

H2Teesside Project

Environmental Statement

Volume III – Appendices

Appendix 7A: Marine Plan Policy Assessment [

Document Reference: 6.4.6

The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 - Regulation 5(2)(a)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

7A.0	APPENDIX 7A: MARINE PLAN POLICY ASSESSMENT.....	3
7A.1	Introduction	3
7A.2	References.....	34

TABLES

Table 7A-1:	Marine Plan Policy Assessment	4
-------------	-------------------------------------	---

7A.0 APPENDIX 7A: MARINE PLAN POLICY ASSESSMENT

7A.1 Introduction

7A.1.1 As part of a Development Consent Order (DCO) application, it is a requirement of Section 104 of The Planning Act 2008 to have regard for the appropriate marine documents that are determined in accordance with Section 59 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA, 2009). This includes the UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS) (HM Government, 2011), which provides the policy framework for the marine planning system. It provides the context for Marine Plans. Marine Plans, where they exist, put into practice the objectives for the marine environment that are identified in the MPS alongside the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (HM Government, 2012) and the Localism Act 2011 (HM Government, 2011). Therefore, a marine plan policy assessment has been undertaken to determine the potential effects of the Proposed Development on policies included in the North-East Inshore Marine Plan (HM Government, 2021). The assessment is presented below in Table 7A-1.

Table 7A-1: Marine Plan Policy Assessment

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
NE-ACC-1	<p>"Proposals demonstrating appropriate enhanced and inclusive public access to and within the marine area, including the provision of services for tourism and recreation activities, will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on public access should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate <p>- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant"</p>	<p>"NE-ACC-1 supports proposals for appropriate enhanced and inclusive public access to, and within, the marine area, including those providing services for tourism and recreation activities. NE-ACC-1 also provides clarity on how public access should be protected, and ensures that proposals do not have a significant adverse impact on existing public access. Where proposals cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate significant adverse impacts to public access, they should not be supported.</p> <p>While NE-ACC-1 supports and protects public access to the marine area, in some circumstances, access restrictions may be required. Where they are incompatible with existing or proposed access restrictions, proposals for the provision of new public access should not be supported."</p>	OUT	The Proposed Development Activities will not relate to or impact public access.	Not significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-AGG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for extraction of aggregates has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the proposal is compatible with aggregate extraction.	NE-AGG-1 safeguards marine aggregate licence areas from other activities, unless it is demonstrated that the other activities are compatible with marine aggregate extraction. This enables continuity of supply of construction aggregate and supports local and national objectives and economies.	OUT	The Proposed Development Activities are not occurring in an area with a marine aggregate extraction license.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-AGG-2	Proposals within an area subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate should not be supported unless it is demonstrated that the proposal is compatible with aggregate extraction.	NE-AGG-2 safeguards marine aggregate Exploration and Option Agreement areas to enable the aggregate industry to explore defined areas to identify commercially viable aggregate resource. Proposals will only be supported if they are compatible with marine aggregate extraction. This enables future supply of	OUT	The Proposed Development Activities are not occurring within a marine aggregate Exploration and Option Agreement area.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
		construction aggregate and supports local and national objectives and economies.						
NE-AGG-3	Proposals in areas of high potential aggregate resource that may have significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - significant adverse impacts on future aggregate extraction so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding	NE-AGG-3 ensures that proposals consider areas of high potential aggregate resource, as defined by the British Geological Survey. It ensures that any impacts on access to commercially viable marine sand and gravel resources in the future are managed, enabling secure access to sufficient supply of aggregate resources.	OUT	The Proposed Development Activities are not occurring within an area of high potential aggregate resource.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-AIR-1	Proposals must assess their direct and indirect impacts upon local air quality and emissions of greenhouse gases. Proposals that are likely to result in increased air pollution or increased emissions of greenhouse gases must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - air pollution and/or greenhouse gas emissions in line with current national and local air quality objectives and legal requirements.	NE-AIR-1 ensures that proposals consider and address where they may cause direct or indirect air pollution or greenhouse gas emissions and manage these accordingly. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate air pollution and or greenhouse gas emissions in line with current national or local air quality objectives and legal requirements must not be supported.	OUT	The effects of the Proposed Development on air quality have been assessed in Chapter 8: Air Quality (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2) and indirect effects on the marine environment have been assessed in Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2). The Proposed Development Activities are expected to have no significant effects (direct or indirect) on the marine environment through changes to local air quality or greenhouse gas emissions.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
				<p>The GHG Impact Assessment has been included within Chapter 19: Climate Change (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2). No residual significant effects for the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Proposed Development are anticipated following GHG Impact Assessment, CCRA and ICCI and are therefore in line with current national and local air quality objectives and legal requirements.</p>				
NE-AQ-1	<p>Proposals within existing or potential strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate consideration of and compatibility with sustainable aquaculture production. Where compatibility is not possible, proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate <p>- adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture production so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>NE-AQ-1 seeks to protect both existing aquaculture operations as well as potential future opportunities for aquaculture, within spatially defined strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production. NE-AQ-1 does not prevent non-aquaculture developments or activities; it supports sustainable aquaculture production by spatially defining areas where all proposals are required to demonstrate consideration of and compatibility with sustainable aquaculture. If this cannot be achieved, the policy stipulates proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on sustainable aquaculture should follow the steps in the mitigation hierarchy before being allowed to proceed. It is recommended that you read the full policy aim/rationale for more detail.</p>	OUT	<p>The Proposed Development Activities are not occurring within existing or potential strategic areas of sustainable aquaculture production.</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
NE-AQ-2	Proposals enabling the provision of infrastructure for sustainable aquaculture and related industries will be supported.	NE-AQ-2 aims to tackle barriers to aquaculture by encouraging the provision, maintenance and development of marine and land infrastructure to support sustainable aquaculture and related industries. This policy supports sustainable aquaculture projects by encouraging the direct development of infrastructure, as well as supporting connectivity between marine operations and land infrastructure, which will ensure that opportunities for aquaculture are realised. Due to the overlap between some shoreside aquaculture and fisheries infrastructure, NE-AQ-2 supports the integration of aquaculture with the fishing industry through the sharing of infrastructure and the diversification of fishers. This policy will also benefit employment and the development of skills in coastal communities.	OUT	The Proposed Development Activities are not related to aquaculture provision, or located within an area of aquaculture production.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-BIO-1	Proposals that enhance the distribution of priority habitats and priority species will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on the distribution of priority habitats and priority species must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated	NE-BIO-1 encourages and supports proposals that enhance the distribution of priority habitats and priority species. NE-BIO-1 seeks to maintain the distribution of priority habitats and priority species by requiring proposals manage significant adverse impacts. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate, or as a last resort compensate, for significant adverse impacts, will not be supported.	IN	The Proposed Development is located within close proximity to several priority marine habitats, including Annex I priority habitat 'Mudflats and Sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide', and priority marine species including herring (<i>Clupea harengus</i>). Detailed impact assessments conducted in Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2) have	Not Significant	Negligible disturbance to priority species	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
				identified No Significant Adverse impacts on priority habitats and species.				
NE-BIO-2	<p>Proposals that enhance or facilitate native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, will be supported. Proposals that may cause significant adverse impacts on native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity, or native species migration, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate <p>- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated 	<p>NE-BIO-2 supports and encourages proposals that enhance or facilitate native species or habitat adaptation or connectivity or native species migration. NE-BIO-2 requires proposals to manage negative effects which may significantly adversely impact the functioning of healthy, resilient and adaptable marine ecosystems. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate, or as a last resort compensate, for significant adverse impacts, will not be supported.</p>	IN	<p>The Proposed Development intersects a limited number of minor tributaries (ditches) that drain into the River Tees. The River Tees is an important migratory route for several fish species including salmon (<i>Salmo salar</i>) and brown trout (<i>Salmo trutta</i>). However, due to the nature of the Proposed Development and only short-term temporary works occurring within a number of minor tributaries that are not anticipated to represent migratory routes, no significant adverse effects are expected.</p>	Not Significant	Negligible disturbance to migratory species	N/A	Not Significant
NE-BIO-3	<p>Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of ecosystem services, will be supported. Proposals must take account of the space required for coastal habitats, where important in their own right and/or for ecosystem functioning and provision of ecosystem services, and demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid 	<p>This policy applies to applies to intertidal habitats down to mean low water in the inshore marine plan area only.</p> <p>NE-BIO-3 encourages and supports proposals that deliver biodiversity gain by conserving, enhancing or restoring coastal habitats. NE-BIO-3 also requires proposals to manage net habitat loss as a result of coastal squeeze, to support the functioning of healthy and resilient coastal and intertidal ecosystems.</p>	OUT	<p>There is expected to be no habitat loss in intertidal habitats down to mean low water during the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Construction of the hydrogen pipeline across the River Tees and Greatham Creek will use trenchless technologies.</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	b) minimise c) mitigate d) compensate for - net habitat loss	Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate, or as a last resort compensate, for net habitat loss, will not be supported.						
NE-CAB-1	Preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of protection is burial. Where burial is not achievable, decisions should take account of protection measures for the cable that may be proposed by the applicant. Where burial or protection measures are not appropriate, proposals should state the case for proceeding without those measures.	Subsea cabling is important to the growth and sustainability of telecommunications, offshore wind farms and electricity transmission. NE-CAB-1 supports and encourages cable burial where possible, to meet the needs of the sector while enabling co-existence with other users of the North-east marine plan areas.	OUT	The Proposed Development activities do not include the installation of subsea cables.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-CAB-2	Proposals demonstrating compatibility with Cables existing landfall sites and incorporating measures to enable development of future landfall opportunities should be supported. Where this is not possible proposals will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts on existing and potential future landfall sites so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	Subsea cabling is important to the growth and sustainability of telecommunications, offshore wind farms and electricity transmission. Existing and potential future landfall sites for subsea cables are not currently protected from other proposals and uses, which may prevent these sites from being used as cable landfall locations. NE-CAB-2 seeks to avoid the loss of existing and potential future landfall sites, and supports all proposals that consider the requirement for future cable landfall opportunities, ensuring that socially and economically vital cable activities can continue.	OUT	The Proposed Development activities do not include the installation of subsea cables.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-CAB-3	Where seeking to locate close to existing subsea cables, proposals should demonstrate compatibility with ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning activities relating to the cable.	NE-CAB-3 protects the ongoing function, maintenance and decommissioning of subsea cables, up to the point of landfall.	OUT	The Proposed Development does not include subsea cabling, and is not expected to interfere with existing subsea cables in the local area.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
NE-CBC-1	Proposals must consider cross-border impacts throughout the lifetime of the proposed activity. Proposals that impact upon one or more marine plan areas or terrestrial environments must show evidence of the relevant public authorities (including other countries) being consulted and responses considered.	NE-CBC-1 requires a considered approach to enhance cross-border co-operation between the terrestrial and marine planning systems in the North-east marine plan areas, the bordering English east marine plan areas and the jurisdiction of Scotland, Norway, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands.	IN	Consultation has been undertaken with Natural England, the Marine Management Organisation, the Environment Agency, and other national and local organisations, with responses considered and incorporated into the Environmental Statement where applicable.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-CC-1	Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration will be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on habitats that provide a flood defence or carbon sequestration ecosystem service must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant d) compensate for significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated.	Proposals that conserve, restore or enhance habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration will be supported. Habitats that provide flood defence and carbon sequestration contribute to natural resilience for coastal communities that are vulnerable to coastal erosion and change. NE-CC-1 requires proposals to manage impacts, enabling these important habitats to continue to provide this valuable service. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate or, as a last resort, compensate for significant adverse impacts, will not be supported.	IN	There will be no direct loss of habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration, including saltmarsh, sand dunes and mudflats (see Chapter 12: Ecology and Nature Conservation (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2)). It is anticipated that such habitats may be exposed to indirect effects from the Proposed Development construction activities. However, all indirect effects will be mitigated through the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and therefore any significant adverse impacts will be avoided.	Not Significant	Negligible impacts to habitats that provide flood defence or carbon sequestration.	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
NE-CC-2	Proposals in the North-east marine plan areas should demonstrate for the lifetime of the project that they are resilient to the impacts of climate change and coastal change.	The effects of climate change are wide-ranging and can include sea level rise, coastal flooding and rising sea temperatures. NE-CC-2 adds provision to enable enhanced resilience of developments, activities and ecosystems within the North-east marine plan areas to the effects of climate change and coastal change.	IN	A summary of the findings of the CCRA for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development can be found in Appendix 19A: Climate Change Resilience Assessment (ES Volume III, EN070009/APP/6.4). The assessment found that, with mitigation measures in place, there are no significant risks to resilience to climate change.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-CC-3	Proposals in the North-east marine plan areas, and adjacent marine plan areas, that are likely to have significant adverse impacts on coastal change, or on climate change adaptation measures inside and outside of the proposed project areas, should only be supported if they can demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	NE-CC-3 ensures proposals do not exacerbate coastal change, enabling communities to be more resilient and better able to adapt to coastal erosion and flood risk where identified. NE-CC-3 also supports proposals that do not compromise existing adaptation measures, which will enable an improvement in the resilience of coastal communities to coastal erosion and flood risk. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate significant adverse impacts will not be supported.	IN	The assessment in Chapter 9: Climate Change (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2) found that, with mitigation measures in place, there are no significant risks to resilience to climate change. In addition, the Proposed Development is anticipated to have no significant adverse impacts on coastal change, or on climate change adaptation measures in the local area.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-CCUS-1	Decommissioning programmes for oil and gas facilities should demonstrate that they have considered the potential for re-use of infrastructure.	The re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure may bring cost savings for carbon capture, usage and storage projects. Re-using oil and gas infrastructure for carbon capture, usage and storage may also potentially benefit	IN	To the extent that it may be classed as an oil and gas facility, the current design life of the Proposed Development is 25 years. However, the	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
		<p>existing owners and operators of these oil and gas assets through maximising the economic life of their asset, as well as offering wider benefits supporting decarbonisation of the UK economy. This policy encourages the consideration of infrastructure re-use by oil and gas operators prior to decommissioning. The policy notes that re-use of infrastructure may not be a viable or realistic option, the aim is for the potential to be considered.</p>		<p>operational lifetime could exceed 25 years. Therefore, the plan for decommissioning of the Proposed Development has not yet been finalised, however, the Applicant will assess at that time whether any infrastructure can be retained for future use. The Proposed Scheme does not involve the re-use of oil and gas infrastructure.</p>				
NE-CCUS-2	<p>Carbon capture, usage and storage proposals incorporating the re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure will be supported.</p>	<p>The re-use of oil and gas infrastructure can be economically beneficial for both oil and gas, and carbon capture, usage and storage operators, as well as offering wider economic and environmental benefits. This policy encourages re-use by supporting new carbon capture, usage and storage proposals that utilise still viable oil and gas infrastructure. This policy does not mean proposals that do not incorporate the re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure will be disadvantaged or rejected in the proposal process. Although the re-use of infrastructure can be beneficial, there are many complicated considerations to have regard to, and the suitability of each piece of infrastructure for re-use must be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	IN	<p>The Proposed Development activities includes a carbon dioxide (CO₂) compression facility which will connect to the Northern Endurance Partnership (NEP) CO₂ gathering pipeline network. NEP is an existing project, and although the Proposed Development does not 're-use' existing infrastructure, it will make use of the new infrastructure put in place for NEP.</p>	Not Significant	Beneficial use of other infrastructure to reduce disturbance to the local environment.	N/A	Not Significant
NE-CCUS-3	<p>Proposals associated with the deployment of low carbon infrastructure for industrial clusters should be supported.</p>	<p>The government identified potential regional clusters which can be utilised for low carbon development in the Delivering clean growth: CCUS Cost</p>	IN	<p>The Proposed Development is associated with the deployment of low</p>	Not Significant (beneficial)	Supports the deployment of low carbon infrastructure	N/A	Not Significant (beneficial)

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
		<p>Challenge Taskforce report and the subsequent plan, The UK carbon capture, usage and storage (CCS) deployment pathway: an action plan. NE-CCUS-3 supports the development of low carbon industrial clusters where low carbon infrastructure, including carbon capture, usage and storage technologies could be deployed. Encouraging developments associated with industrial clusters aims to reduce the capital costs of deploying carbon capture, usage and storage, maximising the economies of scale.</p>		<p>carbon infrastructure. The proposed capture technology in the Hydrogen Production facility uses an amine-based solvent to absorb CO₂ produced by the H₂ production process, with an anticipated design carbon capture rate of 95% (see Chapter 1: Introduction). The captured carbon will then be stored using the NEP infrastructure, which is part of the East Coast Cluster.</p>				
NE-CE-1	<p>Proposals which may have adverse cumulative effects with other existing, authorised, or reasonably foreseeable proposals must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse cumulative and/or in-combination effects so they are no longer significant. 	<p>While cumulative effects are considered in relevant assessments and decision-making, the increasing use of the marine area reinforces the need to consider and address cumulative effects, of both terrestrial and maritime projects, in line with the aims set out in the UK Marine Policy Statement (Defra, 2020). In conjunction with and in support of other relevant North-east marine plan policies, this policy is intended to ensure relevant effects, including those that may seem less significant in their own right, are taken account of and addressed. In doing so, the policy will help to ensure that the cumulative effect on the wider environment of the North-east marine areas and other relevant receptors are effectively managed.</p>	IN	<p>A full assessment of cumulative effects between the Proposed Development and other developments (see Chapter 23: Cumulative and Combined Effects (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2)) has determined no significant cumulative effects on marine or terrestrial environments within the marine plan area.</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-CO-1	<p>Proposals that optimise the use of space and incorporate opportunities</p>	<p>The North-east marine plan areas, and in particular the inshore area, are likely</p>	IN	<p>The locations of facilities and infrastructure of the</p>	Not Significant (beneficial)	N/A	N/A	Not Significant (beneficial)

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	<p>for co-existence and co-operation with existing activities will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on, or displace, existing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate <p>- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>to be busier in the future, and use of the space may become limited. To realise sustainable social, environmental and economic benefits it is therefore important to plan for and make efficient use of the space. NE-CO-1 encourages proposals to be spatially planned, take account of existing activities, and promote co-existence. The policy ensures that new proposals seek to avoid creating conflicts and to minimise their footprint, or to optimise it where it may not be feasible to minimise.</p>		<p>Proposed Development have been carefully planned around existing infrastructure to ensure successful co-existence during the construction and operational phases. In some instances, there is potential for the Proposed Development to utilise existing infrastructure, such as the use of the NZT outfall, and connection into the NEP CO₂ Export Corridor.</p>				
NE-DD-1	<p>In areas of authorised dredging activity, including those that are subject to navigational dredging, proposals for other activities will not be supported unless they are compatible with the dredging activity.</p>	<p>Dredge areas, and the area surrounding these that are required for dredge activity to take place, may be adversely impacted by new proposals such as those that negatively impact the ability to access or egress from these sites. NE-DD-1 ensures continued safe access by vessels to ports and harbours over the lifetime of the North-East Marine Plan. This policy discourages proposals that would cause significant adverse impacts on dredge activities, such as the need for related vessels to navigate to and from authorised dredge areas.</p>	IN	<p>The Proposed Development is located within a navigational dredging area. However, Proposed Development activities are not expected to interfere with dredging activity given that they will pass under relevant watercourses.</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-DD-2	<p>Proposals that cause significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites should not be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on licensed disposal sites must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise 	<p>Disposal sites, and the surrounding areas that are required for the disposal activity to take place, may be adversely impacted by new proposals that negatively impact the ability to access or egress from these sites. NE-DD-2 ensures that disposal sites are not compromised, reducing the need to designate new disposal sites that are not intended for alternative use, and so</p>	OUT	<p>The Proposed Development is not located within a licensed disposal site.</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	<p>c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate the significant adverse impacts, proposals must state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>reducing environmental impacts. This policy discourages proposals that would cause significant adverse impacts on disposal activities, such as the need for vessels to navigate safely to and from disposal sites. Preserving licensed disposal sites, including where sites are being used for alternative use, will enable and facilitate the growth of ports and harbours within the North-east inshore marine plan area. Over the 20-year life span of the Plan this may become more prevalent in the developing economic climate.</p>						
NE-DD-3	<p>Proposals for the disposal of dredged material must demonstrate that they have been assessed against the waste hierarchy. Where there is the need to identify new dredge disposal sites, including for alternative use sites, proposals should be supported if they conform to best practice and guidance.</p>	<p>This policy ensures that proposals have considered all steps within the waste hierarchy prior to the disposal of dredge material as a last resort. The establishment of new disposal sites which are for alternative use should be supported. The establishment of new dredge disposal sites as a last resort in the waste hierarchy should only be explored after previous levels within the waste hierarchy have been considered, and the potential to utilise open, disused or closed sites has been fully investigated and discounted. In some cases, designated disposals sites cannot be used, for example where sediment size does not match or there are particular constraints. NE-DD-3 then provides a source of best practice and guidance for the designation of new dredge disposal sites. This is required as the demand increases for new disposal sites, and encourages early consideration of</p>	OUT	Dredging is not planned as part of the Proposed Development activities.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
		impacts to avoid conflicts during the proposal process.						
NE-DEF-1	Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence areas should only be authorised with agreement from the Ministry of Defence.	There are a high number of defence activities and estates in the North-east marine plan areas. Marine infrastructure can affect their continuity or future use. NE-DEF-1 aims to avoid conflict between defence activities and new proposals within the North-east marine plan areas. This policy will ensure defence interests are not hindered.	OUT	The Proposed Development is not located within, or expected to affect, Ministry of Defence areas.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-DIST-1	Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on highly mobile species through disturbance or displacement must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.	NE-DIST-1 reduces the effects of disturbance and displacement by requiring proposals to manage impacts, highlighting good practice and encouraging strategic management of unauthorised activities. NE-DIST-1 enables people to appreciate marine biodiversity and act responsibly to protect and recover populations of rare, vulnerable and valued species. Proposals that cannot, avoid, minimise and mitigate for significant adverse impacts will not be supported.	IN	There is potential for the Proposed Development to disturb fish, marine mammals (particularly seals) and birds. However, several mitigation measures will be in place to reduce the effects of disturbance to such species. Taking mitigation measures into consideration, Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2) has determined no residual significant effects to fish and marine mammals. Furthermore, Chapter 13: Ornithology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2) has reported no significant effects on any of the marine ornithological receptors.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
NE-EMP-1	Proposals that result in a net increase in marine related employment will be supported, particularly where they meet one or more of the following: 1) are aligned with local skills strategies and support the skills available 2) create a diversity of opportunities 3) create employment in locations identified as the most deprived 4) implement new technologies - in, and adjacent to, the North-east marine plan areas.	NE-EMP-1 supports existing national policies and strategies (eg the UK Marine Policy Statement (Defra, 2020) and the UK's Industrial Strategy: building a Britain fit for the future) by encouraging decision-makers and proponents to deliver additional employment benefits from proposals, particularly those benefits associated with the listed policy criteria. NE-EMP-1 seeks to maximise sustainable economic activity, prosperity and opportunities for all, both now and into the future	IN	The Proposed Development is anticipated to have a beneficial significant effect on employment during the construction phase. Employment is also expected to increase during the operational phase.	Significant (beneficial)	Positive impact towards local employment	N/A	Significant (beneficial)
NE-FISH-1	Proposals that support a sustainable fishing industry, including the industry's diversification, should be supported.	Commercial fisheries can be affected by changes to fish abundance, growth, distribution or behaviour. NE-FISH-1 supports long-term strategic proposals that enable the fishing industry to diversify or build in resilience to manage climate change risks and maximise opportunities for sustainable use of marine resources.	OUT	The Proposed Development activities are not related to commercial fishing / the fishing industry.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-FISH-2	Proposals that enhance access for fishing activities should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on access for fishing activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.	NE-FISH-2 supports enhanced access for sustainable fishing activities and seeks to limit significant adverse impacts from other marine activities on access for fishing activities, enabling continued sustainable marine resource use and generating prosperous, resilient and cohesive coastal communities. This policy covers not only fishing activity, but also the transit routes to and from sites and any berthing/beaching or landing/loading points.	OUT	The Proposed Development activities are not expected to enhance or impact fishing activities.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-FISH-3	Proposals that enhance essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery	NE-FISH-3 recognises that the protection of habitats and the services	IN	The Proposed Development activities	Not Significant	Negligible disturbance to	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	<p>and feeding grounds, and migratory routes, should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on essential fish habitat, including spawning, nursery and feeding grounds, and migratory routes, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>they provide can enhance fish populations, supporting the long-term existence of the fisheries and contributing to Good Environmental Status as detailed in the Marine Strategy Part One: UK updated assessment and Good Environmental Status. NE-FISH-3 encourages and supports proposals that deliver biodiversity gain for essential fish habitats. NE-FISH-3 enables sustainable use of marine resources within environmental limits, alongside productive fisheries, by requiring proposals to avoid impacts on essential fish habitats or, if avoidance of impacts is not possible, to manage impacts on essential fish habitats.</p>		<p>will occur within minor tributaries (ditches) that drain into the River Tees in a limited number of locations. However, an assessment of effects in Chapter 19: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2) on fish determined that no significant effects are expected.</p>		<p>fish species and habitat.</p>		
NE-HER-1	<p>Proposals that demonstrate they will conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets will be supported. Where proposals may cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, proponents must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - any harm to the significance of heritage assets. If it is not possible to mitigate, then public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh the harm to the significance of heritage assets.</p>	<p>The aim of this policy is to conserve and enhance marine and coastal heritage assets through considering the potential for harm to their significance. This consideration will not be limited to designated assets and extends to those non-designated assets that are, or have the potential to become, significant. The policy will ensure that assets are considered in the decision-making process and will make provisions for those assets that are discovered during the course of developments.</p>	IN	<p>As stated in Chapter 17: Cultural Heritage (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2), no marine assets are situated within the Proposed Development Site and the Proposed Development Site does not contribute to the significance of any marine or underwater assets situated in the River Tees. The pipeline crossing the River Tees will be drilled below the river and above ground installations on the shores will not alter the setting of any assets. As such, the Proposed Development will not result in any impacts to marine or</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
				underwater assets through changes to setting.				
NE-INF-1	Proposals for appropriate marine infrastructure which facilitates land-based activities, or landbased infrastructure which facilitates marine activities (including the diversification or regeneration of sustainable marine industries), should be supported.	Supporting infrastructure development, diversification and regeneration will provide socio-economic benefits and support marine business, including those that are land-based. NE-INF-1 supports the integration of the marine and terrestrial systems. It does so by encouraging proposals (and other measures) that maintain or improve existing, or provide new, sustainable marine or land-based infrastructure that facilitates activity in the other environment.	IN	The infrastructure to be developed as part of the Proposed Development is located within both marine and land-based environments. Furthermore, the Proposed Development land-based facilities will allow connection into the NEP CO ₂ gathering pipeline network, to allow exportation of CO ₂ to the offshore storage facility. Additionally, the transportation of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) during the construction of the Hydrogen Production Facility will be facilitated through local ports, including Redcar Bulk Terminal (RBT).	Significant (beneficial)	Beneficial impact	N/A	Significant (Beneficial)
NE-INF-2	(1) Proposals for alternative development at existing safeguarded landing facilities will not be supported. (2) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing safeguarded landing facilities must demonstrate that they avoid significant adverse impacts on existing safeguarded landing facilities. (3) Proposals for alternative development at existing landing facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) should not be supported unless that	Landing facilities in the North-east inshore marine plan area are critical for enabling industries including shipping, tourism, recreation and leisure, construction, aggregates and waste. By protecting existing landing facilities, identifying the difference in safeguarding, NE-INF-2 mirrors similar provisions in terrestrial planning and supports the continued operation of vital existing landing facilities.	OUT	The Proposed Development does not interfere with existing safeguarded landing facilities.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	<p>facility is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for waterborne transport.</p> <p>(4) Proposals adjacent and opposite existing landing facilities (excluding safeguarded sites) that may have significant adverse impacts on the landing facilities should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate</p> <p>- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant</p>							
NE-INNS-1	<p>Proposals that reduce the risk of introduction and/or spread of invasive non-native species should be supported. Proposals must put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse impacts that would arise through the introduction and transport of invasive non-native species, particularly when:</p> <p>1) moving equipment, boats or livestock (for example fish or shellfish) from one water body to another 2) introducing structures suitable for settlement of invasive non-native species, or the spread of invasive non-native species known to exist in the area.</p>	<p>NE-INNS-1 aims to avoid or minimise damage to the marine area from the introduction or transport of invasive non-native species. Proposals that do not put in place appropriate measures to avoid or minimise significant adverse impacts that would arise through the introduction and transport of invasive non-native species will not be supported.</p> <p>NE-INNS-1 also aims to support those projects that attempt to reduce the risk and/or introduction of invasive non-native species such as eradication projects.</p>	IN	<p>The use of vessels and transportation of materials during the construction phase of the Proposed Development have the potential to result in the introduction, transportation or spread of INNS. The effects of the introduction, transportation or spread of INNS have been assessed in Chapter 12: Ecology and Nature Conservation, and Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2). All vessels will be required to comply with International Maritime Organisation (IMO) (2011) Guidelines for the control and management of ships'</p>	Not Significant	Negligible effect on the introduction, transportation or spread of INNS	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
				<p>biofouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species (Biofouling Guidelines), and International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments with the aim of preventing the spread of marine INNS (IMO, 2017). Furthermore, an Invasive Plant Species Management Plan will also be developed as part of the Final Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) (CEMP). With these measures in place, the risk of INNS is considered negligible.</p>				
NE-INNS-2	Public authorities with functions to manage activities that could potentially introduce, transport or spread invasive non-native species should implement adequate biosecurity measures to avoid or minimise the risk of introducing, transporting or spreading invasive non-native species.	NE-INNS-2 aims to avoid or minimise the introduction and spread of marine invasive non-native species by encouraging public authorities with relevant functions throughout the North-east to implement adequate biosecurity measures, increase awareness of invasive non-native species and provide suitable guidance to help reduce their adverse impacts on the marine environment, which could include the eradication of existing invasive species.	IN	The use of vessels and transportation of materials during the construction phase of the Proposed Development have the potential to result in the introduction, transportation or spread of INNS. However, all vessels will be required to comply with International Maritime Organisation (IMO) Guidelines for the control and management of ships' biofouling to minimize the transfer of	Not Significant	Negligible effect on the introduction, transportation or spread of INNS	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
				invasive aquatic species (Biofouling Guidelines), and International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments with the aim of preventing the spread of marine INNS. An Invasive Plant Species Management Plan will also be developed as part of the Final CEMP(s).				
NE-ML-1	Public authorities must make adequate provision for the prevention, re-use, recycling and disposal of waste to reduce and prevent marine litter. Public authorities should aspire to undertake measures to remove marine litter within their jurisdiction.	Litter at sea often originates on land. Increase in development, access, recreation and tourism in the North-east marine plan areas may result in increased litter, and an adverse impact on the environment on which these activities rely. Preventing marine litter through effective waste management is vital. Addressing marine litter along the coastline is also an important step towards dealing with this problem.	IN	Waste is likely to be generated during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. However, waste will be managed through the implementation of a Site Waste Management Plan as part of the Framework CEMP (EN070009/APP/5.12) which will allow waste streams to be estimated and monitored. Therefore, no marine litter is expected and thus there are expected to be no significant effects.	Not Significant	Negligible effects on marine litter	N/A	Not Significant
NE-ML-2	Proposals that facilitate waste re-use or recycling to reduce or remove marine litter will be supported. Proposals that could potentially increase the amount of marine litter in the marine plan areas must include measures to, in order of preference:	NE-ML-2 makes sure proposals avoid, minimise or mitigate waste entering the marine environment and encourages support for improvements in waste management and removal of marine litter, during construction and over the lifetime of the development. Proposals	IN	Waste is likely to be generated during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. However, waste will be managed through the	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - waste entering the marine environment.	that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate waste entering the marine environment will not be supported.		implementation of a Site Waste Management Plan as part of the Framework CEMP (EN070009/APP/5.12) which will allow waste streams to be estimated and monitored. Therefore, no marine litter is expected.				
NE-MPA-1	Proposals that support the objectives of marine protected areas and the ecological coherence of the marine protected area network will be supported. Proposals that may have adverse impacts on the objectives of marine protected areas must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts, with due regard given to statutory advice on an ecologically coherent network.	NE-MPA-1 encourages and supports proposals for activities that further the conservation objectives of marine protected areas. NE-MPA-1 also ensures proposals take account of adverse impacts on individual sites and the overall network, protecting important habitats, species and geological features, and enabling the successful and continued management of these sites. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate adverse impacts should not be supported.	IN	The Proposed Development is located adjacent to several MPAs, including Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar, and Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SSSI. Several other MPAs also have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development due to the mobile nature of marine species, including Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast SAC and Southern North Sea SAC. However, an assessment of impacts in Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2) and the Habitat Regulations Assessment (EN070009/APP/5.10) found there to be no significant effects on the MPA network expected	Not Significant	Negligible disturbance to MPAs	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
				during the Proposed Development lifetime.				
NE-MPA-2	Proposals that enhance a marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change, enhancing the resilience of the marine protected area network, will be supported. Proposals that may have adverse impacts on an individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to the effects of climate change, and so reduce the resilience of the marine protected area network, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts.	NE-MPA-2 ensures proposals account for adverse impacts on each impacted individual marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change, improving resilience and working towards a well-managed marine protected area network. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise or mitigate adverse impacts should not be supported.	IN	The aim of the Proposed Development is to produce low carbon H ₂ , compliant with the UK Government's Low Carbon Hydrogen Standard (DESNZ, 2023). Therefore, this makes a direct contribution to the UK's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets. As a result, this is considered to help enhance a marine protected area's ability to adapt to climate change by contributing to alleviating the stressors created by increased GHG emissions.	Not Significant (beneficial)	Beneficial impact on MPAs due to reduction of GHGs.	N/A	Not Significant (beneficial)
NE-MPA-3	Where statutory advice states that a marine protected area site condition is deteriorating or that features are moving or changing due to climate change, a suitable boundary change to ensure continued protection of the site and coherence of the overall network should be considered	NE-MPA-3 ensures flexibility by supporting boundary changes to improve the resilience of the marine protected area network. NE-MPA-3 enables adaptive management to help mitigate the loss of features within sites, and support adaptation to climate change.	In	The Proposed Development activities are not expected to have an effect on the site condition of the surrounding MPA network.	Not Significant	Negligible effect on site condition	N/A	N/A
NE-MPA-4	Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on designated geodiversity must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no	NE-MPA-4 makes sure proposals account for significant adverse impacts on designated geodiversity, protecting important geological and geomorphological features that underlie and determine the character of our landscape and seascape. Proposals that cannot avoid, minimise	IN	Impacts on local geology were screened into the Environmental Assessment. A detailed assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development on local geology (see Chapter 10: Geology, Hydrology and	Not Significant	Negligible disturbance to local geology	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	longer significant.	or mitigate significant adverse impacts should not be supported.		Contaminated Land (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2)) identified no significant adverse effects.				
NE-OG-1	Proposals in areas where a licence for oil and gas has been granted or formally applied for should not be authorised unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with the oil and gas activity.	This policy protects the supply of oil and gas by safeguarding areas where there are existing licences. However, this does not sterilise areas for other activities as proposals that demonstrate compatibility with oil and gas activities may be supported. The policy gives clarity on dealing with potential future conflicts with other users who may want to use the same space as oil and gas extraction activities, by supporting co-existence opportunities for different users of the North-east marine plan areas. This supports the UK in meeting its energy and security objectives, as activities that may impact or sterilise areas that may be used for potential oil and gas extraction would hinder the fulfilment of the objectives of the UK Marine Policy Statement (Defra, 2020) and the UK's energy objectives.	OUT	The Proposed Development is not located within an area where a licence for oil and gas has been granted.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-OG-2	Proposals within areas of geological oil and gas extraction potential demonstrating compatibility with future extraction activity will be supported.	Maximising the economic recovery of oil and gas resources may require access to discoveries of deposits that have not yet been developed. However, other proposals may require access to the same area of seabed as these resources and, therefore, to future potential oil and gas production. This policy safeguards areas identified as having geological potential for future oil and gas extraction by ensuring that proposals have regard to future oil and gas activity prior to gaining support.	OUT	The Proposed Development is not located within an area of geological oil and gas extraction.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
NE-PS-1	<p>In line with the National Policy Statement for Ports, sustainable port and harbour development should be supported. Only proposals demonstrating compatibility with current port and harbour activities will be supported. Proposals within statutory harbour authority areas or their approaches that detrimentally and materially affect safety of navigation, or the compliance by statutory harbour authorities with the Open Port Duty or the Port Marine Safety Code, will not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact upon future opportunity for sustainable expansion of port and harbour activities, must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate <p>- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant. If it is not possible to mitigate significant adverse impacts, proposals should state the case for proceeding.</p>	<p>NE-PS-1 makes sure proposals do not restrict current port and harbour activity or future growth, enabling long-term strategic decisions, and supporting competitive and efficient port and shipping operations.</p> <p>NE-PS-1 provides clarity on how the economic interests and statutory duties of ports and harbours should be protected and makes sure new development does not restrict current activities, future growth or compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code. NE-PS-1 protects the efficiency and resilience of continuing port operations, and further port development.</p> <p>NE-PS-1 supports the National Policy Statement for Ports. NE-PS-1 recognises that harbour masters are experts in navigational safety within their own jurisdictional areas and that their views regarding how proposals affect safety of navigation, the Open Port Duty and compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code should be sought and given significant weight.</p> <p>NE-PS-1 confirms that proposals that compromise these important duties should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>For further detail, see the full policy statement.</p>	IN	<p>The Proposed Development is located within the PD Ports Statutory Harbour Authority. However, the Proposed Development activities are not expected to detrimentally and materially affect safety of navigation, or the compliance by statutory harbour authorities, or have an adverse impact on future opportunity for sustainable expansion.</p>	Not Significant	Negligible disturbance to the PD Ports Statutory Harbour Authority	N/A	Not Significant
NE-PS-2	<p>Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce underkeel</p>	<p>NE-PS-2 confirms that proposals that compromise these important navigation routes should not be authorised.</p>	OUT	<p>The Proposed Development does not require static sea surface</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	clearance must not be authorised within or encroaching upon International Maritime Organization routeing systems unless there are exceptional circumstances.	NE-PS-2 enables and supports safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses. NE-PS-2 specifies that developments should not be authorised where the use of International Maritime Organization routeing systems may be compromised. Authorisation of proposals that impact upon the use of International Maritime Organization routeing systems are very rare.		structure infrastructure and does not significantly reduce underkeel clearance.				
NE-PS-3	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce underkeel clearance which encroaches upon high density navigation routes, strategically important navigation routes, or that pose a risk to the viability of passenger services, must not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.	The North-east marine plan areas are very busy with respect to high-density navigation routes, strategically important navigation routes and passenger services. NE-PS-3 confirms that proposals that pose a risk to safe navigation or the viability of these routes and services should not be authorised. NE-PS-3 aims to protect these routes and services by enabling and promoting safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses. NE-PS-3 focuses on minimising negative impacts on shipping activity, protecting the economic interests of ports, harbours, shipping and the UK economy overall, and affording protection to the areas used by high intensities of traffic (UK Marine Policy Statement 3.4.2 (Defra, 2020)). It also gives effect to provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework (Section 37), which aims to encourage sustainable transport.	OUT	The Proposed Development does not require static sea surface structure infrastructure and does not significantly reduce underkeel clearance.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-PS-4	Proposals promoting or facilitating sustainable coastal and/or short sea shipping as an alternative to road, rail	NE-PS-4 aims to support sustainable coastal or short sea shipping where appropriate as an alternative to road, rail or air methods lowering carbon	OUT	The Proposed Development is not related to facilitating	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	or air transport will be supported where appropriate.	dioxide emissions and reducing road congestion. Bulk volumes are moved quickly with a reduction in administrative burden and increased efficiency through economies of scale. Short sea routes also allow the transshipment of cargo from large vessels landing into major European ports to the UK (and through direct movements of smaller bulk materials), reducing costs, improving reliability and allowing smaller ports to expand through the establishment of increased numbers of short sea shipping routes where suitable. Policy NE-4 supports the government policy for ports (National Policy Statement for Ports, Section 3.1.4, Section 3.3.5 and Section 3.4.14). The short sea shipping market is expected to grow over the lifetime of the marine plan, providing a flexible and specialised service. There are, however, several factors to consider in what is a price-sensitive market. In particular, the relatively lower costs of road transport, time constraints on delivery of goods and the availability of government subsidies.		sustainable coastal and/or short sea shipping.				
NE-REN-1	Proposals that enable the provision of renewable energy technologies and associated supply chains, will be supported.	NE-REN-1 recognises that importance of the supply chain within the lifecycle of renewable energy projects. NE-REN-1 enables public authorities to support proposals that will reduce costs, ensuring that businesses are operating competitively and with a long-term strategy. Developing a strong supply chain will not only support the domestic installation of offshore wind but could contribute to establishing a successful	OUT	The Proposed Development will result in the production of low carbon H ₂ and will export carbon dioxide (CO ₂) to the Northern Endurance Partnership (NEP) offshore storage facility. Although, the Proposed Development will not enable the provision of	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
		export market, particularly in relation to the emerging floating offshore wind industry. The Offshore Wind Sector Deal outlines a commitment to increase UK supply chain content to 60% by 2030. This policy supports proposals that indicate how they will draw on and develop the UK supply chain as part of their development.		renewable energy technologies such as offshore wind, but it will allow for supply chain growth within the low carbon infrastructure, along with Hygreen and NZT as neighbouring projects.				
NE-REN-2	Proposals for new activity within areas held under a lease or an agreement for lease for renewable energy generation should not be authorised, unless it is demonstrated that the proposed development or activity will not reduce the ability to construct, operate or decommission the existing or planned energy generation project.	Renewable energy technologies contribute to the diversification and decarbonisation of the electricity grid. NE-REN-2 protects areas identified for energy developments from other activities that could affect the sites ability to generate energy. It enables the development of safe, profitable and efficient marine businesses.	OUT	The Proposed Development does not overlap with any areas held under a lease or an agreement for lease for renewable energy generation.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-REN-3	Proposals for the installation of infrastructure to generate offshore renewable energy, inside areas of identified potential and subject to relevant assessments, will be supported.	NE-REN-3 supports the identification of future leasing rounds and provides a level of certainty for other activities as to where future development may occur. NE-REN-3 is in place to facilitate the identification of sites for future offshore renewable energy development. Spatial areas for all technology types will be updated, as required, based on improved understanding of constraints and technical advancements in new technology. Proponents and decision-makers should refer to Explore Marine Plans for the most up-to-date data.	OUT	The Proposed Development is not located within areas of identified potential and subject to relevant assessments for offshore renewable energy.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-SCP-1	Proposals should ensure they are compatible with their surroundings and should not have a significant adverse impact on the character and visual resource of the seascape and	The aim of the policy is to manage significant adverse impacts on the seascape and landscape of the North-east inshore and offshore marine plan areas. It will make sure that an area's	IN	The impacts of the Proposed Development on the character and visual resource of the seascape and landscape	Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect	Long-term adverse impacts expected	N/A	Moderate Adverse (Significant)

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	<p>landscape of the area. The location, scale and design of proposals should take account of the character, quality and distinctiveness of the seascape and landscape. Proposals that may have a significant adverse impact on the seascape and landscape of the area should demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate <p>- adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p> <p>If it is not possible to mitigate, the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal must outweigh significant adverse impacts to the seascape and landscape of the area. Proposals within or relatively close to nationally designated areas should have regard to the specific statutory purposes of the designated area. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>	<p>value, quality and its capacity to accommodate change is considered and that the scale and design of a proposal is compatible with its surroundings. The policy's primary aim is to make provisions for those areas of seascape without statutory designation. The policy also supports those areas with existing statutory designation such as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage Sites. Defined Heritage Coasts are also supported although they do not hold statutory designation.</p>		<p>of the area have been assessed in Chapter 16: Landscape and Visual Amenity (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2). The Study Area includes the North East Marine Character Area (MCA). The MCA is relatively industrialised in areas with views of an extensively developed lowland coast. However, areas of naturalised coastline are present. Susceptibility to change arising from the Proposed Development is therefore considered to be Low. Moreover, the assessment has identified the potential for significant effects on the landscape and seascape, particularly from Redcar Seafront and the England Coastal Path during construction, and the England Coastal Path during operation.</p>				
NE-SOC-1	<p>Those bringing forward proposals should consider and demonstrate how their development shall enhance public knowledge, understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the marine environment as part of (the design of) the proposal.</p>	<p>NE-SOC-1 seeks to increase the general knowledge, understanding, appreciation and enjoyment by people of the many values provided by the marine environment through encouraging proposals that incorporate these factors.</p>	OUT	<p>The Proposed Development is not related to the public use of the environment within which they are occurring which in any event is not in the marine environment.</p>	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
NE-TR-1	<p>Proposals that promote or facilitate sustainable tourism and recreation activities, or that create appropriate opportunities to expand or diversify the current use of facilities, should be supported. Proposals that may have significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate - adverse impacts so they are no longer significant.</p>	<p>NE-TR-1 supports these established industries through promotion of sustainable tourism and recreation at appropriate locations. It also encourages diversification of activities to create additional employment opportunities, while reducing adverse impacts on natural resources and heritage assets.</p> <p>To minimise stakeholder conflict, NE-TR-1 also addresses the potential impact of proposals on existing tourism and recreation use, or future potential activities; those proposals that cannot avoid, minimise and mitigate significant adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities are unlikely to be supported.</p>	OUT	The Proposed Development activities are not related to sustainable tourism or recreation activities.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-UWN-1	Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive sound must contribute data to the UK Marine Noise Registry as per any currently agreed requirements. Public authorities must take account of any currently agreed targets under the Marine Strategy Part One Descriptor 11.	Impulsive sounds can have an adverse effect on marine life and human enjoyment of marine areas. NE-UWN-1 supports the established noise registry to determine baselines, levels of impulsive sound and management options through the recording and assessment of the distribution and timing of impulsive sound sources in the marine environment. This will enable effective marine management and protection of biodiversity or viable populations of species.	OUT	Based on assessments in Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration, and Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2), the Proposed Development is not expected to result in the generation of impulsive sound in the marine environment.	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant
NE-UWN-2	<p>Proposals that result in the generation of impulsive or non-impulsive noise must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate</p>	<p>Underwater noise levels have increased with marine space use. Noise can affect highly mobile species, including causing chronic stress and death at higher intensities.</p> <p>NE-UWN-2 supports management of</p>	OUT	The Proposed Development is expected to generate non-impulsive noise during construction and operation. However, noise generated is expected to be airborne	Not Significant	N/A	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	- adverse impacts on highly mobile species so they are no longer significant.	underwater noise, requiring proposals to take appropriate noise reduction actions. NE-UWN-2 enables clear and proportionate regulation to make sure marine activity respects environmental limits and protects biodiversity.		noise rather than underwater noise. Airborne noise could affect seals haul-out at Seal Sands, which has been assessed in Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2). The impact pathway for underwater noise was scoped out of the assessment in Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2). The only source of underwater noise expected is from the use of vessels. The underwater sound produced by the small number of vessels associated with the Proposed Development, are not expected to be greater than the background vessel noise already occurring in the River Tees and Tees Port.				
NE-WQ-1	Proposals that protect, enhance and restore water quality will be supported. Proposals that cause deterioration of water quality must demonstrate that they will, in order of preference: a) avoid b) minimise c) mitigate	NE-WQ1 supports activities with a primary objective to protect, enhance and restore water quality. NE-WQ-1 also manages activities that may cause deterioration of water quality by ensuring that adverse impacts from proposals must be avoided, minimised and mitigated.	IN	There is the potential for Proposed Development activities to result in a deterioration in water quality, through surface water and chemical run-off, and accidental spills from vessels during construction, and the	Not Significant	Negligible impact on local water quality	N/A	Not Significant

NORTH-EAST INSHORE MARINE PLAN	POLICY TEXT	POLICY AIM/RATIONALE	POLICY SCREENED IN OR OUT	JUSTIFICATION FOR SCREENING	POTENTIAL IMPACT ON POLICY	TYPE OF IMPACT	MITIGATION OR HOW ANY IMPACTS WILL BE ADDRESSED	FINAL POLICY ASSESSMENT
	- deterioration of water quality in the marine environment.			release of treated effluent into Tees Bay during the operational phase. However, the assessments in Chapter 9: Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources and Chapter 14: Marine Ecology (ES Volume I, EN070009/APP/6.2), taking into account mitigation measures, found that any changes in water quality are expected to be minor and short-term, with rapid dilution. Therefore, both assessments have identified no significant effects to water quality.				

7A.2 References

- Department for Energy Security & and Net Zero (DESNZ) (2023). *UK Low Carbon Hydrogen Standard: Guidance on the greenhouse gas emissions and sustainability criteria, Version 2*.
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2020). *UK Marine Policy Statement, version 2*.
- HM Government (2012). *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*.
- HM Government (2011). *The Localism Act 2011*.
- HM Government (2021). *North East Inshore and North East Offshore Marine Plan. Published by Defra*.
- International Maritime Organisation (IMO) (2011). *2011 Guidelines for the Control and Management of Ships' Biofouling to Minimize the Transfer of Invasive Aquatic Species. Annex 26. Resolution MEPC.207(62). Adopted 15 July 2011*.
- International Maritime Organisation (IMO) (2017). *International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM)*.