

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: 8.46 Responses to Questions in the Rule 17 Letter dated 10 February 2025

Planning Act 2008



Applicant: H2 Teesside Ltd

Date: February 2025

DOCUMENT HISTORY

DOCUMENT REF	8.46		
REVISION	0		
AUTHOR	DWD		
SIGNED	MS/NC	DATE	17.02.25
APPROVED BY	DWD		
SIGNED	GB	DATE	17.02.25
DOCUMENT OWNER	DWD		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1	Background	2
1.2	The Purpose and Structure of this Document	2
2.0	RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS/ MATTERS RAISED IN THE RULE 17 LETTER.....	3

TABLES

Table 2-1: Applicant’s responses.....	3
---------------------------------------	---

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 RESPONSE TO QUESTION 17

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 This document has been prepared on behalf of H2Teesside 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 This document provides the comments of the Applicant in response to Questions contained in Annex B of the Examining Authority's Rule 17 Letter dated 10th February 2025 [PD-020] and the Rule 17 Letter received on 11th February 2025.

2.0 RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS/ MATTERS RAISED IN THE RULE 17 LETTER

Table 2-1: Applicant's responses

QUESTION	QUESTION TO	QUESTION / MATTER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
1	Applicant and relevant Interested Parties (IP)	In the Deadline (DL) 7 submission, it was detailed that an agreed resolution is not able to be provided for the routing of the hydrogen distribution network through the Saltholme Sub Station site. In light of this, please provide a clear and detailed explanation as to whether it is considered that Compulsory Acquisition (CA) rights can be sought, and the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) tests be satisfied, for all land in the Application, from and including the land at Saltholme Substation north to the Cowpen Bewley Above Ground Installation. This explanation should additionally cover the eventuality that CA rights are not recommended for land owned by National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC at Saltholme Substation as a Statutory Undertaker.	<p>Please see the separate 'Saltholme Interaction Report' submitted alongside this Rule 17 Response document.</p> <p>This report includes the drawings referred to in item 1 of the ExA's Rule 17 Request of 11 February.</p> <p>In response to item 2 of the ExA's Rule 17 Request of 11 February, the Applicant has also submitted a without prejudice version of the draft DCO that provides for the removal of the Cowpen Bewley Spur (as defined by the Rule 17 request, although please not the commentary in section 3 of the Saltholme Interaction Report); if the ExA/Secretary of State do consider that a serious detriment is caused to NGET's interests, even with the compromise solution set out in the Saltholme Interaction Report'.</p> <p>The relevant plans and other certified documents that will be affected by these changes will be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>Please note that these documents show changes north from plot 3/6 – which is the 'mainline' pipeline corridor; as it is from that point that the spur would need to be removed, not just north of the Saltholme Substation. This is because in the scenario that the 'spur' is removed, the Applicant would not need to get to or past the Saltholme Substation from the mainline corridor and so plots to the west and south of the substation would also need to be removed.</p>
2	IPs	The Examining Authority (ExA) would invite all IPs to summarise their position, in regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) any outstanding objection(s); ii) Protective Provisions (PP); iii) CA/ temporary possession; and iv) the status of any side agreement, interface agreement or other relevant agreements they consider necessary to provide relevant protections or mitigations from the Proposed Development. 	n/a
3	Applicant	The ExA would remind the Applicant of the provisions of Section 127 of the PA2008, especially in regard to the matter of 'serious detriment', and notes that the majority of objections from Statutory Undertakers remain, including in relation to reaching finalised agreement on PPs and/ or related side agreements. In the absence of confirmation from relevant Statutory Undertakers in regard to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) withdrawal of outstanding objections; ii) agreeing finalised PPs; and/ or iii) reaching agreement with regard to any side agreements required, the ExA is concerned about the status of PPs, the absence of written confirmation from	<p>The Applicant fully acknowledges the importance of reaching resolution with the Statutory Undertakers and other Affected Parties with whom it is negotiating Protective Provisions and related Side Agreements; and has been working extensively and at speed to seek to reach an agreed position with all parties.</p> <p>As indicated at CAH3, however, these discussions do need to be seen in the context that the Applicant also needs to ensure that a resolved position is appropriate in the circumstances of the authorised development, and not just accepting the positions put forward by Interested Parties.</p>


QUESTION	QUESTION TO	QUESTION / MATTER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
		<p>Statutory Undertakers agreeing those PPs, and a number of side and other agreements not being concluded.</p> <p>In the light of this concern the ExA would urge the Applicant to resolve these matters with Statutory Undertakers as a matter of urgency and would remind the Applicant that it will be unable to consider any matters resolved after the close of the Examination in its Recommendation Report to the Secretary of State. This would include any agreement as to PPs, side agreement, interface agreement or other relevant agreements received after the close of the Examination.</p>	<p>Ensuring this is the case is what has meant that negotiations have still needed to continue to this point, but as stated, the Applicant is working hard to get to an agreed position wherever this is possible.</p>
4	Statutory Undertakers	<p>Please can all Statutory Undertakers state if they consider that the Applicant has satisfied the tests in PA2008 in relation to Statutory Undertakers land where this relates to your undertakings.</p>	n/a
5	Applicant and relevant IPs	<p>Pursuant to the matter highlighted in 3. above, as stated by the ExA at a number of the Hearings, the ExA will not be asking the Secretary of State to decide and consult further on which version of a PP to include in the final Development Consent Order (DCO) if any are not agreed by the close of the Examination. To that end, please can all parties who are negotiating PPs, including the Applicant, provide by DL7a on Monday 17 February 2025 a statement of agreement of a single version of PPs with that agreed version presented to the ExA. If this is not possible please provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your preferred version of PPs which should be highlighted to show where there is disagreement. • Commentary as to the reason for the disagreement and why this disagreement has not been resolved. • Commentary on the potential consequences if this is not resolved in your favour. • Statement of progress on any side agreements. <p>We reiterate that we will not be rewriting PPs, we will be recommending one of the versions which is presented to us by the end of the Examination.</p> <p>All parties will have a further opportunity to comment on DL7a submissions at DL8 on Monday 24 February 2025 with the Applicant's final reply to these comments at DL9 on Friday 28 February 2025.</p> <p>If PPs are subsequently agreed after DL7a and before the close of the Examination, the ExA will accept these as additional submissions at any time between DLs with conformation from both parties that these are indeed an agreed version.</p>	<p>Alongside this Rule 17 response, the Applicant has provided documents individually responding to the vast majority of parties who have sought Protective Provisions to be put into the draft DCO.</p> <p>These documents provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Applicant's preferred version of the Protective Provisions for the relevant Interested Party, with side comments identifying numbered 'Issues'; and • text discussing each numbered Issue, explaining the Applicant's position on matters it understands the relevant Interested Party disagrees with in respect of the Applicant's preferred form, including commentary on why the Applicant considers the consequences of the Interested Parties' position are not acceptable. <p>Additionally, the Applicant has provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a Protective Provisions Position Statement which deals with those parties who do not have individual specific documents (for the reasons given in that statement); and • updated Land Rights Tracker (as requested in the revised Examination timetable), which sets out the on-going engagement/progress with each party.
6	Natural England (NE)	<p>With regard to NE's Key Issue NE3, please confirm you are satisfied with the Assessment of Permanent Loss of Functionally Linked Land (FLL) at Navigator Terminal, which can be located at Appendix A of the Applicant's 'Comments on Submissions received at DL6A' [REP7-024] submitted by Applicant at DL7,? If not please explain why not. Additionally:</p> <p>i. provide any further evidence you hold that supports categorisation of those sectors of</p>	<p>Please see the 'Environmental Position Statement' and the Natural England Statement of Common Ground also submitted at this Deadline. The Applicant understands that NE now agree with the Applicant's position on NE3.</p>

QUESTION	QUESTION TO	QUESTION / MATTER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
		<p>the main site being FLL; and comment on the Applicant's definition of FLL, and any implications for its advice on the main site if this definition is used given the survey shows gull using sectors 9 and 12 outside of wintering season.</p>	
7	Applicant	<p>Please explain the implications of permanent loss of sectors 9 and 12 of the main site if the land were assumed to be FLL, in the wider context of available roosting habitat.</p>	<p>The industrial land immediately south of the River Tees is in a state of constant flux as parts of it are cleared and new structures are built. Sectors 9 and 12 were in occasional use by small numbers of gulls, in particular black-headed and herring gulls, during AECOM's surveys.</p> <p>These species are known to use terrestrial habitats opportunistically, as is the case with these two sectors and some of the adjacent count sectors within Teesworks. They are also known to roost, nest and loaf on the flat or gently sloping roofs of buildings and will readily utilise these and immediately adjacent terrestrial habitats that are close to coastal habitat.</p> <p>Such behaviour was observed on occasion on some of the now-absent former steelworks buildings by surveyors carrying out surveys for Net Zero Teesside, as well as at other sites visited by AECOM surveyors (such as Grimsby docks). We would therefore not regard the construction of the Proposed Development infrastructure on Sectors 9 and 12 as a complete loss of FLL per se (if it was considered to have that status), as it is likely to provide opportunities for gulls to utilise some of the proposed buildings opportunistically.</p> <p>Furthermore, roosting and foraging habitat of higher quality is abundant throughout the wider area, and most is covered by SPA designation, the boundary of which was revised in 2020 specifically to capture the most important areas of land and water used by SPA birds on Teesside.</p> <p>Outside of the SPA boundary the grassland and farmland habitats across Brinefields, Cowpen Bewley and the land west of the railway line toward Greatham are favoured by these and other species.</p> <p>In conclusion, with regard specifically to Sectors 9 and 12, there is no evidence that these are of any more than local level importance (in the context of CIEEM guidance¹) for wetland birds, nor would the losses of the habitats here in their current form result in an effect on either the individual species, the waterbird assemblage or the function and integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA that is greater than negligible, taking into account the likely ongoing use of some of the proposed building infrastructure and surrounding habitats by gulls. The Applicant therefore does not regard this land as playing a key functional supporting role to the SPA in the context of the wider landscape; the actual losses of habitat to built infrastructure for the Proposed Development are in any case unlikely to negate the use of these sectors by herring and black-headed gull; and there are abundant alternative resting places in the wider area, including more optimal habitats.</p>

¹ Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2022). *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal, version 1.2*. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

QUESTION	QUESTION TO	QUESTION / MATTER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
			<p>Therefore, we do not predict the changes to the use of this land in these count sectors to result in significant losses of FLL (if it were considered to be such), and there would be no AEoI to the SPA.</p> <p>It is understood that NE agree with this position.</p>
8	NE	<p>The ExA has not been able to locate any further detailed comments from NE, submitted at DL7, in regard to NE's key Issues NE2, NE10, NE15 and NE17.</p> <p>Please provide NE's detailed comments on NE's Key Issues listed above, which are outstanding or signpost where within NE's examination documentation submitted to date these detailed comments can be located.</p>	<p>The Statement of Common Ground between H2 Teesside Limited and Natural England - Rev 3 submitted for Deadline 7A demonstrates that NE10 and NE15 are agreed with NE and that there is one outstanding query in relation to NE2. The Environmental Position Statement sets out the position with regards to NE17.</p>
9	Applicant	<p>With regard to NE's Key Issue NE7, please submit details of expected maintenance works at the River Tees crossing and how these have been accounted for in the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>Additionally please explain how the development was designed to avoid disturbance impacts to Special Protection Area birds.</p>	<p>Maintenance works of the pipeline corridor, including at the River Tees crossing, is accounted for in the Report to Inform HRA [REP6a-012] at paragraph 4.3.3 whereby it notes that the extent of maintenance would typically involve occasional arrival by vehicle and a walkover visual inspection. Therefore, these isolated activities would not lead to likely significant effects.</p> <p>If necessary, these activities would be conducted approximately once a month by a two-person team using a 4x4 vehicle.</p> <p>As discussed in paragraph 6.7.0 of the HRA, outside of the main site, the predicted noise levels during operation are under 60 dB and thus below the threshold for disturbance. While this may result in some localised displacement while maintenance is happening, any displaced birds will return as soon as maintenance ceases. The nature of bird use across the landscape is that short-term localised disturbance events are part of their normal experience and is one of the reasons birds use multiple areas (including different areas at different times). The proposed development operational activities (including maintenance) in the vicinity of Tees crossing will not result in prolonged and continuous disturbance.</p> <p>Throughout the design evolution of the Proposed Development, there have been numerous refinements to avoid disturbance impacts to Special Protection Area birds, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement of the Order Limits across the Proposed Development site to take into consideration the location of sensitive environmental receptors including the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and avoid direct entry into the SPA. Further detail on this is available in ES Chapter 6: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-058]. This design refinement has avoided direct loss of any part of the SPA. • Pre-existing established pipeline has been considered and utilised in the final pipeline routing to reduce construction impacts where possible [APP-058]. • Change 2.F in the Applicant's First Change Report [CR1-044] removes the requirement for HDD adjacent to the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA. • The use of a micro bored tunnel (MBT) crossing reduces disturbance compared to other installation methods. • In the Report to Inform HRA submitted at Deadline 6A [REP6a-010], the extent of acoustic and visual screening barriers was increased to prevent construction impacts

QUESTION	QUESTION TO	QUESTION / MATTER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
			<p>on bird species following consultation with Natural England (relevant representation NE2 [REP7-024]).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of auger bore piling rather than conventional percussive piling on the main site.
10	Applicant/ The Crown Estate	<p>The ExA notes the Applicant’s updates regard to Crown Consent, during both CAH1 and CAH2. It also notes the Applicant’s oral submissions at CA Hearing 2, contained in [REP6a-018], where it states, “The applicant continues to await comments on the land agreement from the Crown Estate.”.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant/ The Crown Estate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> confirm the outstanding Crown consent(s) has/ have now been obtained, entering a copy of that/ those Crown consent(s) into the Examination; or provide a full and detailed explanation, in writing, as to why the outstanding Crown consent(s) have not been obtained and why the relevant parties have failed to resolve obtaining/ providing the Crown consent within the 6-month Examination period. 	<p>The Applicant sent Heads of Terms to the Crowns appointed agent, Carter Jonas, on the 6th December. These terms included the Crowns standard template document as agreed between the parties. Despite chasing on numerous occasions there has been limited to no engagement with Carter Jonas however the Applicant, their appointed agent, a representative from the Crown and Carter Jonas met on 11th February to discuss the terms and timetable to reaching agreement on the Heads of Term’s and the completeness of the Option Documents.</p> <p>It was confirmed at the meeting that the Head of Term’s were largely agreed and a few clarifications are required until this matter can be passed into legals. Both parties agreed that it is realistic to have the Heads of Term’s agreed prior to the end of examination.</p> <p>The Crown have confirmed that the Section 135 consent process will be started once the matter has been passed to the Lawyers</p>
11	The Mission to Seafarers	<p>In the light of your submissions [RR-050] and [REP5-093] the ExA sort an update with regard to consultation between the Applicant and yourselves during the second CA Hearing. The applicants oral response is set out in [REP6a-018] (see Applicants response to Agenda Item 2 and Action Point CAH2-AP12). The ExA would ask whether the Applicant’s response, including adding the following paragraph to its Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP7-009] satisfies your concerns and enables you to remove your concerns/ objections to the Proposed Development. Paragraph included by the Applicant into the CEMP:</p> <p><i>“The Applicant must seek to minimise the interference with or suspension of rights of access during the construction of the authorised development, including those held by the Mission to Seafarers. The Applicant must notify any party whose rights of access may be affected by the authorised development prior to their access being affected, and provide, except in an emergency, and where reasonably practicable, a diversion route for their access requirements whilst their existing route is affected. The Applicant must keep any party whose rights of access are affected by the authorised development regularly updated as to when the interference or suspension of rights is likely to be lifted and notify them without undue delay when the interference or suspension of rights is lifted.”.</i></p> <p>(See CEMP [REP7-009] Table 8.8 on page 68).</p>	n/a
12	Environment Agency (EA)	<p>In your DL6 submission [REP6-008] the EA refer to progress on PPs being prepared by its legal team. A further update in regard to this matter was provided at DL7 [REP7-037]. Please enter a copy of the EA’s preferred PPs, which have been supplied to the Applicant, into the Examination.</p>	<p>The Applicant has, alongside this Rule 17 response set out the Protective Provisions it received from the EA, with the Applicant’s mark-up and reasoning for why it has proposed the minor amendments it has put to the EA (as reflected in the DCO submitted at Deadline 7). Comments from the EA are awaited on these revisions, but the Applicant is aiming for all matters to be resolved prior to the end of Examination.</p>

QUESTION	QUESTION TO	QUESTION / MATTER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
13	Applicant	<p>The ExA notes your DL7 submissions Covering Letter [REP7-001] where you indicate you are submitting an agreed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the United Kingdom Health Security Agency (UKHSA). Your letter also states <i>“The UKHSA advises it does not sign third party SOCG documents but has confirmed its agreement to the SOCG.”</i> Please provide evidence of the UKHSA’s agreement to the DL7 submitted version of the SoCG completed with it.</p>	<p>Please see below a copy of the email dated 6 February 2025 at 15:18 from the UK Health Security Agency confirming final confirmation of their agreement with the SoCG. The email addresses have been redacted.</p> <hr/> <p>From: Nsipconsultations [REDACTED] Sent: 06 February 2025 15:18 To: Geoff Bullock [REDACTED] Cc: Nsipconsultations [REDACTED] Subject: RE: UK Health Security Agency’s Response - H2 Teesside Project - Updated Draft Statement of Common Ground</p> <p>Dear Geoff</p> <p>Thank you for your follow-up email regarding the SoCG. UKHSA does not sign third party SoCG documents, we have always provided comments on the SoCG as needed, confirming agreement or otherwise and then provided confirmation of our position in a covering letter on behalf of the organisation. This has always been acceptable in terms of response by PINS. Please do take our response provided so far as the final confirmation of our agreement with the SoCG.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>  <p>Ms Carol Richards NSIP Admin Team Environmental Hazards and Emergencies Department Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards UK Health Security Agency [REDACTED]</p> <p>www.gov.uk/ukhsa Follow us on Twitter @UKHSA</p>
14	UKHSA	<p>The Applicant in its DL7 Covering Letter [REP7-001] advises the SoCG with the UKHSA [REP7-035] is as finally agreed with you. However, it also states <i>“The UKHSA advises it does not sign third party SOCG documents but has confirmed its agreement to the SOCG.”</i> As such, please confirm that the Applicant SoCG with the UKHSA, as submitted at DL7, has been finally agreed with you.</p>	n/a
15	Applicant and IPs with whom the Applicant is seeking to enter into a SoCG with.	<p>The ExA has revised the Examination timetable in relation to the submission of final versions of SoCG (ie signed and dated versions of the document) to DL7A (Monday 17 February 2025). Should it not be possible to submit final SoCG by DL7A, the Applicant and relevant IPs are asked to provide, by the same DL, a detailed explanation as to why it has not been possible to provide a final SoCG, including specifying the areas where disagreement remains.</p>	<p>Please see the Deadline 7A Cover Letter for an update on the position with Statements of Common Ground.</p>
16	Anglo American	<p>The ExA notes your DL7 submission [REP7-042], which includes your preferred PPs for our consideration. We also note your comments in regarding Schedule 3 of the draft DCO. In the light of these comments and, in the absence of a response from the Applicant regarding a draft side agreement to reflect the proposed technical arrangements at points of project interface (defined as ‘Shared Areas’), the ExA would ask Anglo American to submit its preferred form of wording for Schedule 3 of the DCO.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that following a technical meeting on 23 January, it will be returning the Side Agreement to Anglo American this week. It also notes that the Side Agreement that it received from Anglo American was, understandably, subject to a number of ‘holds’, which reflects the overall approach of the parties (as discussed at the CAHs) to seek to agree technical matters first before undertaking substantive drafting. Now that those technical meetings have happened that substantive drafting can meaningfully progress.</p>

QUESTION	QUESTION TO	QUESTION / MATTER	APPLICANT RESPONSE
			<p>The Applicant also notes that it inserted Schedule 3 into the DCO at Deadline 5. However the Applicant is yet to receive Anglo American's comments on Schedule 3 or its preferred version of that Schedule. The Applicant understands that Anglo American is going to submit its preferred version of Schedule 3 into examination at Deadline 7A.</p> <p>In this context, the Applicant has submitted Protective Provisions Position Statements in respect of both Schedule 3 and the PPs for Anglo American's benefit, setting out the Applicant's position on both of these schedules absent an Agreement between the parties, and understands that Anglo American will be doing the same. This will enable the ExA to come to a view, if that is required, however both parties are looking to negotiate an agreed resolution.</p>
17	Applicant	<p>The Applicant's 'Technical Note for the Implications of Change 3 on Cultural Heritage [REP7-013], submitted at DL7, indicates <i>"The results of the investigation were shared with Tees Archaeology in December 2024 and January 2025..."</i> and states <i>"...a suitable programme of archaeological mitigation was agreed in e-mail exchanges on the 14th, 17th, 20th and 22nd of January 2025."</i> Please submit copies of these e-mail exchanges into the Examination.</p>	<p>The correspondence referred to in the Inspectorate's Question 17 is submitted as Appendix 1 to this document.</p>
18	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council/ Tees Archaeology	<p>Please confirm you agree with the findings and conclusions set out in paragraph 1.3 (Results and Mitigation) of the Applicant's 'Technical Note on the Implications of Change 3 on Cultural Heritage' [REP7-013], submitted at DL7, and that a suitable programme of archaeological mitigation referred to in that Technical Note has been agreed by you.</p>	n/a

APPENDIX 1 RESPONSE TO QUESTION 17

From [REDACTED]
S [REDACTED]
T [REDACTED]
S [REDACTED]

H [REDACTED]

Thanks for the update – I'm not as well acquainted with the DCO process as I would like to be.

I do have more detail on the anti-glider posts and their locations, but the report is still confidential at the moment. However, I have emailed to see if I can share it with you, as I think it would be useful for you to see; I'm just waiting to hear back about this.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

(Planning)

Please note I usually work Tuesday to Friday

Tees Archaeology
Sir William Gray House
Clarence Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8BT

[REDACTED]

<https://teesarchaeology.com/>

From [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Su [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks for the quick response, much appreciated. I've asked Wessex to amend the report and that'll come back to you shortly for final sign-off and I expect we'll be submitting it to PINS at the next submission deadline.

I've asked our legal advisors on how best to secure the detailed mitigation you mentioned below, but, just to manage expectations, your request for an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy in your response to PINS a few weeks was turned down by BP's legal team. The reasoning seemed to be that there was nothing overly contentious and that the DCO requirement was sufficient to secure pre-construction work without a need for an AMS at submission. The evaluation and earthworks survey are therefore still secured through the DCO requirement for a WSI to be approved prior to works starting.

My aim is to get some updated wording in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) at the next submission deadline that will secure avoiding the archaeology and using bog mats in the 'teacup handle'. I've asked for more information on the Venator site connection and I'll try to get something secured in the CEMP for that as well. The plan is to drill below the creek, so it'll be a question of ensure the receiving pit and open-cut don't impact the glider posts. On that note, do you have any more detail as to where those anti-glider posts are located? The HER isn't particularly detailed and only consists of a single point with the description:

"A series of concrete anti landing glider posts occupy the site to the south and east of the Venator plant. Associated with the Command Post, Generator House and Bombing Decoy Site to the south."

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Associate Director - Archaeology and Heritage

[REDACTED]

Fr [REDACTED]
S [REDACTED]
To [REDACTED]
Su RE: H2Teesside Geophysical Survey Report

[REDACTED]

Thanks for sending that through.

A few points on the report:

- The report keeps referring to the 'Lead Archaeologist' at Tees Archaeology. None of us here at Tees Archaeology have that title, and I would appreciate it being [REDACTED] the Tees Archaeology Team Leader and approved the WSI when I was on leave in May/June, while I dealt with the project otherwise (title – Archaeologist (Planning)).
- The stratigraphic evidence has [203] as prehistoric, but the later conclusions have the feature as prehistoric/Romano-British. There should be consistency regarding this.

I'm satisfied with the proposed mitigation measures for the 'teacup handle'. Would it be possible get an earthworks survey done in the relevant fields around Cowpen Bewley to mitigate for the impact of the development on the ridge and furrow in this area? I'm also trying to work out if any of the temporary compound area to the south extends east beyond previously investigated/disturbed areas; if it does, I would recommend a watching brief in those parts given its proximity to the Romano-British settlement (from which human remains were recovered).

Further afield from the western corridor – the proposed development needs to take care during the works near Venator to remove/minimise impact on the anti-glider posts. Not quite enough detail (unless I haven't found the right figure yet? There are that many documents...) to work out if any are proposed to be impacted at the moment.

As previously discussed below, we would want to evaluate the mitigation planting area to the north of Cowpen Bewley before other on-site works take place, to determine the most appropriate mitigation (if needed).

Hope this makes sense – let me know what is or isn't feasible.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Archaeologist (Planning)

Please note I usually work Tuesday to Friday

Tees Archaeology
Sir William Gray House
Clarence Road
Hartlepool
TS24 8BT

[REDACTED]

<https://teesarchaeology.com/>

Fr [REDACTED]
Se [REDACTED]
To [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: H2Teesside Geophysical Survey Report

[REDACTED]

Please find attached the final evaluation report for your review.

Please let me know if you're still satisfied with the mitigation we discussed below – ie. moving the works as far west as possible in the 'teacup handle', use bog mats for the access track and other works, and that any intrusive works in the area of the enclosure would be monitored. There may be an opportunity to drill below the field as well, so I'll explore that. Am I right in understanding that we wouldn't need to monitor intrusive works along the western end of the corridor or further away from the geophys/trial trenching remains?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Associate Director - Archaeology and Heritage

[REDACTED]