for this potential impact pathway?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Q. Can the Applicant explain whether the use of percussive/ impact piling would result in any change to the predicted noise levels and therefore the conclusion that LSE can be excluded to bird qualifying features of the Humber Estuary Ramsar. Please provide evidence to support the response.</p> <p>Q. Can the Applicant provide a complete version of paragraph 4.5.1.2 of [AS-016] as there is missing text, which appears to cross-refer to relevant information in other assessments.</p>
Q5.121	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.8 – Loss of Functionally Linked Land (FLL)</b></p> <p>Q. Further to the Applicant’s additional survey information, can NE confirm whether it considers there to be a LSE in respect of loss of FLL, and if so, for which qualifying interest features/criterion of the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar site?</p> <p>Q. Can the Applicant provide the quantum of FLL that will be lost as a result of temporary and permanent land take for the Proposed Development?</p>
Q5.122	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.9 - Noise/ vibration/ light disturbance to bird features using FLL during construction and operation</b></p> <p>Q. Can the Applicant confirm that its updated assessment in [AS-016] considers impacts to bird features using FLL of the Humber Estuary Ramsar site (as well as the Humber Estuary SPA), as this is not clear from the current drafting?</p> <p>Q. Following review of the additional information on noise levels, does NE consider there to be a LSE in respect of noise/ vibration/ light disturbance to birds using FLL during construction and operation, and if so, for which additional qualifying interest features/criterion of the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar site?</p>
Q5.123	Natural England	<p>From RIES Table 2.3</p> <p><b>ID 2.1.10 – Recreational Disturbance</b></p> <p>Q. Can NE confirm, following the Applicant’s responses [REP4-021],[REP4-028],[AS-016], whether it considers a LSE should be screened in for recreational disturbance? If LSE cannot be excluded, can NE confirm for which qualifying interest features/ criterion of the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar site would be affected?</p>

**ExQ3: 17 April 2023**

**Responses due by Deadline 8: 28 April 2023]**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q5.124	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 3.1</p> <p><b>ID 3.1.2 - Operational stack emissions– in-combination</b></p> <p>Q. Following review of [AS-016], can NE confirm whether it agrees with the Applicant’s conclusion of no Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEol) from operational air quality emissions in combination with Keadby 2 and 3?</p> <p>Q. What is the Applicant’s response to NE’s concerns that nitrogen deposition could undermine the conservation objectives of the sites?</p>
Q5.125	Natural England,	<p>From RIES Table 3.1</p> <p><b>ID 3.1.3 – Construction dust</b></p> <p>Q. Following review of [AS-016], does NE consider that AEol can be excluded? If not, can NE advise what further information it considers is required from the Applicant?</p>
Q5.126	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 3.1</p> <p><b>ID 3.1.4 – Noise/vibration/ light disturbance to bird features – construction</b></p> <p>Q. What is the Applicant’s response to NE’s suggestion that the timing of construction activities be secured within the DCO?</p> <p>Q. What is the Applicant’s response to NE’s suggestion that Appendices K and M of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP6-024] should be updated to incorporate clearer references to trigger points for mitigation based on the evidence used in its assessment?</p> <p>Q. Does NE agree with the Applicant’s conclusion of no AEol, irrespective of whether the timing of construction activities can be secured?</p>
Q5.127	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 3.1</p> <p><b>ID 3.1.5 – Noise/vibration/light disturbance to bird features using FLL – construction</b></p> <p>Q. The ExA’s questions in ID 3.1.4 are also relevant to this impact pathway and the Applicant and NE are requested to respond on that basis.</p>
Q5.128	Natural England, Applicant	<p>From RIES Table 3.1</p> <p><b>ID 3.1.6 – Operational stack emissions – in-combination</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Q Can the Applicant and NE comment on whether measures to improve Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) units would be viewed as mitigation or compensation and provide reasoning for the response?
Q5.1.29	Applicant	Q3.4.1 Can the Applicant provide a summary of all mitigation measures it seeks to rely on to avoid AEoI and explain how these would be secured in the DCO?
Q5.1.30	Natural England	Q3.4.2 Aside from the matters raised in [REP6-041] and summarised in Table 3.1 of this RIES, does NE have any outstanding concerns about mitigation measures and how these are proposed to be secured? If so, please provide further details.
Q5.1.31	Natural England	Annex Q.1.1. Following review of the ROC Report to Inform HRA [AS016], NE is requested to confirm whether there are any site/features/impact pathways shaded orange and denoted with a '?' for which it <b>does not agree</b> with the Applicant's conclusion.
Q5.1.32	Natural England	Annex Q.1.2. NE is requested to confirm whether there are any site/features/impact pathways shaded light green and denoted with a '?' for which it <b>does not agree</b> with the Applicant's conclusion.
<b>6. Climate Change</b>		
Q6.0.1	The Applicant, Environment Agency	<p>Following on from Q2.6.0.2 the EA advised at D7 "<i>we can now comment that carbon capture readiness, i.e. sufficient land and any known barriers, does not apply to energy from waste plants so the guidance we follow does not include them. Accordingly, we are unable to offer any assistance on these matters</i>"</p> <p>The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published its consultation on Decarbonisation Readiness on 13 March 2023 with the consultation closing on 24 April 2023. Within it, it proposes amongst other things, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing the 300 MW minimum capacity threshold at which the requirements apply.</li> <li>• Moving the Decarbonisation Readiness (DR) requirements from the planning consent process to the environmental permitting process.</li> <li>• Expanding the generation technologies in scope to include biomass (as well as biogas from anaerobic digestion), energy from waste (EfW), and combined heat and power (CHP) to support the rapid decarbonisation of the electricity system, complement</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>existing technology-specific decarbonisation policies, and make the requirements simpler and more consistent across technology types.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applying transitional arrangements to the implementation of DR, to ensure that policy is not changed for plants for which investment decisions have already been. This will ensure that investor confidence is preserved.</li> </ul> <p>Including both new build and substantially refurbishing combustion power plants in scope and enabling existing combustion power plants to voluntarily apply for a DR permit.</p> <p>The consultation as drafted proposes that Decarbonisation Readiness (DR) as a requirement comes into force for newly built and substantially refurbishing plants from 1 July 2024.</p> <p>Going on to state “<i>This should allow sufficient time after the legislation has been made for the Environment Agency to carry out any further necessary engagement with stakeholders and publish any further guidance or supporting documents on the requirements, ahead of them coming into force.</i>”</p> <p>(i) As currently drafted, it would appear that the current proposal would be caught by this change in requirement, and it would therefore be helpful to understand the implications this may have for the proposed development if this change were introduced.</p> <p>The ExA would also find it of assistance if both the Applicant and the EA could respond to the following questions.</p> <p>(ii) Does the Applicant have anything further to add to the responses already provided to Q2.6.01 and Q2.6.02 in [REP6-032]?</p> <p>(iii) The Consultation referred to above follows a technical study undertaken on behalf of BEIS by AECOM dated 30 June 2022 available at <a href="https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/111111/carbon_capture_readiness_report.pdf">carbon capture readiness report.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk)</a>. Can the EA provide any further advice in light of the Applicant’s response to Q2.6.0.2 and the assessment information set out within the study?</p> <p>(iv) Can the EA advise if there is any reason to dispute the response provided by the Applicant to Q2.6.02?</p>
Q6.02	Environment Agency, Natural England, NLC	<p><b>Environmental Permits/ Licences/ Permissions</b></p> <p>Can you advise whether there are any impediments that may stand in the way of granting any licence, permission or permit within your area of responsibility.</p>
<p><b>7. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations</b></p>		

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q7.0.1		No further questions at this time
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>	
Q7.1.1		No further questions at this time
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Electricity Connections and Other Utility Infrastructure</b>	
Q7.2.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Electricity Connection</b></p> <p>Within [APP-039] it states under paragraph 2.1.1.3 that the DCO includes Associated Development of an electrical grid connection. This does not appear to be explicitly defined in any of the Work Nos.</p> <p>i) Can the Applicant clarify if this connection is intended to form part of Work No.14, or is it intended that this is covered under (m) of Work No.1, or as set out in answer to the ExQ7.2.2 that the connection is intended to be delivered through the powers available to Northern Powergrid as a statutory undertaker?</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Ground Conditions, Contamination and Hydrogeology</b>	
		No further questions at this time.
<b>9.</b>	<b>Historic Environment</b>	
Q9.0.1	Historic England	<p><b>Requirement 11 and outstanding concerns</b></p> <p>Can you advise whether you consider Requirement 11 of the dDCO and the updates to Chapter 12 of the ES [REP4-011] that have occurred since your responses to first written questions have resolved the concerns you identified in the responses to Qs 9.01, 9.0.5 and 9.0.6</p>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Landscape and Visual Effects and Design</b>	
Q10.0.1		No further questions at this time.
<b>10.1</b>	<b>Lighting</b>	
Q10.1.1		No further questions at this time.
<b>11.</b>	<b>Major Accidents and Hazards</b>	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q11.0.1		No further questions at this time.
<b>12.</b>	<b>Noise and Vibration</b>	
Q12.0.1		No further questions at this time.
<b>13.</b>	<b>Other Strategic Projects and Proposals</b>	
Q13.0.1	The Applicant, NLC	Can both parties advise if there have been any additional projects or changes to projects which the ExA should be aware of since the examination commenced.
<b>14.</b>	<b>Policy</b>	
Q14.0.1	Applicant, NLC, all IPs	The Government published further iterations of the National Policy Statement (NPS) Energy Suite of national policies for consultation, the period of which will run until the 23 May 2023. Could each IP provide an update on their position in respect of the status of these policy documents, what elements within them should be regarded as important and relevant in the ExAs recommendation and subsequently in the Secretary of State (SoS) decision. Could IPs advise on what weight they consider the ExA should give to these documents and advise on whether there are any particular aspects of the consultation documents the ExA should have particular regard to.
Q14.0.2	Applicant, NLC	Can both parties provide an update in respect of progress on the draft Local Plan and if there have been any changes that the ExA should be aware of since the examination commenced.
<b>15.</b>	<b>Socio-economic Effects</b>	
Q15.0.1	NLC	No further questions at this time
<b>16.</b>	<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>	
Q16.0.1		No further questions at this time.
<b>17.</b>	<b>Waste</b>	
Q17.0.1	The Applicant, Environment Agency, UKWIN	<b>Waste Capacity</b> If it was demonstrated the proposed development were to create an excess capacity of energy from waste plants or there was a shortage of supply of waste for the generation of energy from

**ExQ3: 17 April 2023**

**Responses due by Deadline 8: 28 April 2023]**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		waste either locally, regionally or nationally, is there any evidence which you can refer to that identifies at what level this may create an adverse effect on prevention, re-use or recycling, as expected within the waste hierarchy?



**ExQ3: 17 April 2023**

**Responses due by Deadline 8: 28 April 2023]**