

# 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 H2 Teesside Order

Document Reference: 8.25.2 Response to ExQ2.2 Assessment of Alternatives

Planning Act 2008



**Applicant: H2 Teesside Ltd**

Date: December 2024

---

## DOCUMENT HISTORY

<b>DOCUMENT REF</b>	8.25.2		
<b>REVISION</b>	0		
<b>AUTHOR</b>	DWD		
<b>SIGNED</b>	NC	<b>DATE</b>	18.12.24
<b>APPROVED BY</b>	DWD		
<b>SIGNED</b>	MS	<b>DATE</b>	18.12.24
<b>DOCUMENT OWNER</b>	DWD		

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Overview .....	2
1.2	The Purpose and Structure of this document.....	2

## TABLES

	Table 1-1: Applicant’s Responses to ExQ2 Assessment of Alternatives.....	3
--	--	---

---

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Overview**

1.1.1 This document has been prepared on behalf of H2 Teesside Limited (the 'Applicant'). It relates to an application (the 'Application') for a Development Consent Order (a 'DCO'), that was submitted to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero ('DESNZ') on 25 March 2024, under Section 37 of 'The Planning Act 2008' (the 'PA 2008') in respect of the H2Teesside Project (the 'Proposed Development').

1.1.2 The Application has been accepted for examination. The Examination commenced on 29 August 2024.

### **1.2 The Purpose and Structure of this document**

1.2.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2.2 on Assessment of Alternatives, which were issued on 28 November 2024 [PD-015]. This document contains a table which includes the reference number for each relevant question, the ExA's comments and questions and the Applicant's responses to each of those questions.

**Table 1-1: Applicant’s Responses to ExQ2.2 Assessment of Alternatives**

EXQ2	QUESTION TO:	QUESTION:	RESPONSE
Q2.2.1	Applicant	<p>The ExA notes your response at Q1.2.9 to its First Written Questions (ExQ1) [REP2-020] as well as the updated Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) [CR1-023]. It notes one of the two options proposed for effluent discharge has been removed, committing to the option involving discharge via the NZT outfall at Tees Bay (Case 2B) as the basis of the HRA.</p> <p>Removal of the alternative option (Case 1B) to transport Minimalised Liquid Discharge offsite is not included in the Change Application, but this is not surprising as it does not appear there would be any change to the infrastructure required or controls within the draft DCO arising from its removal. However, the ExA finds it a little confusing that only the Report to Inform HRA [CR1-023] refers to removal of Case 1B when it is still considered in other assessment work, eg the Nutrient Neutrality Assessment [APP-047], Water Framework Directive Assessment [APP-048] and Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 9 Water Resources [APP-061], which have not been updated.</p> <p>Bearing the above in mind, please provide clarification that Case 1B has been removed and provide an explanation as to any implications for the draft DCO and/ or existing assessment work? If required, review the relevant Examination documentation, update it accordingly and enter such updated documentation into the Examination.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that Case 1B (offsite transportation of Minimalised Liquid Discharge) has been entirely removed as an option. This was not included in the Change Application as it merely reflects the selection of the preferred approach, namely discharge via the NZT outfall at Tees Bay (Case 2B), therefore, no update is required for the existing assessment work.</p> <p>Regarding the implications for the draft DCO [REP4-004] and assessment work, the Applicant notes the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The removal of Case 1B has no impact on the infrastructure or controls specified within the draft DCO [REP4-004], as these were designed to accommodate both options.</li> <li>2. The Change Application Report [CR1-044] identified and updated only those chapters and documents where the change had a potential material impact. For Case 1B, no such updates were necessary since both options were considered from the outset, and the assessments already accounted for either approach.</li> </ol> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the ExA’s observation that some existing documents, such as the Nutrient Neutrality Assessment [APP-047], Water Framework Directive Assessment [APP-048], and ES Chapter 9 Surface Water, Flood Risk and Water Resources [APP-061], still reference Case 1B, however, would note that Case 1A forms the basis of these assessments so the removal of Case 1B makes no material difference to the assessments.</p> <p>The Report to Inform HRA was updated in response to NE’s relevant representation on the Proposed Development, with the choice to remove Case 1B simply included as part of this wider update for efficiency purposes.</p>