

H2Teesside Project

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN070009

Land within the boroughs of Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees, Teesside and within the borough of Hartlepool, County Durham

The H2Teesside Order

Document Reference: 7.5 Consultation Statement

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009



Applicant: H2 Teesside Ltd

Date: 16 October 2024

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Document Ref	7.5		
Revision	0		
Author	Aecom		
Signed	Aecom	date	16.10.24
Approved by	bp		
Signed	bp	date	16.10.24
Document Owner	Aecom		

1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Overview	4
1.2 Purpose and Structure of this Document	5
2.0 COMPLIANCE WITH PINS ADVICE PAGE AND THE ExA’S RESPONSE TO THE APPLICANT’S CHANGE NOTIFICATION	7
3.0 CONSULTATION OF PRESCRIBED AND NON-PRESCRIBED PERSONS	9
3.1 Introduction.....	9
3.2 Who was consulted?.....	9
3.3 How were they consulted?	9
3.4 How could feedback be provided / what was the deadline for comments?	11
3.5 Responses to the consultation	11
4.0 CONSULTATION OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY	14
4.1 Introduction.....	14
4.2 Who was consulted?.....	14
4.3 How were they consulted?	14
4.4 How could feedback be provided / what was the deadline for comments?	15
4.5 Responses to the Consultation.....	16
5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES.....	17
APPENDICES	36

TABLES

Table 2-1 PINS Advice Page Compliance.....	7
Table 2-2 ExA Response Compliance	7
Table 5-1 Summary of consultation responses received from prescribed consultees	17
Table 5-2 Summary of consultation responses received from the local community	28

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This Consultation Statement (Document Ref. 7.5) has been prepared on behalf of H2Teesside Limited (the ‘Applicant’). It forms part of a Change Request relating to an application (the ‘Application’) that has been submitted to the Secretary of State (the ‘SoS’) for Energy Security and Net Zero, under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (the ‘PA 2008’), seeking development consent for the H2Teesside Project (the ‘Proposed Development’). The Application was submitted on 25 March 2024, and was accepted for examination on 22 April 2024. The Examination started on 29 August 2024.
- 1.1.2 The Applicant, a bp company, will be the lead developer of the H2Teesside Project and bp will be appointed as the operator of H2Teesside. The Proposed Development will support the decarbonisation of UK-produced natural gas by converting it to low carbon hydrogen in Teesside for use in industrial applications, thus helping to achieve national targets in relation to net zero. It will also contribute to restoring manufacturing jobs in the Tees Valley. The Proposed Development will export carbon dioxide (‘CO₂’) to the Northern Endurance Partnership (‘NEP’) offshore storage facility via NEP infrastructure on the adjacent Net Zero Teesside (‘NZT’) site, including the high-pressure compression facility and the CO₂ export pipeline.
- 1.1.3 Due to the Proposed Development’s nature and scale, the extent of land interests within the proposed Order Limits and the potential routing of the hydrogen pipeline and other connections, the Application necessarily included a degree of optionality. The Applicant has previously explained the need for this optionality in its application documentation and its Examination submissions to date, but has also been clear that its aim would be to reduce that optionality, if possible, as the design of the Proposed Development is progressed and becomes more certain. The options included in the Application were consulted upon and also assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (‘EIA’) undertaken for the Proposed Development and reported in the Environmental Statement (‘ES’) [APP-051 to APP-225].
- 1.1.4 Since submission of the DCO Application, the Applicant has continued to engage with Interested Parties with a view to addressing their comments and agreeing common ground, while also continuing with project design work. This work has identified a total of 14 proposed changes to the Proposed Development.
- 1.1.5 On 15 August 2024, at Procedural Deadline A, the Applicant issued a letter [PDA-020] formally notifying PINS, acting on behalf of the SoS, of its intention to formally request a change to the Application and sought advice from the Examining Authority (‘ExA’) on the procedural implications of doing so. The notification included a document entitled ‘Change Notification Report’ (the Notification Document) (Document 7.1) [PDA-019] which provided details of the proposed changes.
- 1.1.6 The Notification Document confirmed that the Applicant would carry out non-statutory consultation on the proposed changes prior to making the formal Change Request. The proposed approach to the non-statutory consultation was set out at Section 4.0 of the Notification Document.

1.1.7 The ExA provided a response to the Applicant’s Notification Document on 21 August 2024 [PD-006]. In regard to the proposed non-statutory consultation on the proposed changes, the ExA’s response stated:

1.1.8 “The ExA notes the Applicant’s position regarding consultation on the proposed changes in advance of submission ... as set out in the Change Notification and that the prospective changes are a result of responses provided to previous consultation and subsequent engagement with Interested Parties. As such the ExA considers the proposed consultations as set out in the Change Notification [PDA-019] will ensure fair, appropriate and proportionate consultation.”

1.2 Purpose and Structure of this Document

1.2.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to describe the non-statutory consultation that has been undertaken by the Applicant in respect of the proposed changes and how the responses received to that consultation have been taken into account. This Consultation Statement forms part of the formal change request that has been submitted to the ExA.

1.2.2 The Planning Inspectorate has issued advice to applicants on how to request changes to applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (‘NSIPs’) after these have been accepted for examination¹ (‘PINS Advice Page’). The process for requesting a change to an Application involves four main steps as follows:

- **Step 1** – The Change Notification is submitted.
- **Step 2** – Advice is provided by the ExA.
- **Step 3** – The Applicant consults about the proposed change.
- **Step 4** – The change application/request is submitted.

1.2.3 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to explain how the Applicant has satisfied the requirements set out in Step 3 above. The remainder of this document is structured as follows:

- **Section 2: Compliance with PINS Advice Page and the ExA’s Response to the Applicant’s Change Notification** – signposts where in this Consultation Statement the Applicant has demonstrated compliance with the PINS Advice Page and the ExA’s response to the Applicant’s Change Notification.
- **Section 3: Consultation of Prescribed and Non-prescribed Persons** – describes how prescribed persons, relevant local authorities, statutory undertakers, landownership interests and other persons were consulted on the proposed changes.
- **Section 4: Consultation of the Local Community** – describes how the local community was consulted on the proposed changes.

¹ Advice Page – Changes to an application after it has been accepted for examination

-
- **Section 5: Consultation Responses** – provides a summary of the consultation responses received and how the Applicant has had regard to these.

1.2.4 The Appendices for this document are contained in Document Reference 7.6 ‘Consultation Statement Appendices’ and have been submitted separately alongside this document. The following appendices are contained within that document:

- List of prescribed and non-prescribed consultees, and persons over whose land Compulsory Acquisition powers will be exercised.
- List of locally elected representatives and inner consultation zone map.
- Example consultation letters.
- A copy of the Consultation Document.
- Consultation Notice as published in the newspapers.
- Consultation notice erected on various sites, site location map and photo of site notice installations.
- Screenshots of responses to the consultation.
- Screenshots of the Project Website.
- A copy of the feedback form (both online, and in hard-copy).

2.0 COMPLIANCE WITH PINS ADVICE PAGE AND THE ExA’S RESPONSE TO THE APPLICANT’S CHANGE NOTIFICATION

2.1.1 The PINS Advice Page sets out a number of matters that need to be included within a Consultation Statement. Table 2-1 below explains where in this Consultation Statement these requirements are met.

Table 2-1 PINS Advice Page Compliance

Requirement	Where Dealt With
Confirmation that ... any consultation bodies who might have an interest in the proposed change have been consulted (reflecting the requirements of the EIA Regulations 2017). The Applicant should identify those consultation bodies who were consulted on the proposed changes but were not consulted on the original Application.	The Applicant can confirm that there are no consultation bodies consulted on the proposed changes who were not consulted on the original Application.
Confirm who has been consulted in relation to the proposed change and explain how and why they have been consulted.	Sections 3 and 4 describe who, why and how prescribed and non-prescribed persons and the local community have been consulted.
Details of how the Applicant has considered the content of the consultation responses received.	Section 5 provides a summary of the content of the consultation responses received and how bp has had regard to the matters raised.
Copies of all consultation responses received, including any responses to publicity about the proposed change.	Copies of all consultation responses received are contained in Appendix 7 (Document Ref. 7.6).

2.1.2 Table 2-2 below explains where in the Consultation Statement it is demonstrated that the Applicant has complied with the ExA’s Response to the Applicant’s Change Notification.

Table 2-2 ExA Response Compliance

Requirement	Where Dealt With
Lists the persons (affected by the changes) who it consulted identifying any new persons i.e. those who were consulted in relation to the proposed change but not in relation to the original Application.	Section 3.2 and Appendix 1 (Document Ref. 7.6) provides a list of the persons affected by the changes and identifies the new persons consulted in relation to the proposed change but not the original Application.
Identifies (within the above list) those persons who are “affected persons”,	Appendix 1 (Document Ref 7.6) also identifies those persons over whose

meaning those persons over whose land Compulsory Acquisition powers will be exercised.	land Compulsory Acquisition powers will be exercised.
--	---

3.0 CONSULTATION OF PRESCRIBED AND NON-PRESCRIBED PERSONS

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 This section describes how non-statutory consultation was undertaken with prescribed persons, including local authorities, statutory undertakers and persons with an interest in the land affected by the Project (those persons defined by Sections 42, 43 and 44 of the PA 2008), as well as certain other non-prescribed persons, on the proposed changes to the Application.
- 3.1.2 The consultation with these persons took place from 6 September 2024 to 7 October 2024.

3.2 Who was consulted?

- 3.2.1 Prescribed persons, including relevant local authorities, statutory undertakers and persons with an interest in land affected by the Project (those persons defined by Sections 42, 43 and 44 of the PA 2008), the EIA Regulations consultation bodies and certain other non-prescribed persons, were consulted on the proposed changes. Non-prescribed persons included those persons who, although there was no duty to consult under the PA 2008, had previously been identified as being potentially interested in the Project or who had responded to previous consultations on the Project.
- 3.2.2 The persons consulted were largely the same as those notified of the acceptance of the DCO Application pursuant to Section 56 of the PA 2008, subject to any changes to the Section 56 notification list since May 2024, following a review of that list by the Applicant's project team in August 2024. The review of the list resulted in two persons being added, while a small number of persons were identified as no longer being affected by the Proposed Development as a result of the proposed changes. The two persons added, NSMP Operations Limited and Storelectric Limited, were consulted on the proposed changes, and are considered to be affected persons.
- 3.2.3 These parties were added as a result of information received during the continued land referencing process – these parties and interests have arisen post submission of the DCO Application.
- 3.2.4 In total, 463 prescribed and non-prescribed persons were consulted on the proposed changes.

3.3 How were they consulted?

- 3.3.1 The prescribed and identified non-prescribed persons were consulted using the following methods.

Consultation Letter and Consultation Documents

- 3.3.2 The prescribed and non-prescribed persons were sent a letter to notify them of the proposed changes and the consultation.
- 3.3.3 A Consultation Letter was issued via Royal Mail First Class post to all the prescribed and non-prescribed consultees on 4 September 2024. The Consultation Letter was also sent electronically by email on 5 September 2024 to the consultees who had

previously provided email addresses or where email addresses could be obtained for them. Of the 463 letters issued, 146 were also sent electronically.

3.3.4 The Consultation Letter contained a link to the project website, where documents were available to view and be downloaded. Screen clippings of the webpage can be found at Appendix 8 (Document Ref. 7.6). The following Consultation Documents were available on the website:

- Proposed Changes Overview Plan showing the location of the changes (Changes 1 to 14).
- A Consultation Document setting out the rationale for the proposed changes, providing a description of the changes and information on how the assessments within the Environmental Impact Assessment ('EIA') of the Project are likely to change as a result of the proposed changes. The Consultation Document also included detailed plans showing the proposed changes.
- A feedback form, which could be downloaded in PDF format or completed online.
- Plans showing each of the proposed changes in more detail.
- The Change Notification Report.

3.3.5 The Consultation Letter also provided information on how the Consultation Documents could be obtained in alternative formats.

3.3.6 A list of the prescribed and non-prescribed persons consulted can be found at Appendix 1 (Document Ref. 7.6). A copy of the Consultation Letter can be found at Appendix 3 (Document Ref. 7.6). A copy of the Consultation Document, plans showing the proposed changes and the feedback form can be found at Appendix 4, 9 and 10 (Document Ref. 7.6).

Newspaper and site notices

3.3.7 A notice publicising the consultation on the proposed changes was published in national and local newspapers circulating in the vicinity of the Proposed Development and other publications as follows:

- The Times – 6 September 2024.
- London Gazette – 5 September 2024.
- Lloyds List – 5 September 2024.
- Fishing News – 5 September 2024.
- Teesside Gazette – 5 September 2024.
- Northern Echo – 5 September 2024.
- Darlington & Stockton Times – 6 September 2024.

3.3.8 The notice was broadly modelled on the Section 56 notice that was published in the above newspapers and publications in May 2024 to publicise the acceptance of the

Application. The notice provided a summary of the proposed changes and information on the consultation, including how to view and obtain copies of the Consultation Documents; how to respond to the consultation and the deadline by which to do so. Copies of the published newspaper notices can be found at Appendix 5 (Document Ref. 7.6).

- 3.3.9 A copy of the notice published in the above newspapers and publications, including the Proposed Changes Overview Plan, was also erected at a number of locations around the Order Limits. The notices were inspected on a weekly basis for the duration of consultation period (six weeks). A copy of a plan showing the location of the notices can be found at Appendix 6 (Document Ref. 7.6), alongside photo evidence of the installation of the notice at each of these locations.
- 3.3.10 Unregistered land notices were also erected and were monitored alongside the consultation notices.

Meetings with Interested Parties

- 3.3.11 Following the submission of the Notification Document to PINS in August 2024, the Applicant sought to meet with a number of Interested Parties with landholdings within or adjoining the Application Site. The meetings were used as an opportunity to provide an update on the Project and brief each party on the proposed changes to the DCO Application.
- 3.3.12 Meetings were held with the following Interested Parties: PD Teesport, the NSMP entities, Sembcorp, Navigator Terminals.

3.4 How could feedback be provided / what was the deadline for comments?

- 3.4.1 The Consultation Letter and newspaper and site notices confirmed that any responses to the consultation on the proposed changes should be submitted to the Applicants no later than 7 October 2024 via one of the following methods:

- Emailing comments to: info@h2teesside.net
- By post to: FREEPOST H2Teesside
- Online: via the response form at www.h2teesside.co.uk

- 3.4.2 In addition, the project phone line was publicised to provide an alternative method for people to request hard copies of the consultation documents or ask questions about the proposed changes or consultation.

- 3.4.3 The deadline for the receipt of responses provided the prescribed and non-prescribed persons with a period in excess of the 28 days recommended as per Step 3 of the PINS Advice Page.

3.5 Responses to the consultation

- 3.5.1 31 consultation responses were received from prescribed and non-prescribed persons. These were from:
- NATS Safeguarding
 - JNCC (1st response)

-
- Cadent Gas
 - Solar 21
 - Northern Gas Networks (NGN)
 - GTC UK
 - JNCC (2nd response)
 - Cleveland Police
 - Canal and River Trust (1st response)
 - SSE Energy Solutions
 - Ministry of Defence (1st response)
 - Active Travel England
 - The Coal Authority
 - Tees Valley Combined Authority (TCVA)
 - Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
 - Loftus Town Council
 - Ministry of Defence (2nd response)
 - Openreach
 - Ministry of Defence (3rd response)
 - Hartlepool Borough Council
 - Canal and River Trust (2nd response)
 - Environment Agency
 - Industrial Chemicals Ltd
 - Natural England
 - South Tees Group
 - PD Teesport Limited
 - Sembcorp Utilities (UK)
 - Teesside Gas & Liquids Processing (“TGLP”), Northern Gas Processing Limited (“NGPL”) and Teesside Gas Processing Plant Limited (“TGPP”)
 - SABIC
 - Anglo American
 - Net Zero North Sea Storage Limited

3.5.2 A summary of the responses provided by these consultees and the regard had by the Applicant to the matters raised in the feedback provided is set out in Table 5-1.

Copies of the responses received from these prescribed and non-prescribed consultees can be found at Appendix 7 (Document Ref. 7.6).

4.0 CONSULTATION OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section describes how consultation was undertaken with the local community within the vicinity of the Application Site.

4.2 Who was consulted?

4.2.1 The local community within the vicinity of the Application Site was consulted on the proposed changes. Those to be consulted were identified as people living within the Inner Consultation Zone defined in the Statement of Community Consultation and used for the previous consultations on the Proposed Development (and shown in Appendix 2, Document Ref. 7.6).

4.3 How were they consulted?

4.3.1 The local community was notified of the consultation using a number of methods. These are described in more detail below and are consistent with the methods used for previous consultations in September – October 2023 and December 2023 – January 2024).

Letter drop to the local community

4.3.2 A Consultation Letter and Proposed Changes Overview Plan were issued via Royal Mail First Class post on 5 September 2024 to 40,198 addresses within the Inner Consultation Zone.

4.3.3 The Consultation Letter provided notification of the proposed changes and confirmed how members of the community could access information on the proposed changes, the channels through which feedback could be submitted and the date by which comments should be received. A copy of the Proposed Changes Overview Plan showing the location of the proposed changes was enclosed with the Consultation Letter. A copy of the Consultation Letter is included in Appendix 3 (Document Ref. 7.6).

Notification of locally elected representatives

4.3.4 An email providing notification of the proposed changes, was also issued to locally elected representatives, including the three Members of Parliament representing the Redcar and Cleveland, Hartlepool and Stockton North constituencies, 54 councillors from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, Hartlepool Council and Stockton on Tees Borough Council, as well as the Mayor of Tees Valley and the Chief Executive of Tees Valley Combined Authority. A full list of the locally elected representatives notified can be found in Appendix 2 (Document Ref. 7.6).

4.3.5 The email also included details of how to access further information on the proposed changes, the channels through which feedback could be submitted and the date by which comments should be received. A copy of the Consultation Document, which included the Proposed Changes Overview Plan showing the location of the proposed changes, was attached to the email.

4.3.6 These emails summarised the proposed changes, and detailed the ways in which information could be accessed, as well as the methods by which they could provide

their feedback. The letter also confirmed the ways in which the constituents of these elected representatives have been engaged, as set out above. Copies of the emails issued to MPs, councillors and other local representatives can be found in Appendix 3 (Document Ref. 7.6).

Project website

4.3.7 The Consultation Letter contained a link to the project website, where documents were available to view and be downloaded. Screen clippings of the webpage can be found at Appendix 8 (Document Ref. 7.6). The documents made available are those detailed in Section 3, paragraph 3.3.4 above.

Newspaper and site notices

4.3.8 As detailed in Section 3, paragraphs 3.3.7 - 3.3.10, a notice publicising the consultation on the proposed changes was published in national and local newspapers circulating in the vicinity of the Proposed Development and other publications.

Document inspection locations

4.3.9 All of the documents made available on the Project website were also publicly available throughout the consultation period on computers at three locations within the vicinity of the Site:

- Redcar Library, Redcar & Cleveland House, Kirkleatham Street, Redcar, TS10 1RT.
- Stockton Central Library, Church Road, Stockton on Tees, TS18 1TU.
- Hartlepool Civic Centre, Victoria Road, Hartlepool, TS24 8AY.

4.3.10 The document inspection locations were publicised via the Project website, letters and notices referred to in Section 3 above.

4.4 How could feedback be provided / what was the deadline for comments?

4.4.1 The Consultation Letter and newspaper and site notices confirmed that any responses to the consultation on the proposed changes should be submitted to the Applicants no later than 7 October 2024 via one of the following methods:

- Emailing comments to: info@h2teesside.net
- By post to: FREEPOST H2Teesside
- Online: via the response form at www.h2teesside.co.uk

4.4.2 In addition, the project phone line was publicised to provide an alternative method for people to request hard copies of the consultation documents or ask questions about the proposed changes or consultation.

4.4.3 The deadline for the receipt of responses provided the prescribed and non-prescribed persons with a period in excess of the 28 days recommended as per Step 3 of the PINS Advice Page.

4.4.4 A copy of the hard-copy and online feedback form can be found at Appendix 9 and 10 respectively (Document Ref. 7.6).

4.5 Responses to the Consultation

- 4.5.1 13 consultation responses were received from the local community.
- 4.5.2 A summary of the responses provided by these consultees and the regard had by the Applicant to the matters raised in the feedback provided is set out in Table 5-2.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1.1 This section sets out the regard had by the Applicant to the responses received to the consultation in respect of the proposed changes to the DCO Application. Responses from Prescribed Consultees are summarised in Table 5-1 below, while responses from the community responses are set out in Table 5-2.

5.1.2 Copies of the responses from these consultees are included in Appendix 7 (Document Ref. 7.6).

Table 5-3 Summary of consultation responses received from prescribed consultees

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
NATS Safeguarding	05/09/2024	Confirmed previous position of no objections.	Noted. No action required.
JNCC (1 st response)	05/09/2024	Noted that Natural England is now authorised to exercise the JNCC’s functions as a statutory consultee in respect of certain applications for offshore and offshore waters. As the Proposed Development is inshore/onshore, Natural England should provide a response and JNCC noted they would not review the application or provide further comment.	Noted. No action required.
Solar 21	05/09/2024	Concerns regarding interface of H2Teesside with their sites.	Interface was discussed with Solar 21 with regards to Solar 21’s access route. The Applicant confirmed that no pipeline repair works are planned at this location.
Cadent Gas	06/09/2024	Confirmed no comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
Northern Gas Network (NGN)	06/09/2024	NGN confirmed it has sensitive sites located within the Order Limits and requested detailed plans of the Proposed Development.	Detailed plans of the Proposed Development have been shared with NGN.
GTC UK	06/09/2024	Confirmed GTC UK has no assets within the Order Limits and has no comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
JNCC (2 nd response)	09/09/2024	JNCC noted that the Proposed Development is not located within the offshore area, and does not have any potential offshore nature conservation issues, and is not concerned with nature conservation at a UK level, therefore confirmed no comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
Cleveland Police	09/09/2024	Confirmed no comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
Canal and River Trust (1 st response)	09/09/2024	The Canal and River Trust noted their jurisdiction is upstream of the Tees barriers, and does not include the section of the River Tees that will be crossed by the proposals, therefore they do not have any comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
SSE Energy Solutions	09/09/2024	Request that bp use the LSBUS services, review SSE's documents and adhere to instructions to minimise any potential risks or accidents.	The Applicant is already taking this into account in the on-going development of the design of the Proposed Development.

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
Ministry of Defence (1 st response)	10/09/2024	Confirmed no objection to the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
Active Travel	10/09/2024	Confirmed no comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
The Coal Authority	13/09/2024	Confirmed no comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
Tees Valley Combined Authority (TVCA)	14/09/2024	Noted that TVCA has a Statement of Common Ground with bp.	Noted. The Applicant is continuing to liaise with TVCA in order to progress the draft SoCG. The latest draft was submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-041].
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	16/09/2024	Confirmed no additional comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
Loftus Town Council	18/09/2024	Confirmed continued support for the Project.	Noted. No action required.
Ministry of Defence (2 nd response)	24/09/2024	Confirmed no objection to the Proposed Development.	Noted. No action required.
Openreach	25/09/2024	Note that some of Openreach’s apparatus may conflict with the proposals, and therefore protection/alteration/diversion of the affected apparatus likely to be necessary. Openreach request a detailed survey to confirm that anticipated alterations to Openreach apparatus are the most cost-effective means of protecting the network.	Noted. The Applicant is already taking this into account in the on-going development of the design of the Proposed Development.

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
Ministry of Defence (3 rd response)	01/10/2024	Request aviation safety lighting is added to the additional flare and data is submitted to MoD to ensure that the additional flare can be accurately charted.	This request is already accounted for by Requirement 23 Schedule 2 of the draft DCO.
Hartlepool Borough Council	02/10/2024	Hartlepool Borough Council welcome the proposals due to their contribution towards tackling climate change and the local economy, and confirmed no objections towards the Proposed Development.	Noted. No action required.
Canal and River Trust (2 nd response)	03/10/2024	The Canal and River Trust noted that the boundaries of the Proposed Development are close to the River Tees, but the CRT do not own or manage this stretch of waterway. The CRT suggested further enquiries are made with the Land Registry.	The Applicant can confirm that CRT do not own any property interests within the Order limits.
Environment Agency	03/10/2024	No additional comments on the proposed changes.	Noted. No action required.
Industrial Chemicals Ltd	03/10/2024	Holding objection - ICL is seeking assurance that the DCO, will not involve the loss of any access rights over Huntsman Drive and that unrestricted and unimpaired access to the adopted highway and ICL's site will also be retained to enable commercial operations to be maintained without any impediment.	The Applicant's plans do not involve blocking of access routes and the Applicant is looking to work with the common users of the private roads during construction to coordinate activities.
Natural England	04/10/2024	Natural England provided specific comments on the following changes.	<u>Change 1:</u> Nitrogen and amine emissions as a result of two flares are assessed

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<p><u>Change 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Queried nitrogen and amine emissions - Requested further explanation of the closed loop system and consideration of fugitive emissions in the DCO. - Requested emissions arising from both flares should now be included in any further correspondence. <p><u>Change 2C:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They note the change. <p><u>Change 2F:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They welcome Change 2F. <p><u>Change 3:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They welcome Change 3. <p><u>Change 4:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request consideration to be given to any additional noise, vibration and visual disturbance arising, alongside the management of dust and surface water run-off. <p><u>Change 6:</u></p>	<p>in Appendix 1 of the Change Report (Document Ref. 7.3). This concludes that there are no changes to the conclusions to impacts to ecological receptors. This will form the basis of on-going discussions with Natural England.</p> <p>- Regarding further information on the “closed loop” carbon capture process, please see the response to FWQ 1.3.10 (REP2-021).</p> <p><u>Change 2C:</u> Noted. No action required.</p> <p><u>Change 2F:</u> Noted. No action required.</p> <p><u>Change 3:</u> Noted. No action required.</p> <p><u>Change 4:</u> Change 4 is assessed in Appendix 2 of the Change Report for Noise</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They welcome Change 6. <p><u>Change 7:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They reference discussions with bp from 20 August 2024 regarding the Blast Furnace Pool and request consideration to the vertical scale of buildings and structures within the main site in the context of sightlines for Blast Furnace Pool. <p><u>Change 8</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They note Change 8 will need to be considered in relation to the stated representations going forward. 	<p>and Vibration impacts, which concludes in respect of ecology:</p> <p>No changes to the ecological assessment as reported in the Original ES.</p> <p><u>Change 6:</u></p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p> <p><u>Change 7:</u></p> <p>Please see the response to RR-026 NE8 (REP1-007). The Applicant will discuss this further with NE and progress will be reported within the SoCG over the course of the Examination. Any updates needed to the HRA will form part of these discussions.</p> <p><u>Change 8:</u></p> <p>Noted. No action required.</p>
South Tees Group	07/10/2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - South Tees Group support the reductions in land extent, but suggests further reductions should be made and seeks clarification on 	<p>The Applicant continues to engage with STG on land matters. It does not currently consider that further reductions are</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<p>the likelihood of further changes and timeframes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggests that the additional flare potentially increases the environmental impact on the project on STG land and requests detailed environmental information. - Expresses support for change 2C and has no comment on changes 2B and 2D. 	<p>necessary but will continue discussions with STG.</p> <p>The additional flare stack (Change 1) is assessed in Appendix 1 of the Change Application Report and reports that no additional impacts arise.</p> <p>With regards to Changes 2B, 2C and 2D, this is noted. No action is required.</p>
PD Teesport Limited	07/10/2024	<p>Confirm PD Teesport Limited is a freehold owner of land that will potentially be affected by the Project.</p> <p>They note that no attempt has been made to negotiate a private treaty and request to be engaged with urgently.</p>	<p>The Applicant has been engaging in discussions with PD Teesport Limited regarding the Net Zero Teesside scheme and discussions for a private treaty are at an advanced stage. The Applicant notes that a number of the interactions with PD Teesports land and infrastructure is similar to those with Net Zero Teesside and it intends to mirror the principles of these prior agreements for the H2Teesside Project. The Applicant also discussed the relevant changes</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
			with PD Teesport prior to start of consultation.
Sembcorp Utilities (UK)	07/10/2024	<p>Confirm Sembcorp has a gas pipeline within the land proposed in the change request.</p> <p>They note that no attempt has been made to negotiate a private treaty negotiation and request to be engaged with urgently.</p>	The Applicant has had specific meetings and correspondence with Sembcorp in relation to Change 8 and generally in respect of the Proposed Development. These discussions are ongoing using Net Zero Teesside precedence as the starting point, where appropriate.
Teesside Gas & Liquids Processing (“TGLP”), Northern Gas Processing Limited (“NGPL”) and Teesside Gas Processing Plant Limited (“TGPP”)	07/10/2024	<p>Note that the proposed changes increase and intensify the potential interaction between the project and North Sea Midstream Partners (NSMP) Entities infrastructure and raise the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seek clarification that the preservation of the NSMP Entities’ unimpeded access, maintenance and other existing rights are not impacted; - Seek reassurance that the provision of adequate controls and procedures to ensure the continued safe operation will continue; - Seek reassurance related to the preservation of the NSMP Entities’ ability to develop its business 	The Applicant notes NSMP’s concerns and is looking to agree appropriate Protective Provisions with NSMP to address these concerns.

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<p>and operations in the future by making use of its existing assets and rights, including in relation to green transition initiatives and improvements and modifications to the Gas Processing Plant.</p>	
SABIC	07/10/2024	<p>Specific comments provided on the following proposed changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change 2E - supportive of the land reduction; - Change 2F - supportive of the land reduction; and - Change 6 - unsure on the compulsory acquisition and the extent to which this might alter the Book of Reference and welcomes omission from permanent acquisition but would note that if it is removed, it is difficult to see the justification over adjacent plots. 	<p>The Applicant intends to arrange a technical review meeting with SABIC where the concerns regarding Change 6 can be explored further. However, it notes that Change 6 relates to the scope of works within compounds, not the extent or size of those compounds.</p> <p>Change 6 only includes changes to the types and quantum of works planned at the Temporary Construction Compounds, however, the order limits remain unchanged as a result of these as these areas are required to facilitate the construction of the Proposed Development.</p>
Anglo American	07/10/2024	<p>Raised an objection with specific comments provided on the following proposed changes:</p>	<p>The parties have been engaged in technical discussions with Anglo</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change 2E - supportive of the land reduction; - Change 9 - supportive of the land reduction, however it is unclear what bp is proposing for the remainder of their land in the works plan and request clarification; - Seeking clarification of the extent of the Order Limits at Bran Sands frontage - Seeking clarification on the proposed approach for the micro tunnel and impact on the consented dredge pocket. <p>Comment that overall, the proposed changes do not reflect the full extent of discussions with bp.</p>	<p>American regarding the Net Zero Teesside scheme including proposals for H2Teesside. Proposals for the use of land after removal of the AGI have been discussed with Anglo American but not yet formalised. Discussions are ongoing regarding the Brans Sands frontage and the micro tunnel landing location / dredge pocket. The Applicant is working on solutions to allow the projects to co-exist. A technical meeting between the parties is planned for the 21st October 2024. Ultimately Anglo American’s interests will be protected through the anticipated Protective Provisions and Side Agreement.</p>
Net Zero North Sea Storage Limited	07/10/2024	<p>Specific comments supporting Change 2C and 2D noting they support the project as it is a proposed anchor emitter project for the NEP CO2 Transportation and Storage system.</p> <p>Whilst strongly supportive of the Project, Net Zero North Sea Storage Limited raised concerns regarding</p>	<p>The Applicant will continue to work closely with NEP to reach Agreement and/or Protective Provisions.</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<p>land, programme and engineering interactions but note that positive discussion are ongoing to seek a mutual resolution and expresses confidence that agreement will be reached directly with the Applicant in respect of these concerns.</p> <p>In the event an agreement is not reached with bp, NEP will require that appropriate protections are included within the H2Teesside DCO.</p>	

Table 5-4 Summary of consultation responses received from the local community

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
Community response #1, #2, #3 and #12– feedback form	06/09/2024	Raised concerns about the potential of the Proposed Development to negatively affect the health and safety of local residents and specific concern around safety of the additional flare proposed as part of Change 1.	<p><u>Health and Safety of local residents</u></p> <p>Safety is bp’s number one priority. The Proposed Development will be regulated by the Health and Safety Executive in line with the processes set out in the Major Accidents and Disasters chapter of the ES (APP-073) and the mechanisms set out in Appendices 20B and 20C (APP-218 and APP-219).</p> <p>The potential effects of Change 1 have been assessed as part of the Change Application Request in relation to air quality, human health and major accidents and disasters. The air quality assessment can be found in Appendix 1 of the Change Report; this assessment concludes that the additional flare will not lead to new likely significant effects. Human health effects more generally in relation to the additional flare were screened out of further environmental assessment as the magnitude of change is considered to have no difference to that assessed in the original Environmental Statement, where air quality was identified to be not significant in the operational stage. Finally, with regards to major accidents and disasters, the additional flare is considered to be a beneficial change to the Proposed Development because it would route gas to be flared to two locations rather than one, thereby minimising the volume of gas in either system.</p>
Community response #2, #8, #9, #10	07/09/2024	Additionally raised questions as to why there is the use of blue hydrogen over green hydrogen.	As set out in the Applicant’s response to the Rule 6 Letter (PDA-020), the NPS EN-1 is clear that both green and blue hydrogen is required to achieve low carbon hydrogen production required for net zero (paragraphs 3.4.12 and

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
and #12– feedback form			<p>3.4.15). This is reflected in the Government’s Hydrogen Route Map which recognises that blue hydrogen is based on established technology that is suited to larger production volumes and is important in scaling up hydrogen production into the 2030s. In this context, the Applicant is not obligated to consider green hydrogen as an alternative technology option for the Proposed Development – there is strong policy support for blue hydrogen and the Applicant is focused on delivering a project that meets this critical national priority need.</p> <p>Producing green hydrogen relies on the availability of a sufficient, reliable supply of low carbon electricity, produced via methods such as wind and solar power. The current scale at which renewable and low carbon energy is produced, presents significant challenges to producing green hydrogen at an industrial scale, in the timescales in which it is required.</p> <p>Blue hydrogen is a necessary and low-cost option, which can make use of existing infrastructure across the Teesside region, advancing the UK’s energy transition. Further information is set out in the Applicant’s Planning Statement [APP-031], and Need Statement [APP-033].</p>
Community response #3, #10, #12 and #13 – email response	07/09/2024	<p>Additionally raised concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential odours from the Proposed Development; and 	<p><u>Nuisance and odours</u></p> <p>We have prepared an Environmental Statement, to understand the potential impacts of the Project, including odour. Our assessment found that there will not be any odour emissions during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Whilst we have identified there could be potential odour release sources involved in the operation, we will have appropriate</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proximity of their house to the pipeline. 	<p>storage and regular monitoring on place to control odours while the project is in operation. This does not change as a result of any of the proposed Changes to the DCO Application.</p> <p><u>Proximity of pipelines to residential properties</u></p> <p>The Proposed Development (including pipelines) will be developed in consultation with the HSE and in compliance with all applicable codes, standards, specifications and regulatory requirements. The primary governmental requirements are set out in the Pipeline Safety Regulations (1996) and its associated guide produced by HSE (Appendix 1 of REP2-032). The governing pipeline design code is the Institution of Gas Engineers and Managers (IGEM) technical directive 1, edition 6, Supplement 2 (IGEM/TD/1 Ed.6 Supp.2): ‘High Pressure Hydrogen Pipelines’, 2021. This supplement gives additional requirements and qualifications for the transmission of Hydrogen above the requirements in IGEM/TD/1, and its recent date of issue (2021) means it represents latest industry best practice and knowledge. Guidance from other relevant documents will also be considered, but with an order of precedence below the governing design code including BSI PD 8010-1 Pipeline Systems and ASME B31.12 Hydrogen Piping & Pipelines. This will ensure ALARP safety risks arise from the chosen pipeline routes.</p>
Community response #4 – feedback form	07/09/2024	Raised concerns about the potential impact of the Proposed Development on the environment and local ecosystems, with specific	With regards to the marsh land at Greatham Creek, through the early stages of the Proposed Development design, discussions between the Applicant and the Environment Agency took place to identify how best to design the pipeline to avoid impacts on the Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites. This initially led to the Proposed Development design to use horizontal directional drilling (HDD), at a depth greater than 10m below the

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		reference to potential impacts on the marsh land at Greatham.	watercourse, adjacent to the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area. With mitigation in place this was identified to have a not significant effect on surface water, flood risk and water resources [APP-061] and not significant effect on ecology and nature conservation [APP-064]. Change 2F now removes the requirement for HDD altogether and therefore this activity will now no longer occur.
Community response #5 – feedback form	09/09/2024	Raised concerns about the location of the Proposed Development – suggested the project should be relocated ‘elsewhere’.	<p>The low carbon hydrogen produced by the Proposed Development would be supplied via a new hydrogen pipeline network to existing businesses on Teesside. Replacing the natural gas currently used by those industries will help industries on Teesside to reduce their CO2 emissions.</p> <p>The Proposed Development supports the Government’s clustering approach to the development of hydrogen and low carbon infrastructure, being located next to the carbon capture network being developed by the Northern Endurance Partnership whilst delivering low carbon alternatives to the ‘hard to decarbonise’ surrounding businesses on Teesside.</p>
Community response #6 – feedback form	10/09/2024	<p>Raised a series of specific questions related to Change 2A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the need for the use of the additional land; - whether hydrogen is being imported into the AGI; - whether extraction of Natural Gas will occur; and 	<p><u>Need for the use of the additional land</u></p> <p>Change 2A to remove two parcels of land located to the north and east of Cowpen Bewley Village would reduce the extent of the Order Limits by 2.5 hectares, thereby reducing the land required for the project. The only addition of land in the proposed changes is Change 8 which is the inclusion of additional land for the Natural Gas pipeline. This change would result in the requirement for an additional 1.8 hectares of land to be added to the Order Limits. This change involves us seeking additional powers to acquire rights to operate and maintain the gas pipeline, both within the additional 1.8</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whether it is bp’s intention for the hydrogen to be used for domestic premises. 	<p>hectares of land which would be added to the Order Limits and within the parts of the existing Order Limits where the gas pipeline is located. This is the only proposed change that we are consulting on, that requires additional land.</p> <p><u>Whether hydrogen is being imported into the AGI</u></p> <p>The AGI is to enable a connection to local gas networks, the national gas transmission system and Project Union at the AGI, to facilitate the blending of natural gas with low carbon hydrogen.</p> <p><u>Whether extraction of Natural Gas will occur</u></p> <p>No extraction of natural gas will be undertaken as part of the Proposed Development.</p> <p><u>Whether Hydrogen will be used for domestic premises</u></p> <p>It is proposed that the low carbon hydrogen to be produced by H2Teesside will be used for use in industrial applications in Teesside and potentially for blending with natural gas at Billingham or Cowpen Bewley. Whether hydrogen is to be used for domestic heating purposes is a decision Government will make separately, and which is not linked to the decision on the Proposed Development.</p>
Community response #7 – feedback form	11/09/2024	General objection to the project, but no specific reasons or comments provided.	Noted. No action required.

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
Community response #8 and #12– letter	18/09/2024	Also expressed concerns about the potential environmental impact and cost of the project.	<p><u>Environmental impact</u></p> <p>We have undertaken an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to understand the potential impact of the Proposed Development and identify ways in which significant impacts can be avoided, reduced or mitigated. The results of this are presented in the Environmental Statement, with only localised ecological residual adverse effects identified for the Proposed Development alone.</p> <p><u>Cost</u></p> <p>The Applicant has made a decision to proceed with the Proposed Development based on a number of commercial, financial and technical considerations. This should also be seen in the context of the Proposed Development having been successful in the Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Clustering process, meaning that the Government has already determined that this is a feasible project.</p> <p>Section 8 of the Planning Statement [APP-031], and the Need Statement [APP-033] outlines the substantial benefits of the Proposed Developments such as responding to the urgent need for low carbon hydrogen production; the contribution toward energy and climate change policy objectives and net zero by 2050 while also delivering substantial economic benefits to the local and regional economy such as employment (direct and indirect) and supply chain opportunities. Importantly, the Proposed Development would help local industries to decarbonise their operations through offtake agreements to safeguard existing jobs and businesses in Teesside and help to attract new businesses to the region.</p>

CONSULTEE	DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED	SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED	REGARD HAD TO COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES
Community response #11 – email response	06/10/2024	General objection to the Project, but no specific reasons or comments provided.	Noted. No action required.
Community response #13 – email response	07/10/2024	Highlighted specific concerns related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implications of the field system at Cowpen Bewley; - Heritage impacts; - Construction and traffic access to the compound north of Cowpen Bewley; - Impact on the woodland near Cowpen Bewley; and - Lack of clarity on the plans for the gas network beyond the station. 	<p>The change proposed as part of the Changes Application at Cowpen Bewley reduces the amount of land required close to Cowpen Bewley. It does not change any conclusions of the assessment of impacts at Cowpen Bewley reported in the ES.</p> <p>No significant impacts are expected to arise from the traffic movements associated with the works at the Cowpen Bewley AGI. Impacts to the woodland are reported (but are compensated through the proposed Replacement Cowpen Bewley Woodland Park land). No significant impacts are reported to the setting of the Cowpen Bewley Conservation Area as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The response to FWQs 1.2.6-1.2.8 (REP2-20) explain the benefits of the connection at the Cowpen Bewley AGI and the options that are being explored.</p>

5.1.3 In addition to the formal responses to the consultation set out in Tables 1 and 2 above, a total of nine enquiries were also received during the consultation period from members of the public either via email or the project phone line. These enquiries were seeking additional information on how to access the consultation documentation, clarification on how to respond to the consultation or asking general questions about the project and have therefore not been treated as formal responses to the consultation. Where possible responses were provided to all enquiries received during the consultation period to help people better understand the Proposed

Development, the changes on which we were consulting and how to respond to this consultation. Where enquiries were received towards the end of the consultation period, responses were provided as quickly as possible.

APPENDICES

REFER to Document Reference 7.6 'Consultation Statement Appendices'