

Application by National Grid Gas plc

River Humber Gas Pipeline Replacement Project

The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

Issued on 8 December 2015

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information.

Questions are set out using a document-based framework derived from the application, relevant representations and policy guidance. This serves to clarify aspects of the application and support the initial assessment of principal issues provided as Annexe C to my letter of 22 July 2015.

Column 2 of the table indicates to **which persons questions are directed**. The ExA would be grateful if all bodies named could answer all questions directed at them, providing either a substantive response, or to indicate that the question is not relevant to them with a reason. The direction of questions in this way 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. Responsibility rests with each party engaged within the examination to ensure that all questions directed to them (within all sections) have been responded to.

Where questions can be fully addressed within a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) then a reference to the relevant SOCG will be sufficient.

Each question has a **unique reference number** which combines a section number and a question number.

Document references referred to [in square brackets] are the Planning Inspectorates references used in the River Humber Examination Library. This can be found on our website by following this link: [Examination Library](#)

When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are answering a limited number of questions, responses in a letter format will suffice. If you are answering several questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on that used below. An editable version of this table, in Microsoft Word, is available on request from: Riverhumbergaspipeline@pins.gsi.gov.uk

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|--|--|
| 1. | Applicant | <p>November Hearings, Day 1, Action List Point 7 [EV-014] – drafting within the updated CEMP - Pre A3 [REP4-024].</p> <p>Should this drafting be reviewed for clarity and to identify that it involves engagement and taking account of the advice received from both the Environment Agency and Humber Emergency Planning Service?</p> |
| 2. | Applicant and North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) (as marked) | <p>November Hearings, Day 1, Action List Point 18 [EV-014] – the applicant has supplied a Technical Note on Traffic – Annexure 6 [REP4-042]. This provides the applicants summary of the viability of North Lincolnshire Council’s (NLC) proposed two way construction route along the Soff Lane diversion and Chapel Field Road. It also provides 3 plans collectively identifying the existence of services in the soft verges and a commentary on the suitability of the temporary passing places proposed on the haul route at Chapel Field Road, Ferry Road and East Marsh Road to be made permanent;</p> <p>Applicant – At Deadline 3 the track change DCO was amended to identify 8 of 12 passing places as ‘<i>widening</i>’ works instead of ‘<i>temporary widening works</i>’. Of the 12 Work Nos now identified in table 1 (Suitability of Passing Places to be Made Permanent) only 4 have ‘<i>no services affected</i>’ the remainder being subject to ‘<i>further works to assess if protection measures required</i>’. By Deadline 7 (earlier if achievable) please provide a final update/position statement on this matter. What (if any) mitigation is offered and achievable?</p> <p>Applicant – In response to Examining Authorities first questions [8.28] Works 6D, 6H, 6I, 6J and 6K were identified as work improvements to <u>existing</u> passing places and works 6A, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6L, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R as works to provide <u>new</u> passing places. In your response (to the above question) please provide a table identifying each Work</p> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|----------------------|---|
| | | <p>No, whether permanent works are achievable, whether this would involve existing or 'new' passing place provision and whether if such works have been agreed, adoption by NLC on completion is also agreed?</p> <p>NLC – As Action points 20 & 21 from Day 2 of the November Hearings [EV-015], please respond on the applicants D4 submission at Deadline 5 (20 = feedback on 'services plan'; 21 = benefit of retaining passing places (if offered)) and if discussions remain ongoing provide the Council's final position statement on the haul route by Deadline 7.</p> |
| 3. | Applicant | <p>Goxhill Parish Council made a representation following their Parish Council meeting in a letter dated 7.12.15 (which I accepted as a late Deadline 4 submission and is published on the website) [REP4-044].</p> <p>At Deadline 5 please respond to the Parish Council's representation.</p> <p>The Parish Council raised concern over ensuring full and proper consultation over any Traffic Management Plan and enforceability. At Deadline 4, the Initial CEMP was updated in terms of consultation [section 3.4 - REP4-025]. What measures are in place to ensure any traffic regulations within the Initial Traffic Management Plan would be enforceable, how would that be achieved and how is it secured?</p> |
| 4. | Applicant | <p>Day 1, Action Point 22 [EV-014] – SOCG Network Rail – please verify whether the non-uniformly distributed highway axle loading of 17 units HB for Ferry Bridge and the bridge condition (from latest Network Rail assessment) is adequate for the use of the inbound haul route as proposed for abnormal loads throughout the scheme? (Items - 5.5. and 5.9 - minutes from meeting attached to SOCG) [REP4- 030].</p> |
| 5. | Natural England (NE) | <p>HRA matrices [REP4-021] Natural England (NE) - do you agree with the content and</p> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|---|--|
| | | conclusions drawn in the updated HRA matrices? |
| 6. | NE | <p>a) HRA Lamprey – The D3 SOCG states a desire for you to see the Lamprey screen included within the DCO drafting. It is currently identified in CON F-17, page 30 of the D4 CEMP. Is this point agreed? The SoCG also states that the applicant is awaiting info from NE. Does the applicant now have this information and has it resulted in any changes to the DCO?</p> <p>b) In response to ExA first questions [5.3] you noted potential in-combination impacts on birds with Able Marine. Are you now content with (1) the projects/plans considered in the in-combination assessment, and (2) do you have any outstanding concerns regarding in-combination impacts?</p> |
| 7. | RSPB | Your SoCG indicates agreement with the plans and projects that have been presented for the HRA in-combination assessment but ' <i>not in terms of agreeing with their conclusions</i> ' – do you have concerns over the conclusions drawn in the applicant's in-combination assessment? If so what are these, or do you agree with the applicant's assessment of no in-combination impacts? |
| 8. | NE & RSPB, Applicant | The content of RSPBs email dated 27 November 2015 [REP4-004] and the applicants' response at Deadline 4 to Day 1, Action points 10, 12 & 13 on revised mitigation proposals being discussed between the parties is noted [REP4-026]. At Deadline 5 please supply an update. |
| 9. | NE, RSPB, YWT, LWT & Interested Parties | Please review the Deadline 4 Initial CEMP [REP4-024] and Deadline 4 Mitigation Commitments [REP4-026]. Please supply comments on these documents including any points that you wish to draw to the Examining Authority's attention. |
| 10. | NE, RSPB | Matters appear to be progressing satisfactorily in refining Statement of Common |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|--------------------------------|---|
| | | Ground (SOCG) with the applicant. By Deadline 7 (or earlier if achievable) please supply a final position statement. |
| 11. | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT) | <p>YWT email 16.09.15 stated that agreement had been reached between the EA and the applicant on a '<i>compensation package</i>' for Paul Holme Strays associated with the construction phase. Can you please clarify whether this now removes your request for ecological enhancements as raised in response to EXQ1 [REP2-011].</p> <p>YWT also stated '<i>concerns regarding the long term management of Field 26</i>'. This was raised at the hearings as Action Point 2, on day 2 for the applicant's response and that was supplied at Deadline 4 in Hearing Action Checklist 17 & 18, November 2015, Item 2, Day 2 (pages 5-6) [REP4-036]. Please provide your current position on this matter and whether discussions continue, or that position is considered final?</p> |
| 12. | Applicant | In relation to the ' <i>compensation package</i> ' referred to above [ExA Question 2(10)] and agreed with the EA. What has been agreed and how is this secured? |
| 13. | RSPB, YWT | Hearings Day 2, Action Point 3 - At Deadline 4 the applicant updated the CEMP and Con F16 now states ' <i>One barn owl box will be installed on an existing tree within the north-east corner of Field 26 and at least two reptile hibernacula will be created within Field 26</i> '. Is that an appropriate number? |
| 14. | Applicant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The progress report on trial trenching during the hearing was helpful. Can you confirm when final trial trenching evaluation reports will be issued and any necessary mitigation confirmed? • Can you also please verify that you intend to supply this information to Historic England (HE) and North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) to enable them to provide feedback into the examinations and that updated SOCGs with HE and NLC (as necessary) will be |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|
| | | <p>supplied by Deadline 7 (17.02.16), or earlier if achievable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could the entry 8.1.9A in the SOCG Schedule be highlighted '<i>amber</i>' until this work is completed since although this SOCG at D2 is executed, as discussed at the hearing, this matter has yet to be concluded. |
| 15. | Historic England (HE), NLC | Your feedback on the applicant's final trial trenching report and mitigation proposal is requested by Deadline 7 (17.02.16), or earlier if achievable. |
| 16. | Environment Agency (EA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide your feedback on the applicant's response to your Deadline 3 submission on pages 5-9 of '<i>Responses to Comments on Documents Received at Deadline 3</i>' [REP4-034]. In particular that related to separation of fluvial and tidal flood risk (Point 7) and '<i>Lower & Upper Bound Estimates</i>' – has a worst case scenario been assessed in the ES. • The SOCG, at 4.1.4 - Adequacy of FRA is marked '<i>Unresolved</i>' is this position now resolved? |
| 17. | Applicant | <p>Independent Tunnel Validation (Cat 3 check) – during the hearing you stated that you had considered this matter and considered it was something to be governed by good practice rather than statute. The Initial CEMP has also been updated at Pre-L14. However, given the effective design and installation of a sealed tunnel system design is an essential factor in assessing the level of flood risk and that the independent assessment was used in response to ExA first Question 3.5, would it also be appropriate to include this as previously suggested? Furthermore given reference was also made to the Joint Code of Practice (JCOP) for Risk Management of Tunnel Work in the UK in 2003 (as stated in response to ExA Question, 2.11) and that together they reduce the risk of a significant potential adverse effect, should both be included in the draft DCO?</p> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 18. | Applicant, EA (as marked) | <p>Applicant: In Flood Risk Addendum [REP1-013] from Deadline 1 there is a photo on page 3 of the compound area in flood. What year was that taken and what height (Above Ordnance Datum) was the flood event?</p> <p>Applicant: On page 29 of the FRA addendum a map was produced to illustrate the effects of a tunnel breach '<i>Tunnel Collapse Indicative Flood Extents</i>'. The edge of the Lidar ('glass walling') is shown. What are ground levels between here and the village of Goxhill? Does a pathway exist such that the village could be affected?</p> <p>EA: Please provide your feedback on the applicant's response at Deadline 6.</p> |
| 19. | Applicant | Environmental Statement Errata and Amendments [REP4-032] pages 17-21 updates the summary of residual effects on receptors at Paull and Goxhill from the Traffic and Transport Assessment [APP-070]. This adds a column for 'Driver Delay' and a number of these effects are listed as 'Major Adverse'. This is an assessment ahead of mitigation and appears to affect the inbound and outbound haul routes. What are the residual effects after mitigation for 'Driver Delay' and where is that table within the application ES? |
| Deadline 4, UPDATED DRAFT DCO | | |
| 20. | NE,RSPB,NLC, IPs | Updated Deadline 4 draft DCO – please review the Deadline 4 updated draft DCO and advise whether you have any outstanding points of concern regarding securing proposed mitigation, or the drafting. |
| 21. | NE & YWT | Deadline 4 draft DCO Requirement 19 – Ecological Surveys [REP4-017] and PRE-F3, CEMP [REP4-024] – this drafting has been introduced to deal with the protection of water voles during the scheme. Is the wording and process for protection and its security by this requirement and the updated Deadline 4 CEMP clause agreed? |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|---------------|---|
| 22. | EA, Applicant | <p>Updated Deadline 4 draft DCO [REP4-017]</p> <p>SCHEDULE 10 PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS, Part 3, Environment Agency</p> <p>26 – should the drafting refer to ‘<i>Any specified work capable of interfering with or risking damage to any drainage work for flood defence, or the flood defence area</i>’ i.e. to include the flood wall as defined in Schedule 3, 1, or does the current wording already describe that necessary?</p> <p>27 – is this drafting clear, or indeed workable/practical?</p> |
| 23. | Applicant | <p>Deadline 4 Draft DCO – has a compliance check been undertaken against Advice Note 5 - Drafting Development Consent Orders?</p> |
| 24. | Applicant | <p>Hearings Day 2, Action Point 4 – please supply a final list of documents comprising the order using an updated (and refined version) of Master Version Control Document [REP4-011] by Deadline 7, 17.02.15.</p> |
| 25. | Applicant | <p>The term ‘environmental statement’ (ES) is defined in Art 2 and appears in Art 43 Certification of plans etc. Should the latter list the documents comprising the final ES using the reference list from the final version of the Master Version Document Control, 1.6C, Volume 6 [REP4-011]?</p> |
| 26. | Applicant | <p>CEMP</p> <p>Given the central importance of the CEMP to the delivery of mitigation and the limitation of undesirable adverse effects this document lies at the heart of the draft order and the updated Hierarchy of Plans (3.1B) illustrates a two stage process in its development. Would it be appropriate to;</p> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|-----------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define the Initial CEMP within Art 2 and list that document for Certification in Art 43 • Define both the 'Initial CEMP' and 'Final CEMP' or ('PEMP') with the former being the document at its stage of development at the examination close and the latter being the final version that will be approved by the relevant local authority after further detailed design by the MWC and ahead of construction? • Could this then provide clearer drafting describing how the development of the Final CEMP through detailed design is undertaken and then approved in Requirement 12? Currently there is a definition of an application CEMP and a CEMP submitted to the Local Authority for approval and this is unclear. • If this line of thinking were adopted, given the fact the CEMP is the essential document controlling the schemes implementation to ensure mitigation is delivered and the effects of the scheme are controlled in the manner presented should the Final CEMP not be stated to be developed '<i>substantially in accordance with the Initial CEMP</i>'? |
| 27. | Applicant | <p>Environmental Mitigation Commitments Document [REP04-026]</p> <p>The Environmental Mitigation Commitments Document summarises mitigation commitments in the original ES but also includes mitigation measures and refinements during the examination. In line with the statement at para 1.1.8, page 4 for Deadline 4 this was subject to review to ensure all mitigation is collated in the document and referenced to where that is secured in the DCO. That mitigation is referenced in either the Initial Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Initial Traffic Management Plan (initial TMP) or Initial Site Water Management Plan (initial SWMP).</p> <p>Will this document (if necessary) be updated to its final issue for Deadline 7?</p> |

| | Question to: | Question |
|-----|--------------|--|
| 28. | Applicant | <p>Initial Site Water Management Plan (SWMP)</p> <p>This document remains in its original form at application. During the examination additional information by way of addendums for a Mini Pumping Test and Hydrological Impact Assessment were produced (Deadline 2) and removed many of the EAs previous objections. The Initial SWMP is mentioned in the drafting of the Deadline 4 Initial CEMP at 2.4.1, PRE A2, PRE L3 & CON L7.</p> <p>Given the importance of the SWMP in mitigating potential adverse effects would it be appropriate for the following updates to be made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Initial Site Water Management Plan – to be updated to reflect the additional information identified and ensure it is clear within that document that the MWC would be responsible for developing and updating this <i>'substantially in accordance with the Initial SWMP'</i> as detailed design is undertaken. This process being also subject to control under Requirement 5 and Requirement 4 – Detailed Design Approval of the draft DCO. • To ensure the CEMP clauses identify that there is an Initial SWMP and that the MWC must develop the final SWMP <i>'substantially in accordance with the Initial SWMP'</i>. This would tie things back for example to the process for Groundwater Design Control Works on page 52 of the HIA addendum [REP2-036] • That Req 5 (1) be amended to state; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>No stage of the authorised development may commence until, for that stage, a site water management plan based substantially in accordance with the initial site water management plan submitted with the application.....</i> ○ That Schedule 3, 1 Interpretations have added a definition of <i>Initial Site</i> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|-----------|---|
| | | <p><i>Water Management Plan and Site Water Management Plan?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That Schedule 3 Requirements, 1 Interpretation should define Initial Site Water Management Plan and Site Water Management Plan. |
| 29. | EA | <p>Given the following comment in your Deadline 4 representation letter dated 27.11.15 at the final bullet point under DCO Hearing 18.11.15, page 4 [REP4-008];</p> <p><i>We offered a word of caution about the proposed amendment to requirement 5 which would result in the insertion of a cross-reference to the Initial Site Water Management Plan. Because the plan does not include the new groundwater management strategy of reinjection, the final plan could be a considerable departure from this provisional document. As such, the insertion of any such text should be flexibly worded such that it does not inadvertently preclude the agreed measures.</i></p> <p>..and your ongoing dialogue with the applicant on the DCO (including Req 5) your feedback at D5 on question 27 (above) would be appreciated.</p> |
| 30. | Applicant | <p>Initial Traffic Management Plan (Initial TMP)</p> <p>Given the central importance of the Initial TMP to the delivery of mitigation and limitation of undesirable adverse effects this document lies at the heart of the draft order and the updated Hierarchy of Plans (3.1B) illustrates a two stage process in its development. Would it be appropriate to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update Schedule 3, 1 Interpretations to include a definition of Initial Traffic Management Plan and Traffic Management Plan? • Add relevant detail from the Initial Traffic Management Plan into the Initial CEMP, or is the existing cross reference <i>'Refer to the Initial Traffic Management Plan for all traffic</i> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|---------------|--|
| | | <i>and transport commitments' sufficiently robust?</i> |
| 31. | Applicant | Mitigation is proposed for the inbound route during term time Page 34 last row – [REP4-026] restricting HGV construction vehicle movements between the hours of 9am and 3.15pm. The schedule states that this is currently secured via Req 15 and the Initial TMP. Why is this embedded mitigation not stated in Requirement 11? |
| 32. | Applicant | The drafting of Requirement 11 – Construction Hours at 3 (a) includes the words ' <i>spoil movement</i> '. This would have the effect of authorising extended HGV operational hours beyond the 'core hours' in Requirement 11? Please review and more clearly limit to spoil movement within the tunnel and Goxhill compound. |
| 33. | Applicant | Requirement 13 – Noise. Should the drafting of 13 (2) be modified to ' <i>(2) The scheme must be substantially in accordance with the principles and assessment set out in the environmental statement and initial CEMP and set out the particulars of;</i> ' ..and should a new sub clause 13, 2 (c) be added to cover noise monitoring? |
| 34. | Applicant, NE | DCO, Requirement 19 Ecological Surveys – It is recognised some ditches were checked and some could not be accessed. The drafting currently states ' <i>No stage of the authorised development is to commence until it has been established by existing? or further survey work whether...</i> ' If further survey work is envisaged would it be preferable to simply make the requirement subject to that further survey work having been completed? |
| 35. | Applicant | Requirement 21 (2) regarding amendments to approved details currently states – ' <i>must be in accordance with the principles and assessment set out in the environmental statement</i> '. Would the following drafting be more appropriate – ' <i>substantially in accordance with the principles and assessment set out the environmental statement</i> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|-----------|--|
| | | <i>and initial CEMP'</i> |
| 36. | Applicant | <p>DCO Schedule 9 – Drafting</p> <p>Para (1) – the 2008 and the 2009 Act have been defined in Article 2 for the purpose of the whole Order. Is it necessary to redefine them for the purpose of this Schedule?</p> <p>Para 3(2) Unclear - There is no need to refer to the 'authorised development'. This is already defined in Art 2?</p> |
| 37. | Applicant | <p>DCO Schedule - Drafting</p> <p>Para 26(3) <i>within 28 days prior</i> doesn't make sense. Was the intent to state '<i>at least 28 days before?</i> ...and it's also not clear – '<i>if the Agency doesn't raise any requirements within 10 days, is it deemed to have approved the scheme?</i>' Is a deemed approval provision needed and are any other licence conditions were a deemed approval provision is needed?</p> <p>Para 26(4) there is a requirement to submit a scheme of mitigation measures but the inclusion of the words '<i>if any</i>' suggests that the requirement could be to submit a blank scheme. Is that what was anticipated? Please review this drafting for intent and clarity.</p> <p>Re para 27(2). Unclear. Please review, or explain?</p> |
| 38. | Applicant | <p>Schedule 1, 2 (Authorised Development) this drafting was updated at ExA request on 27.11.15 and currently states '<i>which are in accordance with the principles and assessment set out in the environmental statement</i>'. Would this be better drafted to state 'substantially <i>in accordance with the principles and assessment set out in the</i></p> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|-----------|--|
| | | <p><i>environmental statement and initial CEMP"</i></p> <p>Schedule 1, 2 (k) this currently states '<i>and which do not give rise to any materially different effects from those assessed in the environmental statement.</i>' Is this tailpiece capable of removal?</p> |
| 39. | EA | Requirement 6 has been updated and lists items to be included in a site waste management plan. Does this adequately define what is necessary? |
| 40. | Applicant | The expanded Schedule of Voluntary Negotiations table [REP4-028] is helpful. Please add a column to identify under the Planning Act 2008/Book of Reference the Category of interest (1-3) for each plot. |
| 41. | Applicant | <p>For completeness as discussed at the hearing. Should the following parties be added to the Schedule as Cat 3 parties with no affected land but who claim they may be affected by the scheme and who raised objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeff Teasdale – [RR-017] • Mr & Mrs Burn – [RR-018 and RR-022] • Stancer – represented by DDM Agriculture [REP2-009] |
| 42. | Applicant | [REP4-031] Schedule of Amendments to DCO and Plans – This document helpfully summarises changes to the application plans during the examination. With the Land Plans a small number of plots have either been removed, reduced in size, or there have been a couple of 'corrections' (e.g. plots 63 & 63) as the project design has been refined. Can you please verify whether this has all been undertaken within the original order limits and redline boundary and that the redline on the Deadline 4 Land Plans |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>reflects the original application order limits, or a reduction within that?</p> <p>Are further changes anticipated ahead of the close of the examination?</p> |
| 43. | DDM Agriculture | <p>Day 2, Action List, Action Point 8 [EV-015] – Please provide a table of persons you represent identifying the nature of their interests under the PA2008 (Category of interest 1, 2 & 3), the relevant plot numbers and summarising the principle objections, or verify that the information contained on the applicants D4 updated Schedule of Voluntary Negotiations [REP4-028] is correct and summarise the objections.</p> <p>By reference to an Ordnance Survey plan of suitable scale please clearly identify where the individual Land Registry Title holdings of each party are located in relation to the scheme.</p> |
| 44. | DDM Agriculture | <p>Please provide an updated final position statement by Deadline 7 (or an earlier deadline if that can be achieved) regarding your clients Mr Leech, Mr Finch and Mr Faulding.</p> |
| 45. | DDM Agriculture, Forsters LLP | <p>In a letter dated 26.10.15 to The Planning Inspectorate [AS-015] Forsters states that they act for The Corporation of Trinity House of Depford Strong and that final Heads of Terms have been agreed between them and National Grid. This letter also states that corresponding terms have also been agreed between Trinity House and its tenant farmer of the property.</p> <p>Is this tenant farmer Mr Finch?</p> <p>Is it correct that HOTs are exchanged between the applicant and Trinity House and between Trinity House and Mr Finch but that the final formal legal agreement(s) (lease and option) have not yet been executed?</p> <p>Is it correct as stated in the updated Schedule of Voluntary Negotiations table [REP4-</p> |

| Question to: | | Question |
|--------------|-----------|--|
| | | 028] that <i>Mr Finch has reached an agreement with Trinity House to surrender his tenancy</i> ? |
| 46. | Applicant | Hearings Day 2, Action List, Action Point 7 [EV-015] – Please supply an updated position statement on negotiations with ABP and the Crown Estate by Deadline 7, or earlier if achievable? Including on point 3.3 [REP4-035]. |

Abbreviations

| | |
|------|---|
| AA | Appropriate Assessment |
| ABP | Associated British Ports |
| AGI | Above Ground Installation |
| AP | Affected Person |
| CA | Compulsory acquisition |
| CEMP | Construction Environmental Management Plan |
| DCLG | Department for Communities and Local Government |
| DCO | Development Consent Order |
| DECC | Department of Energy and Climate Change |
| DML | Deemed Marine Licence |
| EA | Environment Agency |
| EPR | Examination Procedure Rules |
| ERYC | East Riding of Yorkshire Council |
| ES | Environmental Statement |
| ExA | Examining Authority |
| FIRP | Flood Incident Response Plan |
| HE | Historic England (Formerly English Heritage) |
| HiE | Highways England (Formerly Highways Agency?) |
| HDD | Horizontal Directional Drilling |
| HRA | Habitat Regulation Assessment |
| ISH | Issue Specific Hearing |
| IP | Interested Party |
| LA | Local Authority |
| LIR | Local Impact Report |
| LPA | Local Planning Authority |
| LWS | Local Wildlife Site |
| LWT | Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust |

| | |
|---------|---|
| MCZ | Marine Conservation Zone |
| MMO | Marine Management Organisation |
| MHWS | Mean High Water Springs |
| NE | Natural England |
| NELDB | North East Lindsay Drainage Board |
| NLC | North Lincolnshire Council (Unitary) |
| NPPF | National Planning Policy Framework |
| NPS | National Policy Statement |
| NRA | Navigation Risk Assessment |
| NRIL | Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd |
| NSIP | Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project |
| OFH | Open Floor Hearing |
| OFTO | Offshore Transmission Owner |
| OP | Other Person |
| PA 2008 | Planning Act 2008 |
| PINS | Planning Inspectorate |
| RIES | Report of Implications on European Sites |
| RR | Relevant Representation |
| RSPB | Royal Society for the Protection of Birds |
| RYA | Royal Yachting Association |
| SAC | Special Area of Conservation |
| SNCB | Statutory Nature Conservation Body |
| SOCG | Statement of Common Ground |
| SEA | Strategic Environmental Assessment |
| SEI | Supplementary Environment Information |
| SHIDB | South Holderness Internal Drainage Board |
| SofS | Secretary of State |
| SP | Statutory Party |
| SPA | Special Protection Area |

| | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|
| SSSI | Site of Special Scientific Interest |
| TH | Trinity House |
| The Act | The Planning Act 2008 |
| TBM | Tunnel Bore Machine |
| YWT | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust |
| | |
| | |