



Application by Cory Environmental Holdings Limited (CEHL) for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Cory Decarbonisation Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 20 December 2024

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information, referred to as ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

It is assumed that the Applicant and Interested Parties (IPs) will respond as appropriate and necessary to the points made in representations received at Deadlines 1 and 2, and as such the ExA may not have asked a question relating to a party's response to such points.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex B to the Rule 6 letter of 7 October 2024. To retain consistency with the order of Issues these have been retained in the list below although in some cases there is not a specific question or request the ExA wishes to pose at this juncture. 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 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, giving 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. If Parties consider that a comprehensive response has already been provided in an existing document or submission, please give details in your response.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality issues is identified as Q1.1.0.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

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 seen by using the following link which will be updated as the examination progresses: [Examination Library](#).

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 corydp@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include 'Cory Decarbonisation Project' in the subject line.

Responses are due by Deadline 3: Friday 17 January 2025.



Abbreviations used:

PA2008	The Planning Act 2008	LBBC	London Borough of Bexley Council
AEoI	Adverse Effects on Integrity.	LCO₂	Liquified Carbon Dioxide
AP	Affected Person	LIR	Local Impact Report
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain	LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
BoR	Book of Reference	LPA	Local Planning Authority
CO₂	Carbon Dioxide	MMO	Marine Management Organisation
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	MOL	Metropolitan Open Land
CCF	Carbon Capture Facility	NE	Natural England
CLNR	Crossness Local Nature Reserve	NH	National Highways
CoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice	NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order	PLA	Port of London Authority
dDML	Draft Deemed Marine Licence	R	(Development Consent Order) Requirement
EA	Environment Agency	SAC	Special Area of Conservation
ES	Environmental Statement	SCNR	Save Crossness Nature Reserve
ExA	Examining Authority	SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment	SoR	Statement of Reasons
GB	Green Belt	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
HRA	Habitats Regulation Assessment	TP	Temporary Possession
IP	Interested Person	TWUL	Thames Water Utilities Limited
LaBARDS	Outline Landscape, Biodiversity, Access and Recreation Delivery Strategy		



Index	
0. General and cross-topic questions.....	4
0.1 Design, parameters and other details of the Proposed Development.....	4
0.2 Consultation	6
1. Air Quality	7
2. Alternative locations and layouts considered for the proposed scheme and scope of development.....	7
3. Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	7
3.1 Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment.....	7
3.2 HRA	11
4. Climate Change	12
5. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations	12
6. Cultural Heritage.....	15
7. Cumulative Effects	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	15
8.1 Articles	15
8.2 Schedule 1 – Authorised Development	16
8.3 Schedule 2 - Requirements.....	17
8.4 Schedule 11 – Deemed Marine Licence	21
8.5 Schedule 12 – Protective Provisions.....	21
8.6 Schedule 16 – Design Parameters.....	22
8.7 General	23
9. Flood risk and hydrology.....	23
10. Geology, hydrogeology, soils, materials and waste....	25
11. Land transport and public rights of way.....	25
12. Major accidents and disasters.....	26
13. Metropolitan Open Land.....	27
14. Navigation on the River Thames and marine transport.....	27
15. Noise and Vibration	27
16. Planning Obligations.....	27
17. Social and economic Effects	28
18. Townscape and visual impact	28
19. Other Matters	28

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
0.	General and cross-topic questions	
0.1	Design, parameters and other details of the Proposed Development	
Q1.0.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design document, Annex A – Good design issues to consider</p> <p>Can the applicant explain what measures have been taken to appoint a project board level design champion and their brief? If no design champion is proposed, please give reasons why.</p>
Q1.0.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design document, Annex A – Good design issues to consider</p> <p>Can the applicant explain if and how a representative design panel has been, or will be, used to maximise the value provided by the infrastructure? How will this approach be retained throughout the refinement of the design to detailed design?</p>
Q1.0.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design document, Annex A – Good design issues to consider</p> <p>How have the Design Principles for National Infrastructure published by the National Infrastructure Commission, the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, as well as any local design policies and standards been taken into account? How will this approach be retained throughout the refinement of the design to detailed design?</p>
Q1.0.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Re-use and recycling of material at decommissioning</p> <p>How will the design of all the works be specified to maximise the materials that can be re-used or recycled at the point when the plant is decommissioned and dismantled? DC_LNR 1.6 of DAD: Design Principles and Design Code [APP-047] only applies to works in Crossness Local Nature Reserve (CLNR). How would this be controlled in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)?</p>
Q1.0.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Development Platform - decommissioning</p> <p>The proposed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan would include details of finished levels of land; is the expectation that the development platform would be removed at the decommissioning stage? Please provide details of the intended approach.</p>
Q1.0.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Infilled water courses - decommissioning</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Would those watercourses intended to be infilled or otherwise lost be re-instated as part of decommissioning? If so how would this be controlled?
Q1.0.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Order limits in River Thames</p> <p>In light of the Port of London Authority's (PLA) comments in their Deadline 2 submission [REP2-026] about the extent of Order Limits into the 'authorised channel' of the Thames, what is the Applicant's justification for those limits, what is their response to PLA on this point and are changes necessary?</p>
Q1.0.1.8	The Applicant and Environment Agency (EA)	<p>Use of Amine products within Carbon Capture</p> <p>By what mechanisms are the use of Amine products controlled (do they form part of the Environmental Permit controls)?</p> <p>Should the control of Amine products be dealt with through the dDCO? If so, please provide a method for doing so.</p>
Q1.0.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Options for cooling and liquefaction</p> <p>It is unclear if there are any parameter differences between the two options for the cooling system (Hybrid (Wet-Dry) Cooling Towers or Dry Cooling Towers). Can the Applicant provide clarity on this point and confirm what has been assumed in the ES assessments as the worst case?</p>
Q1.0.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Scoping out of effects associated with the transport and storage of liquified CO₂ (LCO₂)</p> <p>The Applicant has stated in Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 4-2 [APP-076], ID entry 2.1.2, that both the transportation and storage of the LCO₂ falls outside of the scope of the Proposed Development and consequently, the ES, with some exceptions (transportation of LCO₂ is considered in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-054], Chapter 8: Marine Biodiversity [APP-057], Chapter 13: Greenhouse Gases [APP-062], Chapter 19: Marine Navigation [APP-068], and Chapter 20: Major Accidents and Disasters [APP-069]). The Applicant considers that the chapters listed are the only ones relevant to transportation of LCO₂. Storage of the LCO₂ is not assessed on the basis that this would be consented separately.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain the implications for the Proposed Development if the options for CO₂ storage are either not consented, or do not have the capacity to take the CO₂ from the Proposed Development?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.0.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Scoping out of effects associated with the transport and storage of LCO₂</p> <p>Further to Q1.0.1.10 above, It is noted that no specific justification is provided for the response to Scoping Opinion point 2.1.2 [APP-076]: “However, both the transportation and storage of the LCO₂ falls out of the scope of the Proposed Scheme and consequently the chapters of this ES, with the following exceptions……:”</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to provide justification for why the other chapters are not considered relevant to this matter, and whether there is any potential for cumulative effects from transport and storage of the LCO₂ from the Proposed Development (where not considered within the ES aspect chapters), with other projects using the same CO₂ storage location?</p>
Q1.0.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Consistency of description of significance of effects in ES</p> <p>There are some potential inconsistencies in the description of likely significant effects across the different ES Chapters, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) ES Chapter 6: Noise and vibration [APP-055] concludes that no significant residual effects would occur. However, it is noted that the assessment for receptors C1 and C5 identifies a moderate adverse effect (significant) pre-mitigation but that the moderate adverse effect changes to not significant after mitigation, despite remaining moderate. The Applicant is requested to explain how the moderate adverse effect has been judged to not be significant. ii) ES Chapter 22: Summary of Effects [APP-071] occasionally refers to slight to moderate effects (resulting from changes to character and visual amenity from study area open spaces) as significant, and other times not significant. Noting that these effects are described as not significant in ES Chapter 10: Townscape and Visual [APP-059], the Applicant is requested to clarify whether this is a typographical error in ES Chapter 22.
<p>0.2 Consultation</p>		
Q1.0.2.1	The Applicant	<p>Bearing in mind comments made by Ridgeway Users at the Preliminary Meeting and Written Representations [REP1-069] and [REP1-070] how has the applicant communicated and engaged with the wider Romani and other traveller communities who may have cultural connections with the Order Land beyond any direct interests as grazing licence holders?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.	Air Quality	
Q1.1.0.1	London Borough of Bexley Council (LBBC)	<p>Issues raised by LBBC on Air Quality</p> <p>Would the changes proposed by the Applicant to the Design Principles and Design Code set out in their Response to Interested Parties Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019] address the issue of location of short term generators relative to CLNR?</p> <p>Does the Applicant's Response to Interested Parties Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019] address LBBC's comments on i) the potential emissions of chemicals used to capture CO₂ emissions and ii) in respect of the consistency of the evaluation of the model results relating to the EA's nitrosamine guidance and acceptable level of risk?</p>
Q1.1.0.2	The Applicant	<p>Updated tables for Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 5</p> <p>Updated tables for ES Chapter 5, Appendix 5-2 and 5-3 are provided as Appendix B of [AS-044].</p> <p>The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with Natural England (NE) [PDA-002], p10, states that NE is considering how amine deposition impacts to designated sites have been assessed. The Applicant has confirmed [AS-044] that the updated Tables provided for ES Chapter 5: Air Quality and ES Appendices 5-2 and 5-3 do not change any conclusions presented within ES Chapter 5: Air Quality. Can the Applicant confirm whether the updated Tables would change the conclusions of the HRA Report [APP-090]?</p>
Q1.1.0.3	NE and the Applicant	<p>Inner Thames Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - Air Quality</p> <p>The ExA notes that NE advise [REP1-038] that they will continue to work with the Applicant to obtain the information they require and resolve the issue. The ExA requests an update on this matter, including whether the information requested by NE has been provided and what matters of disagreement remain outstanding, including those identified in NE's Deadline 2 representations [REP2-027] in their comments on the Technical Note.</p>
2.	Alternative locations and layouts considered for the proposed scheme and scope of development	
	(No questions at this stage)	
3.	Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment)	
3.1	Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment	

ExQ1: 20 December 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: Friday 17 January 2025

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.3.1.1	The Applicant and LBBC	Monitoring How will the effectiveness of any management regimes or works implemented either on the Order Land or the Offsite Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Area be monitored over time and what mechanisms would be put in place to provide for remedial measures or alternative approaches in light of any monitoring results? How would these be specified and enforced?
Q1.3.1.2	The Applicant and LBBC	Outline Landscape, Biodiversity, Access and Recreation Delivery Strategy (LaBARDS) – review Bearing in mind the potential timespan, should there be a provision requiring the LaBARDS to be reviewed and updated at relevant intervals, for the lifetime of the Proposed Development, and for any updated LaBARDS to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, LBBC within agreed timescales?
Q1.3.1.3	The Applicant and NE	Water Voles The ExA notes that the Applicant and NE have met to discuss a Water Vole Method Statement. The ExA requests an update on this matter, including whether the information requested by NE has been provided and what matters of disagreement remain outstanding.
Q1.3.1.4	The Applicant	Water Voles Please can the Applicant confirm what their timescales are for obtaining a Letter of No Impediment for water voles from NE.
Q1.3.1.5	The Applicant, NE and EA	Effects of lighting on Water Voles Would the lighting strategy required by Requirement (R) 11 in the dDCO be capable of mitigating effects of lighting on water voles? If so, please provide a full and detailed justification and if not, what alternative arrangements are proposed?
Q1.3.1.6	The Applicant	Enhancement – water table Bearing in mind Annex F to the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submission at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-026] can the Applicant confirm that none of the existing or previous management plans included works or proposals to raise the water table to restore the wet character of soils throughout the year on the Norman Road field and the CLNR.
Q1.3.1.7	The Applicant	Water table

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can the Applicant explain what consideration has been given to any potential negative effects of raising the water table might have on species and habitats and how any negative impacts would be avoided or mitigated against? How would such impacts be controlled (if necessary)?
Q1.3.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Loss or replacement of habitat through tree planting on grazing marsh</p> <p>What would the effect be of proposed tree and other planting proposed in the vicinity of the proposed Carbon Capture Facility (CCF) on existing grazing marsh habitats? How would any adverse effects be avoided, mitigated and controlled?</p>
Q1.3.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Accessibility and disturbance</p> <p>How will improvements to access to the extended CLNR ensure that there is no disturbance to habitats and species that may be sensitive to human disturbance? How will the LaBARDS make provision that this is factored in when exact routing of footpaths is confirmed?</p>
Q1.3.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Terrestrial invertebrates</p> <p>With reference to Buglife’s Written Representation [REP1-046] and the SoCG Revision B between Buglife and the Applicant [REP2-012], what specific provision would be made for the mitigation of any habitat loss for invertebrates and any habitat enhancements. How would such mitigation be controlled?</p>
Q1.3.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Priority Species</p> <p>How will the LaBARDS ensure that priority species are appropriately protected and conserved?</p>
Q1.3.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Breeding Birds</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify their response in their Response to Interested Parties’ (IP) representations at Deadline 1 to Save Crossness Nature Reserve’s (SCNR) [REP1-047]? Is there a typographical error in the first sentence (p58)?</p>
Q1.3.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Use of jetty or river structures for ecological niche area</p> <p>The Applicant’s further views are sought on the ‘strong encouragement’ from the EA to use the redundant or retained jetty to create an ‘ecological niche area’ which could be enhanced with timbers and/or fish refugia and whether this should be pursued irrespective of which of the former Belvedere Power Station Jetty options are eventually selected.</p>
Q1.3.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Area of BNG Opportunity Area</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can the applicant confirm the total area of the BNG Opportunity Area?
Q1.3.1.15	The Applicant	<p>BNG Opportunity Area – need for permissions</p> <p>Would any additional permissions be required, such as planning permission, for the works and creation of the BNG Opportunity Area?</p>
Q1.3.1.16	The Applicant	<p>BNG Opportunity Area – baseline habitat</p> <p>Further to the evidence of Dr Joyce at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and the LaBARDS [REP1-012] which states that the former Thamesmead Golf Course has been subject to ecology surveys, but these do not appear to have been provided with the DCO application. Can the Applicant confirm whether it intends to submit these surveys to the Examination, and if not why this is not considered necessary, as it is not clear how any positive weight could be attributed to the potential BNG if the baseline is not known?</p>
Q1.3.1.17	The Applicant	<p>BNG Opportunity Area – future habitats</p> <p>The LaBARDS [REP1-012] states that the exact future habitat creation at the BNG Opportunity Area has not been designed yet. Outline area measurements are listed in Section 11.1 and Appendix 1 of the outline LaBARDS. Further to the evidence of Dr Joyce at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and bearing in mind representations received regarding the proposed BNG Opportunity potential to support a range of wildlife at present, how has the Applicant considered this in the BNG calculations. Can the Applicant confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the design of the BNG Opportunity Area will be determined?; • How this is considered to represent BNG in an area that may already be subject to a diverse ecological baseline?, and • How any positive weight can be attributed to the BNG when it is not known whether the proposed habitats are feasible (eg whether the BNG Opportunity Area is located in an area of potential flood risk)?
Q1.3.1.18	The Applicant	<p>BNG Opportunity Area – mitigation</p> <p>Can the Applicant further confirm how they have applied the mitigation hierarchy to the Mitigation and Enhancement Area within the red line boundary of the Order Land and have ensured that mitigation and net gain have not been conflated resulting in habitat creation that is required to offset habitat loss being considered as overall net gain?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.3.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Environment Agency (EA) requested mitigation measures</p> <p>Within ES Appendix 4-2 [APP-076], and the Consultation Report Appendices [APP-024 – APP-039] the Applicant responds to a request from the EA to vent oxygen into the Thames in the “Thames Tideway” area adjacent to the DCO boundary. The Applicant appears to have confused this with the Thames Tideway tunnel which is 5km from the DCO boundary. As such, it does not appear as though they have considered this as an option for mitigation measures for relevant environmental effects. Can the Applicant confirm whether it has considered venting of oxygen as a mitigation measure/ beneficial effect, and if not then confirm why this is the case?</p>
Q1.3.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Outline documents</p> <p>Some control/mitigation documents relating to the onshore environment have not been provided in draft/outline form and with the exception of the preliminary Navigational Risk Assessment [AS-060], none appear to have been provided in any form for the marine environment. Can the Applicant explain why it does not consider it necessary to provide details of the scope of all proposed control and/or mitigation documents within draft or outline versions for Examination?</p>
<p>3.2 HRA</p>		
Q1.3.2.1	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>The HRA Report [APP-090] at paragraph 2.6.1 indicates that mitigation measures have been relied on in reaching the conclusion of no Adverse Effects on Integrity (AEol). However, the Appropriate Assessment sections of the HRA Report (Section 3 and 4) do not describe any mitigation measures, or indicate that the conclusion of no AEol is reliant upon mitigation measures.</p> <p>Mitigation measures relevant to air quality during operation are described in ES Chapter 5: Air Quality [APP-054] at paragraphs 5.9.3 to 5.9.5. It is also noted that the Environmental Permit required for operation of the Proposed Development will consider detailed operation processes.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm which (if any) mitigation measures relevant to air quality during operation have been relied upon in the HRA Report in reaching the conclusion of no AEol of</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and if so, confirm how each applicable measure would be secured through the dDCO or other legal mechanism?
Q1.3.2.2	The Applicant	Site condition Can the Applicant confirm whether the Epping Forest SAC is currently considered to be in favourable condition?
Q1.3.2.3	The Applicant	HRA Report Conclusions The Applicant has confirmed [AS-044] that the updated Tables provided for ES Chapter 5: Air Quality and ES Appendices 5-2 and 5-3 [AS-044] do not change any conclusions presented within ES Chapter 5: Air Quality. Can the Applicant confirm whether the updated Tables would change the conclusions of the HRA Report [APP-090]?
4. Climate Change		
Q1.4.0.1	The Applicant	Existing land condition and performance How has any existing performance of land that would be lost as a result of the development in terms of any existing beneficial role in reducing climate change been factored into the Applicant's approach to any climate change benefits of the development?
Q1.4.0.2	EA	Carbon cost of development platform vs disruption to CCF plant during flooding Has the Applicant's Response to Interested Parties Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019] addressed the EA's observations [REP1-035] relating to the relative carbon costs of land raising and any equipment being temporarily out of action due to flooding caused by a breach in the flood defences?
5. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations		
Q1.5.0.1	Affected Persons (APs) and IPs	Any inaccuracies Are any APs or IPs aware of any inaccuracies in the Book of Reference (BoR) [REP2-006], Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-020] or Land Plans [APP-136]? If so, please set out what these are and provide the correct details.
Q1.5.0.2	The Applicant	Identification of land interests

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Please could the Applicant confirm that all persons having an interest in land, including any rights over unregistered land have been identified and where this has not been possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) provide a summary of where it has not yet been able to identify any persons having an interest in land, including any rights over unregistered land; and ii) confirm what further steps the Applicant will be taking to identify any unknown right(s) during the Examination?
Q15.03	The Applicant and Statutory Undertakers	<p>Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>The Book of Reference (BoR) [REP2-006] includes a number of Statutory Undertakers with interests in land. The ExA would ask the Applicant to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provide a progress report on negotiations with each of the Statutory Undertakers listed in the BoR, with an estimate of the timescale for securing agreement with them; ii) State whether there are any envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements; and iii) State whether any additional Statutory Undertakers have been identified since the submission of the BoR and whether the latest version of the BoR includes any recently identified Statutory Undertakers.
Q15.04	The Applicant	<p>Objections</p> <p>Please complete the table at Annex A of this ExQ1 document.</p>
Q15.05	APs and IPs	<p>Alternatives</p> <p>Unless already set out in Written Representations, are any APs and/ or IPs aware of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) any reasonable alternatives to any Compulsory Acquisition (CA) or Temporary Possession (TP) sought by the Applicant; or ii) any areas of land or rights that the Applicant is seeking the powers to acquire that they consider are not needed?
Q15.06	The Applicant	<p>Category 3 persons</p> <p>The BoR [REP2-006] advises that there no ‘Category 3’ persons have been identified. Please can the Applicant confirm this remains the case or clarify if there are any other persons who might be entitled to make a ‘relevant claim’ if the DCO were to be made and fully implemented</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and should therefore be added as Category 3 parties to the BoR? This could include, but not be limited to, those that have provided representations on, or have interests in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke or artificial lighting; • the effect of construction or operation of the Proposed Development on property values or rental incomes; • concerns about subsidence or settlement; • claims that someone would need to be temporarily or permanently relocated; • impacts on a business; • loss of rights, eg to a parking space or access to a private property; • concerns about project financing; • claims that there are viable alternatives; or • blight.
Q1.5.07	The Applicant	<p>Additional land Are any land or rights acquisitions required in addition to those sought through the dDCO before the Proposed Development can become operational?</p>
Q1.5.08	The Applicant	<p>Alternatives to CA Please can the applicant expand on the reasons why they consider that there is no alternative to CA for the land that comprises the proposed mitigation area including parts of the CLNR and other land in the vicinity which would not contain the CCF?</p>
Q1.5.09	The Applicant	<p>Special Category Land – open space Bearing in mind development plan allocations and having regard to SCNR’s Written Representations, can the applicant expand on why they consider that Special Category Land would be limited to that shown on the Special Category Land Plan [AS-011] including the Applicant’s response to the suggestion that the CLNR forms open space, that is land used for the purposes of public recreation that may not be reliant on its physical accessibility?</p>
Q1.5.010	The Applicant	<p>Port of London Authority (PLA)</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please can the Applicant provide the latest position on the PLA's comments relating to land identified as their having an interest in [REP1-041] and their Deadline 2 submission [REP2-026] , and as necessary reflect this in any updated BoR.
Q1.5.0.11	The Applicant	Clarification of PLA ownership and size of plots In addition to the above, in light of the PLA's comments in section 2 of their Deadline 2 representations [REP2-026] , please can the Applicant review and where necessary revise the BoR and land Rights Tracker.
Q1.5.0.12	The Applicant	Justification for extent of Order Limits in River Thames In light of PLA's comments in section 4 of their Deadline 2 representations [REP2-026] , please can the Applicant provide a more detailed explanation of the extent of Order Limits and TP sought or propose any necessary alterations.
6. Cultural Heritage		
Q1.6.0.1	The Applicant	Former Belvedere Power Station Jetty There is no requirement in the dDCO to record the Former Belvedere Power Station Jetty in the event it is altered or removed (for example in dDCO R16 or R22). Notwithstanding LBBC's update provided at Deadline 2 [REP2-024] , how will the Jetty be recorded to Historic England Level 2 Historic Building Recording as suggested by LBBC [RR-124] ?
7. Cumulative Effects		
Q1.7.0.1	Marine Management Organisation (MMO), NE and LBBC	List of cumulative schemes assessed Could the MMO, NE and LBBC please confirm whether they are content that all other developments, plans and projects that have the potential to result in cumulative or in-combination effects together with the proposed development have been identified and appropriately assessed by the Applicant in the Environmental Statement [APP-118] and the HRA Report [APP-090] (including any relevant marine licensed projects)?
8. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)		
8.1 Articles		
Q1.8.1.1	PLA	Article 7 - Disapplication of legislative provisions

ExQ1: 20 December 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: Friday 17 January 2025

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The PLA's comments are sought on the Applicant's Response to Interested Parties' Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019], in respect of the PLA's observations regarding the drafting of Article 7.
Q1.8.1.2	The Applicant	Article 10 - Consent to transfer benefit of the Order Given the provisions of this article, what arrangements need to be put in place to ensure that the Deeds of Obligation continue to have effect with any transferee or similar? Does this need to be provided for in the article or elsewhere in the dDCO?
Q1.8.1.3	The Applicant	Article 50 - Crossness Local Nature Reserve (2)(c) provides for "clause 4 of the 1994 agreement shall be abrogated in its entirety". Given that part of the 'Conservation Land' specified in clause 4 lies outside the Order Limits to the west of the boundary fence what measures would be put in place to ensure that the requirements of the 1994 Planning Obligation would remain in force on that part of the CLNR?
8.2 Schedule 1 – Authorised Development		
Q1.8.2.1	The Applicant	Development Platform It is not clear which of the specified works in Schedule 1 permits the development platform, or the required 300mm height flood wall and demountable defences on access roads referred to in ES Appendix 11-2 [APP-107]. Can the applicant confirm which works numbers these three proposed features come under? What is the proposed approach to include and control this element of the proposal?
Q1.8.2.2	The Applicant	Description of Work No 9 It is noted that the ES does not refer to Work No 9 (shown on the Works Plans [REP2-003] and described in the dDCO [REP2-004] as protective works to land "if required" as a result of the authorised development). The Works Plans show that these works are apparently limited to the existing access road and a small area which appears to be a sluice gate or other form of outfall in the western part of the DCO boundary. Can the Applicant confirm what these protective works (if required) may comprise and how any potential impacts have been assessed in the ES?
Q1.8.2.3	The Applicant	Ancillary or related development

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The ancillary or related development listed as (a) to (y) at the end of Schedule 1 of the dDCO [REP2-004] appear to be very broad in scope and therefore it is not clear how these would be controlled, other than the introductory paragraph which states “.....which does not give rise to any materially new or materially different effects which are worse than those assessed in the environmental statement”. Can the Applicant provide additional detail on the ancillary works likely to be required and how the likely impacts would be mitigated - for example, through cross reference to specific measures in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP2-008]?</p>
Q1.8.2.4	The Applicant	<p>Permitted preliminary works</p> <p>The permitted preliminary works [APP-074] and Schedule 2, R5 of the dDCO [REP2-004] appear to be very broad in scope. Whilst it is noted that these would be controlled by measures in the CoCP, it is not clear which measures in the CoCP relate to the different preliminary works. Can the Applicant provide additional detail on the permitted preliminary works likely to be required and confirm, with cross reference to specific measures in the CoCP [REP2-008], how the likely impacts would be mitigated?</p>
Q1.8.2.5	The Applicant	<p>Description of all works and comparison to parameters</p> <p>Other than the lateral limits in the Works Plans [REP2-003] (which are shaded areas rather than given as a measured area), no parameters are given for work numbers 2A, 2B, 2C (modification of existing generating stations) and work number 5 (CO₂ pipeline to works 4B and 4C). Can the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide these parameters, in particular if there are any amendments to the heights of the existing facilities and how these maximum heights have been secured. • If so, confirm how the ES has currently assessed a worst-case scenario in the absence of this information? • What has been assumed in the assessment as the worst case for depth of any below ground pipeline proposed and how is this secured?
<p>8.3 Schedule 2 - Requirements</p>		
Q1.8.3.1	The Applicant	<p>All Requirements specifying matters to be approved</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Bearing in mind the provisions in Article 3 and Schedule 14, why is it not specified that matters requiring approval are submitted and approved <i>in writing</i> in all those Rs specifying matters to be approved.
Q1.8.32	The Applicant	All Requirements specifying matters to be implemented Why is it not specified that matters requiring implementation of a scheme or strategy do not also require that this should be maintained in accordance with the scheme or strategy for the lifetime of the development, until decommissioning, or some other appropriate timescale?
Q1.8.33	The Applicant	R4 – Detailed Design Bearing in mind the potential effects of works in other work packages (for example above ground LCO ₂ pipelines in Work No 5, amenity and educational facilities, and stable blocks in Work No 7, gatehouses and control rooms in Work 9 etc.), why is this R limited to Work No1?
Q1.8.34	LBBC	R8 – Construction Hours LBBC point out that their “limitations for noisy works” have a start time of 08:00 rather than 07:00. What is the basis for this timeframe and what supporting documentation is there?
Q1.8.35	The Applicant	R8 – Construction Hours The Applicant points to the approved construction hours relating to Riverside 2 being that same as those proposed for the development. Does the relative proximity to receptors (including residential receptors) to the CCF development area affect this consideration?
Q1.8.36	The Applicant	R8 – Construction Hours Given the nature of the works why does this R not also include works 7, 8 and 9?
Q1.8.37	National Highways (NH)	R9 - Construction traffic management plan Please can NH clarify what changes to R9 they are seeking? The text in part 3 of the comments [REP1-037] appears to be the same with a commentary on the additional information sought.
Q1.8.38	The Applicant	R10 - Emergency preparedness and response plan (and R14 & R15) What is the distinction between ‘fully commissioned’ used in these Rs and ‘commissioned’ used in others?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.8.3.9	The Applicant	<p>R11 - Lighting strategy</p> <p>This requires the lighting strategy to be implemented but there is no clause that it be subsequently retained, maintained nor that any new lighting be installed in accordance with the strategy – how will this be provided for?</p>
Q1.8.3.10	The Applicant, NE and EA	<p>R11 - Lighting strategy</p> <p>Would this R, either as proposed or suitably amended, be capable of satisfying the particular issue of sensitivity of water voles as pointed out in EA’s Written Representation, section 6 [RE1-035]? Should EA or NE be required consultees on any strategy?</p>
Q1.8.3.11	The Applicant	<p>R12 - LaBARDS</p> <p>R12 (1) is unclear what the precise arrangement and sequence of consultation with Thames Water Utilities Limited (TWUL) is intended, please can the Applicant clarify?</p>
Q1.8.3.12	The Applicant	<p>R12 - LaBARDS</p> <p>What arrangements would be put in place to ensure the long term ongoing management of areas covered by the LaBARDS following decommissioning of the CCF? How would these be secured and monitored, and if necessary updated?</p>
Q1.8.3.13	The Applicant	<p>R12 (2)- LaBARDS</p> <p>Is the provision that the LaBARDS be “substantially in accordance with...” sufficiently precise? What is the justification for this approach? What areas is it anticipated that there may be any deviation? Can these be factored into the R?</p>
Q1.8.3.14	The Applicant	<p>R13 (1) - Surface and foul water drainage</p> <p>The provision for consultation in R13 (1) appears ambiguous – is the intention that the local planning authority (LPA) consult with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) before approving any scheme or for the Applicant to consult with them before submitting the information? Is there an intention that the LPA take consideration of any consultation response from the LLFA?</p>
Q1.8.3.15	The Applicant	<p>R13 (1) - Surface and foul water drainage</p> <p>Given the anticipated site layout and arrangement why does the R seek to approve the drainage strategy in ‘parts’ and what is the relationship of ‘parts’ to works packages?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.8.3.16	The Applicant	<p>R15 – Skills and employment plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the trigger for a skills and employment plan the commissioning of Work No1? • Notwithstanding LBBC’s response at deadline 2 [REP2-024], what is the intended approach to employment and skills development during the preparation and construction phases? • Noting the Applicant’s observations [REP2-019] about construction phase in paragraph 1.2.6 of the Outline Skills and Employment Plan (Revision A) [REP2-022], and noting that it would not be an unusual situation that contractors are yet to be selected, please can the Applicant explain further why it would not be possible to also target the construction phase to provide employment and/or skills development opportunities?
Q1.8.3.17	The Applicant	<p>R16 - Jetty works environmental design scheme</p> <p>The provision for consultation in R16 (1) appears ambiguous – is the intention that the LPA consult with the EA and PLA before approving any scheme or for the Applicant to consult with them before submitting the information?</p>
Q1.8.3.18	The Applicant and EA	<p>R17 – River wall</p> <p>Why is the R to seek approval from the EA rather than the LPA (who may consult with the EA)?</p>
Q1.8.3.19	The Applicant	<p>R18 – Flood risk mitigation</p> <p>R18 (1) requires development to accord with the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). To what extent does the Assessment set out the mitigation to be implemented to support its recommendations as opposed to actions incorporated into the design of the proposed Development or other strategies such as the outline drainage strategy? As an assessment is it appropriate to require that the development accords with it?</p>
Q1.8.3.20	The Applicant	<p>R19 – Navigational risk assessment (NRA)</p> <p>Is inclusion of the phrase “which must not be unreasonably withheld” necessary?</p> <p>The construction of the R means its intention could be unclear. Is the key requirement an intention that the development needs to be carried out in accordance with an approved, updated NRA, and that work No 4 should not commence until it has been approved (with other clauses setting out measures that need to inform the update of the NRA)?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.8.3.21	The Applicant	R20 - Control of noise during operation Why is the trigger the commissioning of Work No 1 when some other work packages contain development that could give rise to noise?
Q1.8.3.22	The Applicant	R23 - Decommissioning environmental management plan Should the decommissioning environmental management plan also incorporate measures to maximise the re-use of any material removed or demolished?
Q1.8.3.23	The Applicant	R24 - Decommissioning traffic management plan Given when decommissioning is anticipated to take place, does the R have enough flexibility to cover other traffic, e.g. river traffic?
Q1.8.3.24	The Applicant	R25 – Heat Strategy How would the timescale for the implementation of the approved Heat Strategy be controlled?
8.4	Schedule 11 – Deemed Marine Licence	
Q1.8.4.1	The Applicant and MMO	MMO comments on draft Deemed Marine Licence (dDML) The MMO's Written Representations and comments on the first Change Request [REP1-036] detail a series of changes to the dDML they consider appropriate. Please can the parties advise whether these are acceptable and agreed or, where appropriate, provide alternative wording.
Q1.8.4.2	The Applicant	Parameters of marine based works The dDML provided in schedule 11 of the dDCO [REP2-004] does not refer to any parameters of marine based works. Can the Applicant explain why no parameters are included in the dDML for the marine based works?
8.5	Schedule 12 – Protective Provisions	
Q1.8.5.1	EA	Suitability of protective provisions Please can the EA clarify what changes to protective provisions they are seeking as mentioned in their written representation [REP1-035] ?
8.6	Schedule 13 – Documents and Plans to be Certified	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.8.6.1	The Applicant	<p>Documents requiring certification - Mitigation</p> <p>Only the documents that have been provided in outline/ preliminary form as application documents are listed as being required to be certified, and as such there does not appear to be a list of all documents requiring certification. Can the Applicant explain why the dDCO as currently drafted does not require all management/mitigation plans to be certified?</p>
8.7 Schedule 16 – Design Parameters		
Q1.8.7.1	The Applicant	<p>Absorber column(s) and stack(s)</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain why it has not included parameter(s) for stack diameter in Schedule 16 (Design Parameters) of the dDCO [REP2-004], for the (two) new stack(s)?</p>
Q1.8.7.2	The Applicant	<p>Absorber column(s) and stack(s)</p> <p>ES Appendix 5-2 (Operational Phase Assessment) [APP-078] states at paragraph 3.2.14 that: “The location of the new Stack(s) is based on the most up to date design information currently available and they lie approximately 100m from the Riverside 1 and Riverside 2 buildings, as shown on the Works Plans (Document Reference 2.3). This is the minimum recommended distance and is secured pursuant to the parameters defined in the Draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1)”.</p> <p>Schedule 16 (Design Parameters) of the dDCO [REP2-004] does not specify a minimum recommended distance between the new stack(s) and the Riverside 1 and Riverside 2 buildings. It is noted that the Work Provisions at Part 2 of the dDCO [REP2-004] state that each numbered work (in this case, 1B) must be situated within the corresponding numbered area shown on the works plans and within the limits of deviation.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm, with reference to its statement that “This is the minimum recommended distance and is secured pursuant to the parameters defined in the Draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1)”, how this minimum recommended distance is secured in the parameters defined in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.8.7.3	The Applicant	<p>Parameters for supporting Plant and Engineering Plans - Indicative Equipment Layout</p> <p>Bearing in mind the approach set out in DAD: Design Principles and Design Code [APP-047] why does the 35m maximum height parameter for supporting plant extend to the southernmost</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>extent of the proposed CCF footprint where buildings and plant of much lower height are anticipated?</p> <p>Should the parameters in Schedule 16 be reviewed in light of this and the principles in the DAD: Design Principles and Design Code document?</p>
Q1.8.7.4	The Applicant	<p>List of components</p> <p>Why is the list of component/building/areas not comprehensive in terms of the works proposed?</p>
8.8	General	
Q1.8.8.1	The Applicant	<p>PLA comments</p> <p>The Applicant's views are sought on the 'minor comments' on the dDCO raised by the PLA in their Deadline 2 representation [REP2-026].</p>
9.	Flood risk and hydrology	
Q1.9.0.1	The Applicant and EA	<p>Flood Risk</p> <p>Bearing in mind the Applicant's Response to Interested Parties' Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019], please can the Applicant and EA advise what further progress has been made regarding the matters set out in the EA's written representation [REP1-035] and what matters remain outstanding?</p>
Q1.9.0.2	The Applicant	<p>Ground raising – development platform</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-051] refers to a 3m development platform, although does not explain why this is required (nor do any of the other ES Chapters). ES Appendix 11-2, FRA [AS-023] notes that the development platform is required to raise the area outside of some potential flood levels. The Applicant is requested to provide information on the requirement for this development platform as follows:</p> <p>i) - The source of material for this platform does not appear to be specified and whilst Table 16-17 of ES Chapter 16 [APP-065] specifies the total anticipated material import for earthworks, it is not specifically stated that this includes the platform. Can the Applicant confirm what has been assumed in the ES assessments in this regard and how any effects of the transport of this material has been assessed in the relevant ES chapters?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>ii) - The height of this platform is also variably presented, as ES Chapter 2 [APP-051] refers to 3m AOD, whereas ES Appendix 11-2 [AS-023] specifies 2.8 – 3.1m AOD. Can the Applicant confirm the value that has been used in the ES (and FRA) assessments and how this is secured?</p>
Q1.9.03	The Applicant	<p>Ground raising – development platform What alternatives to a development platform have been investigated and why were they considered unsuitable? Why would it be necessary for the whole CCF to be sited on a development Platform?</p>
Q1.9.04	The Applicant	<p>Ground raising – development platform height The methodology for the additional modelling given in section 8.3 of ES Appendix 11-2 [AS-023] uses the existing Thames breach model maximum depth of 2.49m AOD (for the 1 in 200-year event plus climate change) as a starting point of determining the development platform height. The 2.49m figure does not match the peak flood depths in Table 8-4 of ES Appendix 11-2, which appears to be 4.59m at point 18. Can the applicant confirm whether the 2.49m figure represents the highest breach within the order limits, (as it is noted the model covers a wider area than the DCO boundary)? If this is not the case, the applicant is requested to provide an explanation of why the 2.49m figure was chosen.</p>
Q1.9.05	The Applicant	<p>Flood wall height ES Appendix 11-2 [AS-023] indicates that the peak breach water level within the DCO boundary is 3.52m AOD, adjacent to the proposed development platform. This would be above the proposed platform level that (based on the description in ES Appendix 11-2) has a minimum proposed level of 2.8m AOD, up to 3.10m AOD. Further breach water levels of greater than 2.8m AOD are also indicated (breaches of 3.10m, 3.14m and 3.52m are noted on site). Paragraph 8.3.56 states that a further 300mm high flood wall is therefore proposed on top of the platform, offering protection up to a height of 3.4m. It is not clear why the wall height has been designed to protect against a 3.10 - 3.40m breach (2.80m - 3.1m platform plus 0.3m wall) rather than the maximum 3.52m breach. The applicant is requested to provide clarity on this matter.</p>
Q1.9.06	EA	<p>Comments in EA's written representation</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Applicant's Response to Interested Parties Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019] (p10) queries whether some comments in the EA's written representation [REP1-035] may relate to a different project; please can EA clarify and confirm the position.
10. Geology, hydrogeology, soils, materials and waste		
Q1.10.0.1	The Applicant	Ground raising - development platform Further to Q1.9.0.2 above, what is the anticipated material to be used for the development platform and from where would it be sourced? How would the import and use of material to construct the development platform be controlled?
Q1.10.0.2	The Applicant	Amines What measures would be put in place to dispose of degraded amines? How would these be controlled?
Q1.10.0.3	Ridgeway Users	Chemicals in watercourse (1) Please can Ridgeway Users clarify what they consider any implications for the Proposed Development would be in the light of their comments about chemicals in the vicinity?
Q1.10.0.4	The Applicant and EA	Chemicals in watercourse (2) The Applicant's comments on this matter in their Response to Interested Parties' Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019] are noted. EA's views on Ridgeway Users comments [REP1-069] on chemicals in watercourse are invited, as are any further comments from the Applicant. What are the implications for the Water Frameworks Directive assessment?
Q1.10.0.5	PLA	Removal and/or dispersive dredging Would the provisions in Article 27 of the dDCO [REP2-004] and the proposal in paragraph 6.2.5 of the CoCP Revision C [REP2-008] that any alternative to backhoe dredging would be agreed with the PLA, MMO and EA address the PLA's concerns [REP2-026] ? Please explain why, or why not, and advise whether any additional measures would need to be put in place.
11. Land transport and public rights of way		
Q1.11.0.1	LBBC	Footpaths LBBC in the LIR [REP1-034] seeks "more powers over how the process for re-routing footpaths would occur in order to make sure that the best possible routes for users are

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		created". Please can LBBC clarify what power they seek and how it envisages the powers sought would be delivered?
Q1.11.02	The Applicant	<p>Temporary and permanent footpaths</p> <p>The ES states in paragraph 14.7.1 [APP-063] that the start and end points of permanent Public Rights of Way diversions are shown on the Access and Rights of Way Plans [AS-008]. Therefore, it is understood that the diversion or new routes for these footpaths are not known at present. The ES assumes that any permanent amendments to footpaths will be present during the operational phase. Can the Applicant confirm when it is likely that these temporary and permanent diversions will be known and what has been assumed in the ES assessments as the worst case?</p>
Q1.11.03	The Applicant	<p>Improvements to England Coast Path/Footpath 3/National Cycle Route 1</p> <p>Work No 4a in the dDCO [REP2-004] includes improvements to the route of the England Coast Path/Footpath 3/National Cycle Network 1. No information is given in ES Chapter 2 [APP-051] regarding improvements to this route, although it is noted that ES Chapter 14 [APP-063] describes mitigation for Footpath 3 as "New information boards detailing the Proposed Development and other points of interest, improvements to the Public Right of Way (PRoW) to ensure they are accessible for all user groups, and inclusion of/updates to existing street furniture including benches, bins and signage". Can the Applicant confirm what the improvement works to this route would comprise and how any potential impacts have been assessed within the ES?</p>
Q1.11.04	The Applicant	<p>TWUL emergency access route</p> <p>Work No 8 in the dDCO [REP2-004] is for the relocation of the existing east to west emergency access track for the Thames Water Crossness sewage treatment works. The Works Plans show this over a wide area, including additional land take within the existing CLNR and proposed mitigation area outside of the proposed CCF. However, it is noted that the route has not been confirmed and there is limited detail presented in relation to Work No 8, such as how the final location will be decided (or any currently preferred options), construction methods and timescales. Can the Applicant confirm what has been assumed in the ES assessments as the worst case for Work No 8?</p>

12. Major accidents and disasters

ExQ1: 20 December 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: Friday 17 January 2025

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
(no questions at this stage)		
13. Metropolitan Open Land		
Q1.13.0.1	The Applicant	Accessibility Notwithstanding the observations made within their Response to Interested Parties' Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-019], please can the applicant expand on the issue of the relevance of issues of accessibility bearing in mind national and local policy for Green Belt (GB) and Metropolitan Open Land (MOL)? (Bexley Local Plan policies SP8 and G3)?
Q1.13.0.2	The Applicant	MOL tests Bearing in mind the above question Q1.13.0.1 how have the tests set out in national and local policy for MOL (and by extension GB) been considered?
Q1.13.0.3	The Applicant	Replacement stables Would the replacement stables be materially larger than the building it would replace? Would the proposed stables be an exception to new buildings being inappropriate development under para 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)? If so, how and why?
14. Navigation on the River Thames and marine transport		
Q1.14.0.1	The Applicant	Additional wharves to support construction materials In light of the PLA's comments in section 4 of their Deadline 2 representations [REP2-026], and further to the information given in the Applicant's response to relevant representations [AS-043] please can the Applicant provide more information why Victoria Deep Water Terminal in Greenwich has been identified as the only viable option for handling construction material, and whether any alternatives might be identified for any stage of the project? If so, which and how will this be factored into the planning for construction transport?
15. Noise and Vibration		
(no questions at this stage)		
16. Planning Obligations		
Q1.16.0.1	The Applicant	Deed of Obligations (A)

ExQ1: 20 December 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: Friday 17 January 2025

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		How will the proposed Deed of Obligations (A) [REP1-030] ensure that the mitigation hierarchy is adhered to in respect of how it would prioritise implementation and its provision for an 'Alternative Off-Site Delivery Mechanism'?
Q1.16.02	The Applicant	Deed of Obligations (B) Given the definition in Schedule 1 of the "Crossness LNR Manager" means the "manager of Crossness LNR, currently employed by TWUL", how would the proposed Deed of Obligations (B) [REP1-031] ensure that the obligation applies to any successors to that post?
Q1.16.03	LBBC, Peabody Trust and TWUL	Deed of Obligations (A) and (B) Are the parties satisfied that the Deeds of Obligations have been drafted in a legally satisfactory manner and meet the tests for such obligations?
17. Social and economic Effects		
(no questions at this stage)		
18. Townscape and visual impact		
Q1.18.01	The Applicant	Effect of development platform 1 How has the development platform been taken into account in the design of the proposed development including the DAD: Design Principles and Design Code [APP-047] and vice versa (such as DC_NOR 1.1 Improve activation of Norman Road to enable passive surveillance)?
Q1.18.02	The Applicant	Effect of development platform 2 How will the development platform affect those features that may need to remain at or near ground level on the CCF development site (such as the Thames Water emergency access route, vehicle and pedestrian routes into the various parts of the CCF, etc.)?
Q1.18.03	The Applicant	Effect of development platform 3 The FRA [AS-023] refers to the possibility that the development platform would be raised by sheet piles. How will the outer faces of the development platform be treated in terms of form, shape, appearance, etc. from all sides?
19. Other Matters		
Q1.19.01	The Applicant, APs and IPs	Revised NPPF

ExQ1: 20 December 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: Friday 17 January 2025

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Bearing in mind that there is a designated National Policy Statement in place, please can all parties advise of any new or different implications the revised NPPF (published on 12 December 2024) may have for the development?
Q1.19.02	The Applicant	Finch v Surrey CC – Supreme Court Judgment Are there any implications for the ES or the application, or any comments the applicant wishes to make regarding the Supreme Court judgement in R (on the application of Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) (Appellant) v Surrey County Council and others (Respondents) [2024] UKSC 20?
Q1.19.03	The Applicant	Changes to the Application The applicant's views are sought on LBBC's comments made in their Deadline 2 representations [REP2-024] on the changes accepted into the Examination on 18 November 2024.

ExQ1: 20 December 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: Friday 17 January 2025

ANNEX A

Cory Decarbonisation Project:

List of all objections to the grant of Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession powers (ExQ1: Question Q1.5.0.4)

In the event of a new interest in the land, or Category 3 person, being identified the Applicant should inform those persons of their right to apply to become an Interested Party under s102A PA2008.

Obj No.ⁱ	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref Noⁱⁱ	RR Ref Noⁱⁱⁱ	WR Ref No^{iv}	Other Doc Ref No^v	Interest^{vi}	Permanent/ Temporary^{vii}	Plot(s)	CA?^{viii}	Status of objection

i Obj No = objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence.

ii Reference number assigned to each Interested Party (IP) and Affected Person (AP)

iii Reference number assigned to each Relevant Representation (RR) in the Examination library

iv Reference number assigned to each Written Representation (WR) in the Examination library

v Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination library

vi This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:

- Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of Order land;
- Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the Order, but who “would or might” be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the Order being implemented, or Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the Order has been implemented;
- Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the Order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the Order.

vii This column indicates whether the applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land/ rights

viii CA = compulsory acquisition. The answer is ‘yes’ if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and National Grid are seeking compulsory acquisition of land/ rights.