

Lower Thames Crossing

9.152 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2 Appendix D – 6, 7, 8

Infrastructure Planning (Examination
Procedure) Rules 2010

Volume 9

DATE: October 2023
DEADLINE: 6

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR010032
Examination Document Ref: TR010032/EXAM/9.152

VERSION: 1.0

Lower Thames Crossing

9.152 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2

Appendix D – 6, 7, 8

List of contents

	Page number
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
2 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2 6	2
3 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2 7	9
4 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2 8	10

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared by the Applicant to set out its responses to the ExQ2 - Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information (ExQ2) [[PD-040](#)].
- 1.1.2 These can be found in Tables set out under the following headings:
- a. Climate Change and carbon emissions (Found in Appendix A)
 - b. Traffic and transportation (Found in Appendix B)
 - c. Air quality (Found in Appendix C)
 - d. Geology and soils (Found in Appendix D)
 - e. Tunnelling considerations (Found in Appendix D)
 - f. Waste and materials (Found in Appendix D)
 - g. Noise and vibration (Found in Appendix E)
 - h. Road Drainage, water environment and flooding (Found in Appendix F)
 - i. Biodiversity (Found in Appendix G)
 - j. Physical effects of development and operation (Found in Appendix H)
 - k. Social, economic and land-use considerations (Found in Appendix I)
 - l. The acquisition and temporary possession of land and rights (Found in Appendix J)
 - m. General overarching questions (Found in Appendix J)

2 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2 6

PINS ID	Question to:	Question / Response
ExQ2_Q6.1.1	Applicant	<p>Ground water effects on designated sites</p> <p>The Ramsar Advanced Grouting Tunnel and Main Tunnels Numerical Model – Technical Report and Groundwater Methodology Report included in 9.89 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ1 Appendix G – 11. Biodiversity (Part 2 of 6) [REP4-195] provides the output from the model considering the flows for the main and grouting tunnels concluding that inflow rates are expected to be low, however the drawdown has the potential to affect land that is a reasonable distance to the east of the line of the tunnels (1,500m), albeit it is concluded that there is limited possibility of a significant direct effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What difference would be likely if a perched water table is encountered? • What is the probability of saline water being encountered and drawn into the tunnelling area that requires to be dealt with? • Disposal of water drawn into the tunnelling area is suggested to be to watercourses that feed into the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – What is considered to be the effect of such a discharge on the designated site? – Are there circumstances in which other means of disposal would be required in order to avoid adverse effects on the designated site? – What monitoring measures are in place to address the disposal of water drawn into the tunnelling area? • Should monitoring show that the discharge of water is causing an adverse effect, can the Applicant confirm what alternative methods exist to dispose of the water and how these are secured? <p>Response:</p> <p>The Applicant would like to clarify that the <i>Ramsar Advanced Grouting Tunnel and Main Tunnels Numerical Model – Technical Report and Groundwater Methodology Report</i> referenced within the first paragraph of the question formed the basis of initial consultation and technical engagement with Natural England and the Environment Agency. This has been superseded by ES Appendix 14.5 [APP-458] in which Annex J comprises the latest Ground Protection Tunnel and Main Tunnels Groundwater Model - Technical Note. It should be noted that no dewatering at the South Portal is proposed. The queried drawdown is superseded as a result of the movement of the proposed South Portal further south and no drawdown is expected to occur at a distance of 1,500m. Please refer to ES Appendix 14.5 [APP-458] in which Annex J Plate 3.3 shows the predicted small</p>

PINS ID	Question to:	Question / Response
		<p>drawdown from the ground protection tunnel and Plate 3.5 of the same annex, shows the predicted small drawdown in the alluvium from the main tunnel. These show the modelled drawdown based on the DCO application design of the tunnels. Even conservative leakage rates into the tunnels, greater than would be allowed by the Lower Thames Crossing tunnelling specification, show similarly small drawdowns (ES Appendix 14.5 [APP-458] Annex J Plate 3.4 and Plate 3.6).</p> <p><i>‘What difference would be likely if a perched water table is encountered?’</i></p> <p>In response, a perched water table is typically described as an accumulation of groundwater that is above the water table in the unsaturated zone. This would most often be where water is trapped above an impermeable layer. The three phases of ground investigation at the Ramsar have encountered shallow water in natural ground and continuously saturated soils and rock beneath. The low permeability silty clay alluvium acts to separate and confine the underlying gravel and chalk aquifers from the shallow water system of the Ramsar site. However, there is no evidence for perched water tables underlain by layers of unsaturated strata. It is important to note that the modelled drawdown from the DCO application design of the tunnels is small; in lateral extent and in magnitude as shown in ES Appendix 14.5 [APP-458] Annex J Plate 3.3 and Plate 3.5 (introduced in the above response). This is because of Project commitments that would reduce the need for groundwater dewatering during construction and would reduce seepage of groundwater into the tunnels during operation. These commitments are contained in ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan [REP5-048] and comprise REAC references RDWE018a, RDWE020 and RDWE027. Therefore, even if there were perched water tables, no significant change to the modelled drawdowns would be expected. The assessment presented in ES Appendix 14.5 [APP-458] Annex J shows that the tunnelling work would result in groundwater drawdown effects that would be negligible or undetectable in the field.</p> <p><i>‘What is the probability of saline water being encountered and drawn into the tunnelling area that requires to be dealt with?’</i></p> <p>The tunnelling method of the highway bored tunnels would comprise a closed faced method (secured through Project commitment RDWE059 of the updated ES Appendix 2.2: Code of Construction Practice [REP5-048]), which would reduce groundwater ingress into the tunnel face so that groundwater would not be drawn into the tunnelling area. The erection of a waterproof segmental concrete lining within the tunnel-boring machine (TBM) shield as part of the tunnelling process, for both the ground protection tunnel and the main tunnel, would ensure negligible leakage into the completed tunnel behind. In addition, please note that ES Appendix 14.5 [APP-458] Annex J presents the results of saline intrusion modelling from both during</p>

PINS ID	Question to:	Question / Response
		<p>construction and during operation. The modelling shows the movement of the saline water interface would be negligible.</p> <p>Referring to the third set of questions, the ExA asks about '<i>disposal of water drawn into the tunnelling area (which) is suggested to be to watercourses that feed into the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site Area</i>'.</p> <p>In response to the question text relating to '<i>the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site Area</i>', the responses below assume that reference should be made to the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site and South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI, both of which are south of the River Thames and in proximity to the proposed tunnelling.</p> <p>To clarify, the Applicant does not propose to dispose of water from the tunnelling works to watercourses that feed the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site and South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI.</p> <p>For the main tunnel, any water ingress from construction of the tunnel would be treated as part of the TBM slurry circuit as described in the Applicant's response to ExQ1_Q10.4.1 in Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ1 Appx F: 10. Road Drainage, Water Environment & Flooding [REP4-193]. Treatment of the main tunnel TBM slurry would be at the North Portal and not south of the Thames.</p> <p>For the ground protection tunnel, if constructed, volumes of water entering the tunnel during construction would be small and mostly comprise water from the wet construction of the two shafts. No slurry would be created by tunnelling of the ground protection tunnel due to the type of TBM envisaged to be used. Water ingress into the ground protection tunnel would be very small (joint leakage only). Water from construction of the shafts or construction of the tunnel would be collected and conveyed to pit bottom for extraction and then disposed of by collection and removal offsite for disposal at a licensed treatment centre. In addition, the Contractor would agree the use of any chemical additives proposed for tunnelling with the Environment Agency in order to protect the water environment, prior to commencement of tunnelling. This is secured through RDWE019, which will be subject to an update at Deadline 7. Any water that collects from small leakages from the completed ground protection tunnel would be collected and removed by suitable means.</p> <p><i>'What is considered to be the effect of such a discharge on the designated site?'</i></p> <p>As stated above, the Applicant does not propose to dispose of water from the tunnelling works to watercourses that feed the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site and South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI.</p> <p><i>'Are there circumstances in which other means of disposal would be required in order to avoid adverse effects on the designated site?'</i></p>

PINS ID	Question to:	Question / Response
		<p>As stated above, the Applicant does not propose to dispose of water from the tunnelling works to watercourses that feed the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site and South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI.</p> <p><i>‘What monitoring measures are in place to address the disposal of water drawn into the tunnelling area?’</i></p> <p>As stated above, the Applicant does not propose to dispose of water from the tunnelling works to watercourses that feed the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site and South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI.</p> <p>In response, and as stated above, significant volumes of water would not be drawn into the tunnelling area. Any water ingress from construction of the main tunnel would be treated north of the River Thames, as part of the TBM slurry circuit as described in the Applicant’s response to ExQ1_Q10.4.1 [REP4-193]. All effluents would receive treatment prior to discharge into the Thames to ensure compliance with Environmental Permitting (REAC ref. RDWE023).</p> <p><i>‘Should monitoring show that the discharge of water is causing an adverse effect, can the Applicant confirm what alternative methods exist to dispose of the water and how these are secured?’</i></p> <p>As stated above, the Applicant does not propose to dispose of water from the tunnelling works to watercourses that feed the Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site and South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI and therefore no monitoring is proposed for the discharge of water from the tunnelling works south of the River Thames. Disposal of water from the tunnelling works would be discharged to the River Thames via the northern tunnel entrance compound. This would be subject to the conditions of an environmental permit (RDWE023 and RDWE028 [REP5-048]).</p>
ExQ2_Q6.1.2	Applicant, Environment Agency, Local Authorities	<p>Limitations of existing survey</p> <p>The wording of GS001 in 6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices Appendix 2.2 – Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan [REP5-049] REAC table (Table 7.1) suggests that “... Supplementary ground investigations would be undertaken to assess residual contamination risks ...”.</p> <p>This infers that the position analysed within the ES and supporting documentation may not accurately reflect what is found on site as further ground investigations are deemed necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is being proposed for intrusive ground investigations where contaminated soils are present without drilling being required? How has this been secured? • Should a programme of instrumentation and monitoring, such as suggested in GS003, be appropriate with respect to all cases where contaminated land is present? <p>If so, where would this be secured and appropriately managed?</p>

PINS ID	Question to:	Question / Response
		<p>Response:</p> <p>In response to ‘<i>This infers that the position analysed within the ES and supporting documentation may not accurately reflect what is found on site as further ground investigations are deemed necessary</i>’.</p> <p>The position analysed in the ES and supporting Appendices takes into account a multitude of evidence gathered to identify the potential contaminant linkages using the source-pathway-receptor approach to develop the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) as set out in Environment Agency land contamination risk management (LCRM) guidance¹. Ground investigation forms one of these lines of evidence. The LCRM guidance recommends a tiered assessment process in stages, with increased site-specific understanding required at each level. In response to this the following has been undertaken for the Project to allow the identification of potential sources of contamination and allow an assessment of risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1, Tier 1: preliminary qualitative risk assessment (hazard identification stage) based on a desk-based study of available information to identify potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors. These are presented as a CSM in Appendix 10.6: Preliminary Risk Assessment Report [APP-427] and shows the potentially complete pollutant linkages and the potential risk associated with each linkage. • Stage 1, Tier 2: To assess the risk from the potential pollutant linkages identified in the Preliminary Risk Assessment [APP-427], an intrusive investigation should be used to provide data to inform a Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (GQRA). The GQRA involves the comparison of site-specific results against Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC) for human health and/or controlled water receptors. This is presented in ES Appendix 10.8 Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment Report for the Phase 2 Investigation [APP-429 to APP-432]. • Stage 2, Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3: The Remediation Options Appraisal and Outline Remediation Strategy [REP1-165] falls within Stage 2 of the LCRM guidance and includes the identification, evaluation and selection of feasible remediation options. <p>The potential sources of contamination are identified in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 10: Geology and Soils [APP-148] and supporting appendices. In accordance with the principles of LCRM, the potential contamination sources designated as medium and high risk, were taken forward to the Remediation Options Appraisal and Outline Remediation Strategy [REP1-165]. It is these medium and high-risk contamination sources that are referred to in GS001 that require supplementary ground investigation. The purpose of these supplementary investigations is to inform the detailed remediation design. This falls within Stage 3 of the LCRM guidance to develop the site-specific remediation strategies and implementation plans required</p>

¹ Environment Agency (2023). Land contamination risk management. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm>

PINS ID	Question to:	Question / Response
		<p>following the principles set in the Remediation Options Appraisal and Outline Remediation Strategy [REP1-165] and this will be undertaken by the Contractor.</p> <p>By adopting the LCRM framework, the position analysed within the ES and supporting Appendices provides a robust and appropriate assessment of land contamination risk. Alongside Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) GS001 for supplementary investigation, REAC GS028 will also be implemented, which sets out the actions to take into account in the event that unexpected contamination is discovered during the construction of the Project. This provides a robust mechanism of control to manage uncertainty associated with ground conditions and is a precedented approach to land contamination risk management. This is secured via Requirement 4 and Requirement 6 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP5-024].</p> <p><i>In response to ‘What is being proposed for intrusive ground investigations where contaminated soils are present without drilling being required? How has this been secured?’</i></p> <p>The Applicant assumes this question relates to this wording of REAC GS001 “...If, during further intrusive ground investigations, <u>drilling</u> is required in areas underlain with contaminated soils...”</p> <p>The Applicant clarifies that this does not only apply to “drilling”, but required supplementary investigation would be undertaken in line with industry best practice BS 5930 and BS 10175. The wording will be amended at Deadline 6 to clarify this.</p> <p>The Applicant also clarifies that the scope of the required supplementary investigation will be determined by the Contractor at the detailed design stage, in consultation with the appropriate regulatory authorities, as secured within REAC GS001. The wording of this REAC was amended at DL5 to confirm that the Contractor would provide a scheme of ground investigation design for acceptance of National Highways in consultation with the Environment Agency and relevant local authorities.</p> <p><i>In response to ‘Should a programme of instrumentation and monitoring, such as suggested in GS003, be appropriate with respect to all cases where contaminated land is present? - If so, where would this be secured and appropriately managed?’</i></p> <p>Where instrumentation and monitoring is required relating to land contamination, this is secured by REAC GS027 which relates to the Remediation Options Appraisal and Outline Remediation Strategy [REP1-165]. There is a requirement in the Remediation Options Appraisal and Outline Remediation Strategy [REP1-165] Section 6.5 for a monitoring action plan (MAP) to be compiled by the Contractor prior to any enabling or construction works which will need to be compatible with the nature of the work being undertaken, the identified or potential contamination and the sensitivity of receptors. This is secured via Requirement 4 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP5-024].</p>

PINS ID	Question to:	Question / Response
ExQ2_Q6.1.3	Applicant	<p>Contamination verification</p> <p>GS017 in 6.3 Environmental Statement Appendices Appendix 2.2 – Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan [REP5-049] REAC table (Table 7.1) uses the terminology “...would be available ...”. This suggests that there is an option not to provide the information. If the Health and Safety File noted is the legal document required under The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations, why would this information not be provided?</p> <p>Are there any other instances where this terminology is used where the inference of flexibility could be considered inappropriate?</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The verification reporting information that is relevant to the future operation of the Project would be included in the Health and Safety File. Hazards relating to land contamination that are removed during remedial works would not necessarily be considered relevant to the Health and Safety File and as such would not need to be included.</p> <p>The terminology “...would be available ...”. is only used in commitment in GS017 and not elsewhere in the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC).</p> <p>It should be noted that the word “would” is commonly used throughout the REAC documentation reflecting that it is subject to DCO being awarded. It does not imply the provision of flexibility on the part of the Contractor. The use of “would” thus has the meaning of “will” within the REAC in the event that the DCO is awarded and the control plan comes into effect.</p> <p>A new statement has been added to the updated Code of Construction Practice, First Iteration of Environmental Management Plan REAC [Document Reference 6.3 ES Appendix 2.2 (6)] which will be submitted at Deadline 6, at paragraph 7.2.3 to make it clear that use of the word “would” implies a positive obligation in this context.</p>

3 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2 7

PINS ID	Question to	Question / Response
ExQ2_Q7.1.3	Applicant, Port of London Authority, Port of Tilbury London Ltd, Environment Agency, Marine Management Organisation, Local Authorities	<p>Tunnel Depth Report</p> <p>Please provide an update on any further discussions in respect of the Tunnel Depth Report [REP3-146]. Please set out any outstanding areas of disagreement and what, if any additional or updated controls you would consider to be necessary.</p>
		<p>Response:</p> <p>The Applicant has held further discussions with the Port of London Authority (PLA) following the submission of the Tunnel Depth Report [REP3-146]. Information has been provided to address concerns raised with regard to the proposed tunnel depth and limits of deviation, specifically with regard to the precautionary scour protection and tunnel boring machine face pressures during construction. The Applicant has provided an update to the Tunnel Depth Report [Document Reference 9.73 (2)] at this submission to reflect these discussions.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that the PLA are satisfied with regard to the precautionary assessments of scour protection, and that they agree that the considerations with regard to tunnel boring machine face pressures can be addressed through agreement over the Protective Provisions, specifically paragraph 99, within the draft Development Consent Order [Document Reference 3.1 (8)], which has also been updated at this submission. Further narrative on areas still under discussion is provided in the Applicant's Responses to IP's comments on the draft DCO at Deadline 5 [Document Reference 9.127]. The Applicant has made changes proposed by the PLA, with some modifications, as set out in the revised draft Protective Provisions and is confident that the drafting can be agreed before the end of the Examination.</p>

4 Responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2 8

PINS ID	Question to	Question / Response
ExQ2_Q8.1.3	Applicant, Local Authorities, Port of London Authority	<p>Transportation of materials and waste</p> <p>Please provide an update on any further discussions/agreement in respect of using river transportation for the delivery of materials and removal of waste? In responding, please provide information in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How river transportation could be maximised where it is appropriate; and • Where other transportation would be more efficient given the linear nature of the project? <p>As a result of the responses provided on these points, are there any updates to the Code of Construction Practice (or other control documents) that should be made?</p> <hr/> <p>Response:</p> <p><i>'Update on any further discussions/agreement in respect of using river transportation for the delivery of materials and removal of waste':</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant views the suggested commitments related to river use, both independently and within the context of a multimodal transport strategy, as an efficient approach to material transportation. The Applicant has recently engaged with the Port of London Authority (PLA) regarding their comments on the utilisation of the river for material transportation, as set out in the outline Materials Handling Plan (oMHP) [REP5-050]. These discussions have proven beneficial in identifying potential solutions to address the PLA's concerns. The Applicant is actively engaged in assessing these with the aim of comprehensively addressing the PLA's comments and concerns by Deadline 7. • The Applicant is committed to working collaboratively with the PLA, intending to resolve any outstanding issues related to the use of the river for material transportation. Both parties are dedicated to continuing their engagement, with the shared outcome of progressing towards a resolution and ensuring effective use of the river for material, plant and equipment transportation. <p><i>'How river transportation could be maximised where it is appropriate; and - Where other transportation would be more efficient given the linear nature of the project':</i></p> <p>The Applicant has not ruled out the use of any wharves or riparian facilities. River and or rail transportation would form part of the commitment to maximise a multimodal approach (paragraph 3.4.13 of the oMHP) or the river use commitment.</p>

PINS ID	Question to	Question / Response
		<p>The aim of the oMHP is to maximise use of river and or rail facilities for all materials. This intent is made clear in paragraph 8.3.3 where the commitment is made that <i>'the Project requires the Contractor to consider and implement a multimodal approach to material transport...the MHP...would include an explanation of how multimodal solutions have been included and implemented or discounted.'</i> The principle of multimodal transport is detailed in paragraph 3.4.12 and 3.4.13 of the oMHP as <i>'use of road, water and rail in combination'</i> to minimise reliance on the road network.</p> <p>The Applicant has struck a balance in developing the commitment to river use by maximising the benefits of river usage while keeping a level of flexibility in the absence of a detailed design that would inform the material specification and procurement of that material.</p> <p>The example provided previously and presented here is that of cement. Without the detailed design the grade of cement that would be required is not yet known, however, it is likely to be of a high specification for tunnelling works. The controls mentioned in the paragraphs above mean that the Contractor would have to give careful preferential consideration to the delivery of cement via river or rail facilities, if appropriate quality material were made available via those routes.</p> <p>Updates to the oMHP will be made in coordination with forthcoming engagement with the PLA. The Applicant is aiming to resolve the concerns raised and make the necessary changes by Deadline 7.</p>
ExQ2_Q8.1.4	Applicant, Local Authorities, Environment Agency	<p>Excavated materials</p> <p>With regard to the Outline Materials Handling Plan [REP5-051], the Excavated Materials Assessment [APP-435] and the Code of Construction Practice [REP5-049]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could greater certainty be provided that the quantities of excavated materials would not exceed the estimates? • In the event that quantities did exceed the estimates, what remediation/mitigation could be secured? • Should/could the controls in the Code of Construction Practice be updated to deal with a situation where the quantities were exceeded? <p>Response:</p> <p>The excavated material quantities have been estimated for the bulk earthworks associated with the highway works. Changes to these quantities would only arise due to changes to the highway vertical alignment. This is tightly constrained by the limits of deviation so it is not foreseen that there would be any significant change in quantities. The limit of deviation for the vertical alignment of the highway is a maximum 0.5m upwards and 1.0m downwards as stated in article 6 of the draft Development Consent Order [REP5-024].</p>

PINS ID	Question to	Question / Response
		<p>The excavated material quantities have been estimated for the tunnel works and are derived from the tunnel diameter. There is minimal scope for an increase in diameter (which would result in an increase in excavated material quantities) as this would provide no other benefit to the operational function of the highway. The proposed sizing of the tunnel accounts for the temporary works requirements and operation of the Tunnel Boring Machine. Therefore, it is not foreseen that there would be any significant change in excavated material quantities generated by the tunnelling activities.</p> <p>The Project already secures a requirement to mitigate, manage and treat materials and wastes and the Applicant does not foresee any updates or changes to the controls being required.</p>
ExQ2_Q8.1.5	Applicant, Local Authorities, Environment Agency	<p>Waste hierarchy</p> <p>Could/should the wording in MW007 of the Code of Construction Practice [REP5-049] be strengthened to provide greater certainty that the waste hierarchy will be followed appropriately? Would the use of individual targets for different materials be an appropriate approach?</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The application of the waste hierarchy is a legal requirement, and the Applicant is not proposing that the Contractor disapply or amend the relevant legislation therefore the Contractor will have to demonstrate compliance with the waste hierarchy. The Applicant considers that the wording of MW007 is clear (“Excavated material (and all wastes) would be managed in line with the waste hierarchy.”) and it is legally secured under Requirement 4(2) of the dCO.</p> <p>The Applicant is proposing to strengthen the wording of Project commitment MW007 [REP5-048] and is proposing to add the following text placed at the end of MW007:</p> <p><i>‘... The final option would be disposal and it would be reported in the Construction Site Waste Management Plan that no practicable alternative management route was available.’</i></p> <p>Section 6.4 of the outline Site Waste Management Plan [APP-337] will also be updated to reflect the change of wording in MW007.</p> <p>Both updates would be reflected in the Code of Construction Practice [REP5-048] and outline Site Waste Management Plan [APP-337] at Deadline 6.</p> <p>The Applicant does not believe setting individual material level targets is appropriate. With detailed design yet to be undertaken, there is the potential for unknown ground conditions; this may influence how excavated arisings are used within the Project. Post-DCO permitting consents such as those under the Environmental Permitting Regulations will also likely have an influence on the final waste management approach. The Applicant therefore considers it likely that setting such targets, particularly at an individual material level,</p>

PINS ID	Question to	Question / Response
		would unnecessarily constrain the Contractor. It should also be acknowledged that the Project already has set targets around reuse/recycling/recovery which is commensurate with similar transport-related NSIPs and Hybrid Bill schemes. An additional significant factor is the fact that, for the sustainable use of wastes leaving the site, the Contractor has no control over external forces and market conditions. The Applicant does not want to restrict the Contractor by setting individual material level targets which, with unknown changes in the external market, may dictate that sub-optimal choices are made, such as increased transport of waste, more carbon-intensive solutions, conflict with other post-DCO requirements or higher cost.

If you need help accessing this or any other National Highways information, please call **0300 123 5000** and we will help you.

© Crown copyright 2023.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/

write to the **Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU**, or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Mapping (where present): © Crown copyright and database rights 2023 OS 100030649. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

If you have any enquiries about this publication email info@nationalhighways.co.uk or call **0300 123 5000***.

*Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls.

These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.

Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources when issued directly by National Highways.

Registered office Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ

National Highways Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363