



The Planning Inspectorate

Application by National Grid Gas plc for an Order Granting Development Consent for the River Humber Gas Pipeline Replacement Project

Agendas for issue-specific hearings

HRA/EIA AGENDA SCHEDULE

It is clear from the Deadline 3 examination submission that negotiations have been progressing between the applicant and interested parties with a number of matters being agreed and others the subject of meetings ahead of the Hearings. This list provides an indication of some of the details to be discussed during the Hearings. A number of items simply require clear (or independent) verification of evidence already presented. The list is not intended to be exhaustive and because of the nature of an examination there are likely to be additional questions raised by Interested Parties, or the Examining Authority.

1. Water Voles – Clarification whether Deadline 3 updated CEMP now agreed with Natural England. Any final feedback from Yorkshire Wildlife Trust?
2. Marsh Harrier – Should the outline mitigation strategy located in the Deadline 3, Statement of Common Grounds with Natural England and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) be referred to in an updated Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) at PRE-F11?
3. Has agreement been reached between the applicant, Natural England and the RSPB on the area of temporary mitigation land to offset the impact of the loss of land to the compounds? Please provide an update.
 - a. If agreement has been reached are Natural England and the RSPB now able to agree and support the conclusion no Adverse Effects on Integrity?
 - b. If agreement has not been reached (on the item above) whilst the parties' positions are well documented in the examination there will be a discussion and questions.
4. Following the further discussions proposed between the applicant and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust [[REP3-028](#), see - EXQ13.4] has there been agreement reached with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust on their suggested mitigation measures for effects on Paull Holme Strays? Please provide an update.
 - a. If agreement has not been reached (on the item above) whilst the party's positions are well documented in the examination there will be a discussion and questions.

5. Inter Tidal habitats – CON-F17 in the CEMP now states '*Pumps shall be placed inside a cage in order to prevent debris / fish (i.e. lamprey) or benthic species from being drawn into the mechanism*'. Is this agreed with NE and MMO and should this be secured in a Requirement?
6. HRA Matrices – please can the applicant address the following items and issue updated HRA matrices at Deadline 4;
 - a. A Likely Significant Effect (LSE) is screened out for all features as a result of habitat loss/alteration and for in-combination effects in Stage 1 Matrix B. However, habitat loss/alteration and in-combination effects have been considered in the integrity matrix (Stage 2 Matrix 1). Can the applicant confirm whether or not these effects should have been screened in and update the matrices accordingly?
 - b. Stage 1 Matrix B identifies features as either breeding/wintering species however Stage 2 Matrix 1 does not. Can the matrices be updated to be consistent with one another?
 - c. In Stage 1 Matrix B, a LSE has been identified as a result of disturbance for red knot and common redshank; however these features have not been taken forward to Stage 2 Matrix 1, nor have they been identified as a feature taken forward to appropriate assessment in Table 9 of the HRA Report (Doc 5.4). Can the applicant clarify this discrepancy and update the matrices accordingly?
 - d. Stage 1 Matrix B refers to wintering bird assemblages, whereas Stage 2 Matrix 1 refers to waterfowl assemblage. Please explain this discrepancy.
 - e. In addition, for both the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar site, the stage 1 matrices identify disturbance as a '*general effect*', however in Stage 2 they are split up to disturbance in fields/estuary. The effects identified should be consistent between the two stages.
 - f. For the Ramsar site, the Stage 1 matrix identifies features as the '*ramsar criterion*' whereas the Stage 2 identifies the individual species. The matrices should be consistent with one another.
7. CON F16 – how many barn owl boxes and reptile covers?
8. Can the EA confirm whether they are now content based on the Deadline 3 submissions there would be no deterioration of water courses in terms of Water Framework Directive?