Chapter	Matter raised in Written Representation	Applicants Response Deadline 2 submission	Comments back from RHDHV Deadline 3 submission
Chapter 6 Ecology and Biodiversity	Justification is there for not avoiding potential for impacts upon lamprey, chalk streams and associated designations through the use of HDD or other trenchless techniques at all connected watercourses?	Natural England have confirmed in their comments (NE19) that relevant watercourses fall outside of the Humber Estuary lamprey migration routes. "Natural England welcomes the commitments to use horizontal directional drilling ('HDD') to cross major watercourses, reinstate minor watercourses, and secure the construction mitigation measures outlined in 7.3.28 of the shadow HRA via the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). In this case, we highlight that the relevant watercourses appear to fall outside the Humber Estuary lamprey migration routes. Therefore, we advise that no further assessment is required to assess potential impacts to lamprey associated with the Humber Estuary SAC/Ramsar." The Applicant acknowledges the importance of chalk streams in the area and their unique ecological features. As such, the chalk streams in the area that are to be crossed by the Proposed Development are to be crossed by non-intrusive construction methods such as HDD or Auger Bore and therefore the Proposed Development will have a negligible/no impact on the chalk streams in the area. Furthermore, minor watercourses (i.e., those other than chalk streams) affected by the Proposed Development will be reinstated within 2 years post construction so that any impacts will only be temporary.	Accepted
	What will the time lag be between completion of works and replacement planting being installed? Provision of dead-hedging currently indicates an undetermined period.	Habitats will be reinstated within 2 years post construction. Habitat reinstatement will be completed at the optimum time of year to make sure vegetation establishes successfully. Detailed timings will be provided within the final Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.	Accepted
	Detail regarding the aftercare period. Aftercare should be long term (e.g. 30 years) and ensure that there are suitable measures in place to legally and financially secure it for the duration.	Post construction monitoring will be completed for 30 years where the Applicant has made a commitment to BNG and will be detailed in the final Landscape and Ecological management Plan. The final Habitat Management Plan will detail any measures required to make sure habitats meet their target condition.	Accepted
Chapter 9 Geology and Hydrogeology	Details regarding potential decommissioning techniques to be added to the chapter in order to demonstrate that there is not the potential for a preferential pathway to be created.	The Applicant has assumed in Chapter 9 [APP-051] that the pipeline will remain in-situ in the decommissioning phase (as outlined in the Draft Decommissioning Strategy presented in Appendix 3-5 [APP-072]. Section 3.15 of Chapter 3 [APP045] also states that a detailed decommissioning strategy would be developed prior to the commencement of any decommissioning activities. It is noted in Section 3.15 of Chapter 3 that special consideration will be given to key locations such as road and railway crossings and that at such locations agreed methodologies between relevant stakeholders will be employed to ensure the pipeline is left in a suitable condition. If above ground infrastructure or specific sections of the pipeline need to be removed or grouted, and the land reinstated during the decommissioning phase, the relevant mitigation measures outlined in Chapter 9 [APP-051] for the construction phase and included in the draft Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP1-013] will remain applicable (e.g. environmental emergency response plan (E4), preparation of a Site Wast Management Plan (E5), Soil Management Plan (F1), pre-entry meetings (E6), a watching brief (E7), and a dynamic risk assessment in accordance with Environment Agency report Land Contamination Risk Assessment (LCRM) will be undertaken if required (E8). Additionally, the mitigation measures to prevent the creation of new contaminant pathways / linkages will also be required [Section 9.8.5 of APP-051]. The mitigation measures will be outlined in a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, as detailed in the CEMP (Section 7.1.8 of [REP1-013]). The decommissioning works will be undertaken in accordance with the Environment Agency Position Statement A8 in 'The Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection', Version 1.2 dated February 2018, if there is the potential for introducing preferential pathways into superficial and bedrock aquifers with backfill designed to suitable engineering standards at the time of decommissioning.	Accepted
Chapter 11 Water Environment	Flood Warning and Evacuation Plans - details on what this would entail, including time to onset and depth of flooding related to evacuation.	As noted in the FRA [APP-101], a FWEP will be produced following completion of the FEED Stage and will include all relevant information regarding mitigation, site operation, evacuation and safe refuge.	Accepted that there is a commitment to the production of a FWEP during both construction and operation. This is secured in the draft CEMP for the construction phase. It is not clear how the production of a FWEP is secured within the DCO for the operational phase but appears to be included in the commitments in the CEMP . Please provide further clarification on this point.
	No consideration of the differences in flood risk during the construction phase vs the operational phase. As such, there appears to be no cross reference to the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) in the FRA – as a document / mechanism for setting out the measures to be included during the construction phase.	An updated version of the FRA (Revision A) has been submitted at Deadline 2 which provides more detail with regards the construction phase. Construction will be undertaken in line with the measures outlined in the draft CEMP and these mitigation measures are referenced in the FRA. As is noted, construction will be undertaken in line with best practice	Accepted
	The FRA assesses the impact of flooding during the construction and operational phases of the development. However, there is no discussion on the decommissioning phase and reinstatement of land / drainage following completion of the project to ensure there is no long-term impact on flood risk.	For the decommissioning stage the pipeline will be left in-situ along its entire length, therefore the impacts associated with the decommissioning phase are related to the removal of above-ground facilities. The scale and nature of activities undertaken during decommissioning would be similar to, and significantly lesser, than those previously undertaken for construction. A Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) will be produced prior to the decommissioning phase and will include mitigation for flood risk	Clarification noted - However, there is no inclusion of the Applicant's clarification related to decommissioning in the FRA. It would have been advisable to include this explanation / reference in the FRA to confirm there will be no long-term impact. Separately it is noted that commitment F5, G2 and G11 in the CEMP all refer to existing land drainage and its reinstatement following construction. However, there is no cross reference to this mitigation, set out within the CEMP, in the FRA related to the impact of the construction of the pipeline on existing land drainage. The mitigation measures in Section 6.3 of the FRA (which include a reference to Section 5.5) appear to focus on the risk to the pipeline itself not potential off-site impacts. It would have been advisable to include cross reference to the above commitments / mitigation measures within the FRA to demonstrate no off-site flood risk or drainage impact either during construction or longer-term.
Chapter 13 Noise and Vibration	Inadequate justification of construction noise assessment criteria, disregarding low baseline sound levels in rural areas.	BS 5228-1 provides examples of how construction noise could be assessed. One of these example is the ABC method, which has been used as a basis for defining the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) and Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) for temporary construction noise effects. The LOAEL and SOAEL for construction noise have been tested at DCO examination and accepted as appropriate in other consented major DCO schemes such as High Speed 2, A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon, Thames Tideway, Luton Airport, Gatwick Airport and Manston Airport. As such, the construction noise criteria used are considered suitable for the Proposed Development.	It should be noted that the majority of the quoted projects submitted their DCO applications prior to the publication of the DMRB LA111 Noise and Vibration (2020), which identifies lower (more onerous) values for the LOAEL and SOAEL than used in the ES. The ABC method states that "*A potential significant effect is indicated if the LAeq, T noise level arising from the site exceeds the threshold level for the category appropriate to the ambient noise level* ". The DMRB interprets this to mean that a construction noise equal to threshold value is the SOAEL, this is a robust expert interpretation which supersedes the interpretation made by the applicant. The applicant should justify why they have disregarded the DMRB's interpretation and how the ABC method could be interpreted to mean that effects are only significant if construction noise levels are 10 dB higher than the threshold value (the criteria applied in the ES). This is particularly important for the rural receptors represented by NM10, where measured daytime baseline noise levels are 25 dB below the threshold value and, whilst this is only temporary, such a large noise level change could significantly change the character of the area. The Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1) requires that the assessment includes "*a prediction of how the noise environment will change with the proposed development... in the shorter term, such as during the construction period* " and an assessment of the effect of the predicted changes. The construction noise assessment criteria in the DMRB uses the ambient sound level as the LOAEL, thereby ensuring that the potential change in noise level during the short term is considered when assessing the effect. The ES does not predict or assess the change from the baseline noise environment due to the proposed development construction and is therefore considered potentially non-compliant with the NPS.
	Construction noise assessment criteria require clarification.	The construction noise assessment accounts for temporary noise effects and applies appropriate criteria that have been tested and accepted at DCO examinations for numerous high-profile nationally significant infrastructure projects	See comments above. It is not the case that the construction noise assessment criteria have been tested through the examination process for each of the projects the applicant refers to, purely because the DCO application was granted. The level of testing applied to the assessment of an issue depends on the extent to which concerns are raised during the examination process. All DCO applications for highways schemes submitted since the publication of the DMRB in 2020 have used the more onerous construction noise assessment criteria in the DMRB. Other (i.e. non-highways) nationally significant infrastructure projects which used the threshold level as the onset of potentially significant effects (as per the 2020 DMRB) include: H2 Teesside, Cory Decarbonisation Project, Byers Gill Solar, Rampion 2 and Bramford to Twinstead (all submitted in 2024).
	Construction noise predictions have not considered potential worst-case and appear to disregard facade reflections.	This comment is addressed in detail in a Supplementary Technical Noise Note presented within Appendix A of this document and which has been submitted at Deadline 2	Accepted
	In determining whether construction noise effects are potentially significant, it would be helpful to provide information on the duration of potential impacts.	A detailed, day by day construction methodology is not currently available and would not be prepared until after the scheme was consented and a Principal Contractor appointed. The approach for identifying likely significant effects was considered conservative by identifying likely significant effects regardless of whether the duration of the activity may last for less than a period of 10 or more days of working in any 15 consecutive days or for a total number of days exceeding 40 in any 6 consecutive months.	Accepted that, disregarding our concerns on the noise assessment criteria, a worst-case assessment has been undertaken by adopting a worst-case location for the works and assuming impact durations would last longer than the stated timeframes. However, BS 5228-1 Section E.3.2 (the ABC Method) is clear that the acceptable exceedance of the threshold value reduces as the impact duration lengthens. The criterion used in the ES (that an exceedance of the threshold value of up to 10 dB is not significant) is considered only appropriate to very short duration impacts. The ES shows that there will be exceedances of the threshold level at many receptors, and at some of these, a very large change from the ambient noise level is predicted. Without any further information, such as the potential duration of any impact, it is considered that assessment of these impacts using the ABC Method in BS5228-1 would conclude a significant effect. Assumptions could have been made, based on the available construction programme, to estimate likely impact durations.
	The construction noise assessment identifies potentially significant effects but the required attenuation is not known; hence, it cannot be known whether the proposed mitigation measures are sufficient to mitigate the effects to a non-significant level.	This comment is addressed in detail in a Supplementary Technical Noise Note presented within Appendix A of this document and which has been submitted at Deadline 2.	The Noise Technical Note states that the performance of mitigation cannot be defined, and proposes that monitoring will be used to verify whether the mitigation is sufficient to avoid significant effects. It states that "*if noise monitoring identified that agreed noise thresholds were exceeded, additional mitigation measures would be explored and immediately implemented* ." According to the proposed mitigation hierarchy, screening would already have been erected around the works at which monitoring will be undertaken. The ES and supplementary technical note do not identify the further mitigation measures that would be implementable at such short notice (i.e. whilst the works are being undertaken) in the event that monitoring reveals an exceedance. Without an indication of what additional mitigation could be installed in this scenario, the proposed mitigation hierarchy does not demonstrate that significant effects will not occur. It is also of note that the adopted noise level thresholds for the onset of significant effects (the SOAEL) is approximately equivalent to the threshold at which properties would be eligible for noise insulation according to BS 5228-1. It is apparent that it would not be feasible to install noise insulation whilst the works are ongoing.
	The noise level parameter used in the operational noise assessment methodology section is inconsistent. Any changes to this parameter may require the assessment to be revised.	It is acknowledged that the paragraph 13.4.36 and 13.4.37 [APP-055] makes reference to the LAeq,T metric incorrectly and should reference the LAr,Tr metric. However, this was a typographical error only and the correct values were used in the assessment and as such there is no affect on the operational noise assessment	Accepted

	The assessment method for impacts on non-residential receptors requires revision to include criteria for omitted receptor types.	Whilst R46 is named as a caravan site, it is predominantly a mobile home site and all receptors within the study area are mobile homes. The other receptor queried is R29a, where night fishing takes place. There is no guidance on suitable construction noise levels for night fishing. As such, R29a was assessed as a residential receptor, which is considered to provide a conservative method of assessment as there is no evidence to suggest that night fishing activities are any more sensitive to noise that occupants of residential properties who may experience sleep disturbance due to noise. No likely significant effects at R29a were identified due to potential night-time works. As such, the assessment of non-residential receptors is considered robust.	Accepted
	Potential noise effects from the use of the Southern construction compound require assessment, along with whether the compounds will be used at night. Night-time noise from the	This comment is addressed in detail in a Supplementary Technical Noise Note presented within Appendix A of this document and which has been submitted at Deadline 2.	Accepted
	The assessment of maintenance venting impacts should be moved to the operational assessment section.	Acknowledged; however, this amendment would be cosmetic and would not affect the assessment or any conclusions on likely significant effects	Accepted
	The operational noise assessment methodology should be updated to describe the method and noise level parameters used for assessment of effects during maintenance.	Paragraph 13.7.47 of the ES Noise and Vibration Chapter [APP-055] states that biennial maintenance activities will be undertaken so noise does not exceed 10 dB above the background noise level. This commitment is secured in Appendix 3-6: Operational Phase Mitigation [APP-073].	Accepted
	Further details are needed on the monitoring and calculation procedures, along with any required mitigation, to ensure that residual effects from maintenance venting noise will be not significant.	Paragraph 13.7.47 ES Noise and Vibration Chapter [APP-055] states that biennial maintenance activities will be undertaken so noise does not exceed 10 dB above the background noise level. This commitment is secured in Appendix 3-6: Operational Phase Mitigation [APP-073].	Accepted
	The discrepancy between Appendix 15.3 and the Chapter in terms of the additional construction traffic to be introduced requires rectification.	Construction traffic movements were calculated over a 10-hour working day from 08:00 to 18:00 so equate to an average of 6 HGV movements per hour.	Accepted
	Further quantitative evidence is required to assess the effects of construction road traffic noise on roads with low traffic flows.	The assessment of construction traffic was undertaken based on calculation methods set out in the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise, which is an industry standard method. As discussed in paragraph 13.7.84 [APP-055], this method is unreliable for low-traffic flows so a quantitative assessment is not possible and a qualitative assessment is considered appropriate. In the case in question, an average of six temporary HGV movements per hour is not considered sufficient to warrant a significant effect.	Accepted
	It is not clear which of the construction works will be included in a section 61 consent application.	The requirement for a Section 61 application for specific works will be determined once a detailed construction methodology has been prepared. It should be noted that a Section 61 cannot be relied upon as mitigation and specific mitigation measures to avoid likely significant effects are secured through the DCO. However, it allows measures such as noise monitoring and a communication strategy to be agreed with the local authority.	It is not apparent what criteria will be used to determine which works will require a section 61 consent application. Whilst it is appreciated that the actual works cannot be identified prior to the final construction methodology, it should be feasible to define the criteria that will be applied in this process.
	The distance to the night-time SOAEL from HDD works is inconsistent between the assessment and mitigation sections.	This typo has been updated in the Draft Construction Environmental Management Plan Revision B which has been submitted at Deadline 2.	Accepted
	The discussion of screening in the residual effects contradicts that proposed in the mitigation section.	The Draft Construction Environmental Management Plan (Revision B) has been updated to add as additional measure to secure barriers where any exceedances of the construction noise SOAEL are predicted. This updated version has been submitted at Deadline 2.	Accepted
	It is not agreed that all reasonable measures have been implemented to control construction noise impacts.	This comment is addressed in detail in a Supplementary Technical Noise Note presented within Appendix A of this document and which has been submitted at Deadline 2.	This relates to the comments on the performance of mitigation measures above, see comments regarding that section.
	The construction noise impact assessment methodology set out in the ES Chapter has not been used to analyse the significance of residual effects.	This comment is addressed in detail in a Supplementary Technical Noise Note presented within Appendix A of this document and which has been submitted at Deadline 2.	This relates to the comments on the performance of mitigation measures above, see comments regarding that section.
Chapter 15 Climate Change	Insufficient information on how the emissions were calculated to assess the robustness and accuracy of the assessment outputs.	The Applicant has provided details of the activity data and emission factors databases used in the calculations, which as laid out in paragraph 15.4.3 [APP-057] are the core components of a GHG calculation. Paragraph 15.4.4. [APP057] sets out the key emission factor databases used. The key assumptions and limitations used are set out from 15.4.25 to 15.4.27 [APP-057] giving sufficient detail of how the materials were assessed, what materials were included and excluded and how the various life cycle stages were accounted for.	The updated Chappter 15 Climate Change has been reviewed (APP-057). Whilst a description of the assumptions used is provided in paragraphs 15.4.25 to 15.4.27, no quantitative data are provided to determine whether the approach adopted is suitable or correct. Furthermore, it would be expected that further assumptions and details would be provided to determine the suitability of the assessment and support its conclusions. For example, bullet point 2 of paragraph 15.4.25 states "Estimated plant activity was provided by the project engineers and converted to carbon emissions using emission factors from DESNZ 2023 Emission Factors", yet no data of the type of plant, nor activity is provided to determine if this approach is reasonable. The carbon assessment acknowledges in paragraph 15.7.4 that the highest contribution of emissions is from "embodied carbon in construction materials, mainly the pipeline and pipeline components". The only information provided regarding the approach to calculating emissions from embodied carbon is provided in bullet 3 of paragraph 15.4.25, which advises that material quantities were derived from a bill of quantities, and emissions calculated using emission factors from the ICE and DESNZ databases. However, no details are provided on the type of materials used (e.g. specification of concrete etc), which would be expected for an assessment of this nature, particularly if this is the highest emission source for the Proposed Development.
	No information on why climate parameters have been scoped out, nor how these parameters were selected.	No major climate parameters were scoped out of the climate change or in-combination climate change impact (ICCI) assessments. The climate projections included were taken from UK projections as detailed in paragraphs 15.5.10 to 15.5.15 [APP-057]. Qualitative consideration was given to some impacts where projected data was not available, as detailed in table 15-15.	The updated Climate Change Chapter has been reviewed APP-057). The Applicant has not provided justification for how the climate change projection data (listed in Table 15-15) can lead to potential impacts on the Proposed Development. Therefore, the potential impacts listed in Table 15-30 are not fully supported, for examples potential impacts of drought conditions have not been considered in Section 15.7 of the assessment.
	CCR impact assessment, there is little data or evidence to support the determination of likelihood and consequences of impacts in Table 15-30, therefore the outcomes of the assessment are unsupported. Furthermore, there is no evidence to determine how the potential impacts on the Viking CCS pipeline in Table 15-30 and 15-31 have been identified.	The Applicant has set out the projected data used to inform the conclusion in table 15-15 [APP-057], whilst listing the methodology for assigning likelihood and significance in tables 15-8 and 15-9 [APP-057]. These present sufficient information to ground the assessment.As a general note, an updated version of the ES Climate Change Chapter (Revision A) has been submitted at Deadline 2	The updated Climate Change Chapter has been reviewed (APP-057). It is acknowledged that the climate change projection data is provided in Table 15-15, and that the methodology for assigning likelihood and significance is provided in tables 15-8 and 15-9. However, there is no evidence to support the assignment of likelihood or consequence metrics for each potential climate change or impact in Table 15-30. For example, the likelihood of "Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events" is classified as "Possible, about as likely as not", and the measure of consequence is determined to be "Medium". There is no justification or narrative for how the assessment has arrived at these conclusions, for example why would the consequence of the impact not be 'Very high' instead of 'Medium' if there is an increase in the frequency and severity of extreme weather events.
Chapter 16 Socio-Economics	Justification for two or more significant effects required for the assessment of amenity effects;	Amenity describes the benefits of enjoyment and wellbeing that receptors gain from a resource in line with its intended function. The assessment of amenity effects within the socio-economics chapter [APP 058] is concerned with the way receptors may be affected by a combination of factors, such as: noise and vibration, air quality, transport and access, and landscape and visual impacts. The potential significant effects resulting solely from one these environmental effects are assessed within the respective topic assessments. For the purposes of the socio-economics assessment, socio-economic effects on amenity are considered to arise from in-combination, or synergistic, impacts resulting from two or more significant residual environmental effects. This is based on the understanding from a socio-economic perspective that the benefits of enjoyment and wellbeing are likely to be significantly affected when compounding significant environmental effects arise at the same time. This approach to assessing amenity effects has previously been applied for a number of DCO applications including Thames Tideway Tunnel and Longfield Solar Farm, as well as for the impact assessment undertaken for the HS2 hybrid bill. In each of these instances, the method was found to be sound. The Applicant therefore considers this approach to be justifiable to assess socio-economic amenity effects for the purpose of this DCO.	The description is helpful and we are happy with the methodology set out. No further queries in realtion to this aspect.
	Justification for scoping out of impact of transient workforce on services such as accommodation; and	As noted in the Applicants response to Written Representation, the size of the expected workforce is considered unlikely to generate significant impacts with respect to temporary accommodation. On this basis, an assessment of the influx on workers on temporary accommodation has been scoped out of the assessment.	Noted and accepted that the impacts are unlikely to be significant given the workforce numbers stated in ES Chapter 16 Socio Economics (APP-058).
	List of LSOA's used to define Local Economic Study Area	The Local Economic Study Area has been defined using LSOAs contained within a 60-minute drive time area. A list of LSOAs has been provided within Appendix B of this document.	Noted and the Local Economic Study Area is accepted based on this definition and information.
	Clarification should be sought on the venting composition and commentary made regarding human health.	As part of the detailed design process for the vent stack, the Applicant will undertake additional atmospheric modelling based on a range of atmospheric criteria and the proposed detailed design of the Proposed Development as a whole. Through compliance with relevant legislation, associated guidance and operational mitigation measures, any potential adverse effects on human (health) and ecological receptors would be avoided.	We appreciate the Applicant's response and note that Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion accepts the scoping out of operational effects to air quality (noting that a periodic review is undertaken as further information becomes available). Furthermore, Para 14.3.9 of ES Chapter 14 (Air Quality) (APP-056) states that the vents, "only comprise of CO2 emissions which will not directly impact human health". Given the above and the Applicants response received at Deadline 2 we are satisfied that no significant impacts to human health from the venting system are likely. However, we wish to know if the proposed atmospheric modelling following detailed design will be made available for review and acceptance by the Authority to ensure this is confirmed before operations of the venting system.

Chapter 17 Health and Wellbeing	ELDC should satisfy themselves that the statement regarding the large number of GP services in the area is correct and the demand placed on them by the resident population is sufficiently low to allow for additional workforce impacts to be non-significant.	The Applicant notes the comment made. To support ELDC in their consideration, reiteration of the key points of the assessment set within the context of the comment is provided here. As outlined in Section 17.5 of ES Volume II - Chapter 17: Health and Wellbeing [APP-059], there are 16 GP surgeries located within the Study Area. Of these GP surgeries, four are located within East Lindsey District Council. It is inherently difficult to apportion potential demand for GP services arising from construction workers to individual local authority areas across the route as construction activity will not be evenly spread over time, and workers will move locations fluidly. As stated in ES Volume II - Chapter 3: Description of the Proposed Development [APP-045], the peak construction workforce is anticipated to be approximately 720 construction workers. The assessment within ES Volume II - Chapter 16: Socio-economics [APP-058] notes that of the 720 peak construction workers, a proportion will already live locally (approximated at 30% of the workforce within the socio□economic assessment), and therefore will already be registered at a local practice, and would not place additional demand on GP services. Potential demand arising in East Lindsey from these construction workers would be limited to those either residing in the district, or those working in the area and requiring emergency treatment, and therefore only represent a portion of the demand arising from this peak number of construction workers. Furthermore, as stated in Paragraph 16.7.5 of ES Volume II - Chapter 16: Socio-economics [APP-058], the average number of workers on-site across the construction period will be 197 workers; a much lower number than in the peak period of construction. Therefore, any demand arising for GP services from workers overall in the Study Area will typically in all likelihood be much less in number than that during the peak period of construction. Demand arising at ELDC level would be lower still than this given the distribution of construction activities.In summary, a combination of factors reduce the potential for effects on GP services in the area of East Lindsey. Firstly, there are a large number of GP practices within the Study Area relative to both the peak and average number of construction workers. The health and wellbeing assessment in ES Volume II - Chapter 17: Health and Wellbeing [APP□059] has been assessed from a worst-case scenario, such that the peak construction workforce will be limited in duration and the average number of construction workers will generally be much lower throughout the construction phase. In addition, any demand arising for services in ELDC would be lower than the average number of construction workers, given that not all construction workers will reside within East Lindsey and require access to services as residents. Finally, construction activity will	The information provided is clear and helpful. Noting that the population estimate for East Lindsay in 2021 (Office for National Statistics) is approximately 143,000 the overall additional number of the construction workforce utilising health services is considered acceptable.
Chapter 18 Materials and Waste	Clarification on how material sensitivity has been defined.	As outlined in paragraph 18.7.4 of ES Volume II - Chapter 18: Materials and Waste [APP-060]. Material receptor sensitivity is determined as 'medium'. On balance, it was established that "the key materials required for the construction of the Proposed Development are forecast (through trend analysis and other information) to suffer from some potential issues regarding supply and stock. This sensitivity is based on professional judgement and acknowledgement that there have been some construction material supply issues during 2020-2023."	Accepted
	Additional details on the estimated volumes of waste as a result of construction activities as well as the split of waste types into inert, non-hazardous or hazardous, how specific materials will be recycled and diverted from landfill.	The material and waste assessment was undertaken on the basis of information available at the time of the assessment and was sufficiently detailed enough to undertake the Environmental Impact Assessment and to assess the significance of impacts. Additional details on the estimated volumes of waste as a result of construction activities as well as the split of waste types into inert, non-hazardous or hazardous, how specific materials will be recycled and diverted from landfill will be provided in the contractor's Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) as part of their Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Table 5 of the Outline SWMP (ES Volume IV – Appendix 18-1: Outline Site Waste Management Plan, [APP-113]) sets out how the waste hierarchy will be applied to construction wastes, and Table 2 indicates the potential recovery rates for key waste types. The mitigation presented in the Draft CEMP [REP1-013] is secured through a requirement within the DCO, which requires a CEMP to be submitted for approval by the planning authority prior to commencement of development. As the SWMP forms part of that, the mitigation measures including waste recovery targets within that are also secured	Accepted, noting that the Outline SWMP that will form part of the CEMP will be updated to include revised waste estimates for specific wastes types (aligned to EWC codes) and will be classified as inert, non-hazardous and hazardous and specific routes will be identified to confirm recovery targets are met as part of the mitigation measure commitments. The updated SWMP will be approved by the relevant planning authority.