

**Application by Port of Tilbury London Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for a Proposed Port Terminal at the Former Tilbury Power Station ('Tilbury2')**

**The Examining Authority's Agendas for Issue Specific Hearing, 18 April 2018**

**Issued on 11 April 2018**

The following appendix sets out the Examining Authority (ExA)'s (the Panel's) agenda for the Issue Specific Hearing on Planning Policy and Environmental Matters on Wednesday 18 April 2018 from 10:00. The hearing will take place at the Thurrock Hotel, Ship Lane, RM19 1YN.

The topics to will include but not necessarily be limited to:

From 10:00-13:00:

- general and cross-topic questions
- planning policy
- noise and vibration
- cumulative/ in-combination effects

From 14:00-17:00:

- historic environment
- landscape and visual impacts
- biodiversity/ terrestrial and marine ecology/ HRA PH
- dredging and navigation

The questions indicate to which party or parties each agenda item is directed. The Panel would be grateful if all parties named would prepare themselves to respond to all agenda items directed to them or indicate that the agenda item is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent a response being provided to an agenda item by a party to whom it is not directed, should the agenda item be relevant to their interests.

Each agenda item has a unique reference number in which the first part of the number indicates the topic, and for consistency this follows the topic numbers from the first written questions (FROs). So, for example the second question on noise and vibration will be designated 16.2.

When you follow-up your oral response to an agenda item at the hearings by your subsequent written response, please start your response by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of agenda items, responses in a letter will suffice. If you are responding to a larger number of agenda items, it will assist the Panel if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [Tilbury2@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Tilbury2@pins.gsi.gov.uk) and include 'Tilbury2 ExA Hearings Round 2 Agendas' in the subject line of your email.

Written responses are due by **Deadline 3 – Monday 30 April 2018**.

### Abbreviations used

<b>PoTLL</b>	Port of Tilbury London Limited	<b>SoCG</b>	Statement of Common Ground
<b>WR</b>	Written Representation	<b>dDCO</b>	Draft Development Consent Order
<b>TC</b>	Thurrock Council	<b>EMCP</b>	Ecological Mitigation and Compensation Plan
<b>TEC</b>	Tilbury Energy Centre	<b>CEFAS</b>	Centre for Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science
<b>CMAT</b>	Construction Materials and Aggregates Terminal	<b>HRA</b>	Habitats Regulations Assessment
<b>GBC</b>	Gravesham Borough Council	<b>LEMP</b>	Landscape Environmental Management Plan
<b>DCO</b>	Development Consent Order	<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>INNS</b>	Invasive Non-Natural Species
<b>PLA</b>	Port of London Authority	<b>CEA</b>	Cumulative Effects Assessment
<b>FWQ</b>	First Written Questions	<b>WFD</b>	Water Framework Directive
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>DML</b>	Deemed Marine Licence
<b>LTC</b>	Lower Thames Crossing	<b>NGET</b>	National Grid Electricity Transmission
<b>Hist E</b>	Historic England	<b>WID</b>	Water Injection Dredging
<b>MMO</b>	Marine Management Organisation		
<b>WSI</b>	Written Scheme of Investigation		
<b>EH</b>	English Heritage		
<b>CEMP</b>	Construction Environmental Management Plan		

## **The Examination Library**

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/TR030003/TR030003-000523-Tilbury%20%20Examination%20Library.pdf>

It will be updated as the Examination progresses.

## General and Cross-topic Questions

0.1	<p><b>Control of Port of Tilbury London Limited (PoTLL) over its Tenants</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Mr Colin Elliott cites his concerns over the apparent lack of control that PoTLL has over its tenants in the existing port on matters such as noise in his written representation (WR) ([REP1-042]). He asks what confidence he can therefore have with regard to control for Tilbury2. What assurances can the Applicant give to Mr Elliott on this matter with regard to Tilbury2?</li><li>ii. He also details concerns about ongoing EMR plant noise. Would the Environment Agency update the hearing on progress with the EMR operator to resolve the noise issue?</li></ul>
0.2	<p><b>Head of Terms for Section 106 Agreement</b></p> <p>With reference to the Head of Terms for Section 106 Agreement between the Applicant and Thurrock Council (TC) (doc ref 5.3) [APP-029]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Would the Applicant and TC state the current position with the development of the Head of Terms for the Section 106 agreement, and the obligations that are currently envisaged to be included within it?</li><li>ii. Can the Applicant confirm that the s106 agreement will be agreed and signed off prior to the close of the examination?</li></ul>

## Planning Policy

14.1	<p><b>Tilbury2 and the proposed Tilbury Energy Centre (TEC)</b></p> <p>RWE Generation Limited (RWE) states that the Order Limits of the site of the proposed TEC and Tilbury2 are almost certain to overlap (re RWE's WR [REP1-087]). Construction periods may run concurrently, and operational and maintenance elements of Tilbury 2 will affect the TEC proposals. RWE lists the various areas of concern that</p>
------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>it has, and the interests that it needs to secure. These rights relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) preservation of access;</li> <li>b) identification of a service corridor across the Tilbury2 site and associated rights;</li> <li>c) provisions relating to the existing cooling water intake under the jetty within the River Thames at the eastern end of the Tilbury2 Order Limits, and within the proposed extended harbour limits forming part of the Tilbury2 application.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Would RWE and the Applicant update the hearing on these matters?</li> <li>ii. Would RWE and the Applicant update the hearing on the Heads of Agreement that are being drawn-up between RWE and the Applicant and the draft protective provisions that RWE would propose?</li> </ul>
14.2	<p>In the light of the Construction Materials and Aggregate Terminal (CMAT) Position Statement (Appendix B of the Applicant's Response to First Written Questions (FWQ) [REP1-016]) is there any operational relationship between the proposed RoRo terminal and the CMAT, i.e. either could operate independently of the other?</p>
14.3	<p>How was the balance established between the RoRo (c 26 Ha) and CMAT (c 16 Ha) uses and land take on the proposed site?</p>

## Noise and Vibration

16.1	<p><b>Noise Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can the local authorities confirm, or otherwise, if the definition of which properties, or properties not yet built, which will be assessed for mitigation is adequate?</li> <li>ii. Ref FWQ 1.16.6 and PoTLL's Response to Written Representations, Local Impact Reports and Interested Parties' Responses to First Written Questions [REP2-007], is Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) satisfied that the noise sensitive receptors proposed are now representative and suitable for the</li> </ul>
------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>re-assessment required under Requirement 10 – noise monitoring and mitigation? If not, what changes would GBC require?</p> <p>iii. GBC (LIR page 17) [REP1-056] has asked for more information on the PoTLL expectations about the on-going monitoring and mitigation regime and how acceptable noise levels will be agreed. Additionally, in SoCG update report 2; TC, 5.2.3 [REP1-021] “Receptor based mitigation - it is not defined who would become eligible / receive an assessment and the geographical boundaries of this - more information is required on this and how this will be funded. Clarification on this issue will be provided by PoTLL but in the first instance would refer to Schedule 2 of the DCO.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please would the local authorities and the Applicant comment on progress with these discussions?</li> <li>• In the light of these discussions are changes required to the wording of requirement 10, and if so what?</li> </ul> <p>iv. Ref FWQ 1.16.13, ES para. 17.196 [APP-031] refers to properties in Dock Road and Calcutta Road for which ‘... there will be a perceptible increase in noise, giving rise to short term significant effect at these properties. The effect is negligible in the long term and the overall assessment is considered not to be significant.’ The Applicant’s answer at deadline 1 [REP2-008] does not appear to accord with what is written in the ES which states ‘short term significant effect’. Would the Applicant please re-consider its answer to the original question?</p> <p>v. Dimensions of piles in ES Chapter 5 [APP-031] do not accord with underwater noise assessment in Chapter 17. Updated Chapter 5 provides different dimensions of piles, although it is unclear what each dimension represents. Would the Applicant state whether the assessment in the ES is still valid, as it assesses 610mm piles, but updated Chapter 5 refers to piles of 1.22m or 0.914m?</p>
16.2	<p><b>Noise impact from dredging</b></p> <p>Re Port of London (PLA) FWQ comments [REP1-082]: For the reasons given in relation to FWQ 1.9.1 The PLA considers that maintenance dredging should not remain subject to regulation under the 1968 Act. Within that licensing process the PLA would expect ecological impacts such as noise to be fully assessed. Please would the</p>

	Applicant respond to this request?
16.3	<p><b>Construction Materials and Aggregate Terminal (CMAT)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Gravesham Council [RR-019] is concerned over 24 hour operation of the CMAT. The ES identifies major and significant effects from the CMAT at night time for receptors in Gravesend. Gravesham has requested the ExA to consider restricted hours of operation. The Applicant has argued that for commercial reasons the CMAT needs to be operated 24 hours, 7 days per week. What alternatives are there?</li> <li>ii. Ref Thurrock Council (TC)'s response to FWQ 1.16.12. [REP1-092] "... a potential concern is the uncertainty that effective mitigation could be achieved following the noise reassessment and with the Operational Management Plan (paras. 17.225 &amp; 17.226), without the necessity of improving the sound insulation of affected dwellings. While this may be an effective solution, noise control at source would be preferred wherever possible". What proposals can the Applicant suggest for noise control at source?</li> <li>iii. Ref PoTLL's Response to Written Representations, Local Impact Reports and Interested Parties' Responses to First Written Questions, p111[REP2-007]: "It is noted that there are similar 24 hour aggregate operations in Gravesham near to Mark Lane, with vessels discharging anytime of day". Please would GBC comment on this response?</li> </ul>
16.4	<p><b>Barrier Design &amp; Location</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The need for detailed design is acknowledged; however, the work numbers within which barriers are located span large areas on the works plans and could lead to visual impacts. The Applicant's statement in the ES [APP-031] does not prescribe a location, but what was assumed in the noise modelling regarding barrier locations?</li> <li>ii. Please can the Applicant provide further details of likely barrier design and location?</li> <li>iii. Highways England has noted that "The Applicant should make arrangements to acquire any land needed to provide noise fences, screening and other structures adjacent to the SRN" [REP2-001]. What arrangements is the Applicant making?</li> </ul>

16.5	<p><b>Combined Noise Effects of the Operation of LTC with Tilbury2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Re PoTLL response para 3 [REP2-007] "...at a high level the combined noise effects of the operation of LTC with Tilbury2 are likely to increase noise levels in Tilbury due to increased road traffic movements with LTC routing through the transport corridor." Would the Applicant please advise: In the absence of traffic figures/data, how has this assessment been made?</li><li>ii. What measures are proposed to mitigate the increased noise levels?</li></ul>
------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Cumulative and Combined Impacts

7.1	<p><b>Lower Thames Crossing (LTC)</b></p> <p>The Applicant has repeatedly stated that it does not propose to consider the combined and cumulative impact of the LTC and the Tilbury2 Proposed Development (eg response to ExA's FRQs [REP1-016]) because there is insufficient information available on the LTC to undertake a meaningful analysis. The local authorities appear to accept this position. The Applicant also states that HE has accepted that the combined and cumulative impact will be undertaken as part of the LTC proposal, although HE also states in its response to ExA's FRQs Q1.7.1 [REP2-062] that it supports the request by Interested Parties for a cumulative effects assessment to be carried out and considers that there is sufficient evidence within the LTC Scoping Report for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. What documents does Highways England suggest should be regarded as representing the current stage of the proposals for the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) for the purposes of cumulative assessment and in combination effects?</li><li>ii. Would the Applicant update the hearing on its current position?</li></ul>
-----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



7.2	<p><b>Tilbury Energy Centre (TEC)</b></p> <p>Similarly, what documents does RWE suggest should be regarded as representing the current stage of the proposals for the Tilbury Energy Centre (TEC) for the purposes of cumulative assessment and in combination effects?</p>
7.3	<p>Does Natural England accept the Applicant's reasoning set out in section 2 of its Response to Relevant Representations [AS-049] for excluding the LTC and TEC from assessment of in-combination effects?</p>

### Historic Environment

13.1	<p><b>Impact of Proposals and Mitigation - General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Would the Applicant and Thurrock Council (TC) update the hearing on the assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the settings of surrounding heritage assets, which TC asserts to be inadequate (re SoCG Applicant-TC Appendix 1 of SOCG Update Report [REP1-021])?</li> <li>ii. Would the Applicant and TC provide an update on TC's assertion that the proposed mitigation will reduce visual impact but will not mitigate against the harm caused by the Proposed Development, and TC's statement that the Applicant should promote a more robust landscape mitigation package (SoCG [REP1-021]; TC's written representation (WR) [REP1-090])?</li> <li>iii. Would the Applicant and TC provide an update on TC's statement that it considers the proposed heights within the Proposed Development are inappropriate (re SoCG [REP1-021])?</li> <li>iv. Would the Applicant and TC provide an update on TC's statement that it considers the proposed lighting scheme to be inappropriate (re SoCG [REP1-021])?</li> <li>v. Would the Applicant and Historic England (Hist E) give an update on the Terrestrial Written Scheme of</li> </ul>
------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Investigation (WSI)?</p> <p>vi. Would the Applicant, Hist E and Marine Management Organisation (MMO) give an update on the Marine WSI and Deemed Marine Licence?</p>
13.2	<p><b>Tilbury Fort – Impact of Proposals</b></p> <p>i. Would the Applicant and English Heritage (EH) update the hearing on their discussions on points raised by EH (re EH’s response to FWQs [REP1-047]) that the impacts of the Tilbury2 proposals have not been fully assessed in the information submitted with the application, and that there will be a permanent effect upon the setting of the Fort that EH considers to be very significant?</p> <p>ii. Would they also update the hearing re EH’s assertion that a balancing exercise of harm to the Fort versus the public benefit of the scheme has not clearly been undertaken, and that the mitigation identified within the Tilbury2 proposals is not effective enough [REP1-047]?</p> <p>iii. Would they also update the hearing re EH’s assertion that it is reasonable that additional compensation is included with the proposals if permitted, as conditions or Section 106 obligations [REP1-047]?</p>
13.3	<p><b>Tilbury Fort - Monitoring and Mitigation for Piling Activities</b></p> <p>i. Would TC state whether it wishes to be a consultee under paragraph 10.2 of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP1-006]?</p> <p>ii. Would the Applicant state whether the monitoring and mitigation will include the tunnels beneath Tilbury Fort, as raised by TC in its written representation [REP1-090]?</p> <p>iii. Would the Applicant state whether the monitoring and mitigation include the laser scan survey and vibration monitoring requested by EH in its response to the ExA’s FROs at deadline 1 [REP1-047]?</p> <p>iv. Would the Applicant state whether any mitigation/contribution to repairs of Tilbury Fort will be secured through the DCO or through a separate agreement?</p>
13.4	<p><b>Tilbury Fort – Impact on Commercial Operation</b></p>

	<p>A number of matters are stated to be under discussion with regard to the commercial operation of Tilbury Fort (re SoCG Applicant-EH Appendix 10 of SOCG Update Report [REP1-021]). Would the Applicant and EH update the hearing on their discussions on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The visitor experience at Tilbury Fort?</li> <li>ii. The commercial operations (residential, filming and visitor access/amenity) at Tilbury Fort?</li> <li>iii. The ecology, landscape treatment and setting impacts on Tilbury Fort?</li> <li>iv. The degree of impact of the Proposed Development on the Fort's setting?</li> <li>v. The opportunities for enhancement to Tilbury Fort?</li> </ul>
13.5	<p><b>Tilbury Fort – Mitigation Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Would the Applicant and TC update the hearing on their discussions on the following proposed additional mitigation measures (re TC's response to ExA's FRQs Q1.13.5 [REP1-092]):             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) monitoring of tunnels beneath Tilbury Fort during construction;</li> <li>b) utilising appropriate colours for the silo and other structures;</li> <li>c) reducing the maximum height of container storage within a zone adjacent to the western boundary of the main site;</li> <li>d) within the limit of deviation for this work, locating the silo as far as possible from the edge of the River Thames?</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Do other parties have any comments on these proposed additional measures?</li> </ul>
13.6	<p><b>Considerations South of the River</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Would the Applicant and Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) update the hearing on their discussions over the magnitude of the impact of the Proposed Development on the settings of the identified built heritage assets and the degree of harm or otherwise (re SoCG Applicant-GBC Appendix 2 of SOCG Update Report [REP1-021])?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Would the Applicant and GBC provide an update on their discussions on further mitigation and enhancement measures beyond those set out in the ES?</li> <li>iii. Would the Applicant and GBC provide an update on GBC's concern about the impact of lighting from the point of view of Gravesend?</li> </ul>
13.7	<p><b>Applicant's Response to FWQs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Would the Applicant clarify the residual effects during construction on built heritage (re response to FWQs Q1.13.13 [REP1-016])?</li> <li>ii. Would the Applicant confirm how the maximum construction period will be secured in the dDCO (re response to FWQs Q1.13.14 [REP1-016], which sought clarity over the construction period)?</li> <li>iii. Would the Applicant confirm if the measures detailed in para 5.1 of the CEMP and in answer to FWQ 1.13.16 will be undertaken (re Applicant's response to FWQs Q1.13.16 [REP1-016], which sought clarity on whether construction facilities have been considered within the ES)? The current wording of 'should' is unsatisfactory.</li> <li>iv. Would the Applicant confirm in terms of significance what the residual effect would be with the identified mitigation (re response to FWQ Q1.13.19 [REP1-016], which asked what construction restrictions would be applied to minimise impacts on archaeology and cultural heritage)?</li> </ul>

### Landscape and Visual Impacts

15.1	<p><b>Landscape and Visual Mitigation - General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Would the Applicant and Thurrock Council (TC) update the hearing on discussions between them on the landscape mitigation package, which TC asserts is limited and will not achieve benefits (re SoCG Applicant-TC Appendix 1 of SOCG Update Report [REP1-021])?</li> </ul>
------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

15.2	<p><b>Landscape and Visual Mitigation – Tilbury Fort</b></p> <p>Would the Applicant and TC update the hearing on their discussions on the further mitigation that TC would propose for Tilbury Fort (re TC's response to ExA's FWQs Q1.15.2 [REP1-092]):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Additional mitigation and enhancement works in the common land and remnant grazing marsh around Tilbury Fort to improve its immediate setting;</li><li>b) More significant boundary treatments around the Main Site and new infrastructure corridor;</li><li>c) Replacing poor quality fencing;</li><li>d) Restoring the ditch network;</li><li>e) Clearing previously dumped material;</li><li>f) Provision of new hedges or trees further from the open marsh area?</li></ul>
15.3	<p><b>Landscape and Visual – Historic England's Issues</b></p> <p>Would the Applicant and Hist E update the hearing on the areas in which Hist E has queries remaining (re SoCG Applicant-Hist E Appendix 4 of SOCG Update Report [REP1-021]):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) future baseline;</li><li>b) locations of visual impact;</li><li>c) visibility of the silo;</li><li>d) impact of berthed vessels on the setting;</li><li>e) contribution of marshland to the setting of Tilbury Fort;</li><li>f) description of activity within the Rochdale Envelope;</li><li>g) disagreements over the level of significance of effects on Tilbury Fort?</li></ul>

### Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment

2.1	Why does Natural England (NE) consider the habitats on the proposed development site “arguably ... irreplaceable (in particular the Lytag site)” [REP1-074], and Buglife the site “unique and irreplaceable” [REP1-030] in their respective WRs? Is it the characteristics of the Lytag and PFA products themselves or the nature of the ground conditions on which they have been placed which gives rise to these circumstances?
2.2	Do NE, Buglife, the Applicant and the Environment Agency (EA) all agree the status of the Lytag Local Wildlife Site (LoWS) is of high quality and of national importance, which is at risk of declining due to successional processes if left unmanaged?
2.3	Are EA, NE, Buglife (and Marine Management Organisation (MMO) if appropriate) content with the proposals for offsite compensation set out in the draft Ecological Mitigation and Compensation Plan (EMCP) submitted at Deadline 2? [ REP2-009]
2.4	Does Highways England agree there are no implications arising from the draft EMCP for the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) works area?
2.5	What is the position concerning the additional wintering bird survey data for February and March 2018 referred to in NE’s WR [REP1-074] concerning land functionally linked to SPAs? In light of this information, does NE still consider that annual bird surveys are required (between 01 September to 31 March during the construction and operational phases)?
2.6	In the light of the advice from the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS) [REP2-012, Annex I] received for Deadline 2, does MMO agree that the approach and assessment methodology for marine ecology is appropriate?
2.7	Can the Applicant explain how the functionally-linked habitat has been valued in the Environmental Impact

	Assessment (EIA) [APP-031] and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) [APP-060] report?
2.8	To whom will the Ecological Clerk of Works provided for in the CEMP [REP1-006] be accountable for ensuring compliance with the ECMP, and what authority/powers is the post holder intended to have for this purpose?
2.9	Implementation of the Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) [REP1-010] involves annual monitoring by a “suitably qualified ecologist” and a 5-yearly plan leading to updates of the LEMP as required. Similarly, to whom is the ecologist accountable and who will decide whether such revisions of the LEMP should take place?
2.10	Further to its assessment in its WR [REP1-074] of the site as a potential Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), what progress has NE made in considering the site for SSSI notification?

### Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

11.1	What are the Applicant’s intentions for the revised version of the HRA report to be submitted for Deadline 3 in the light of NE’s statement in its WR [REP1-074] about further work required to cover for example functionally-linked habitat, Invasive Non-Natural Species (INNS), waste and pollutants, dredging, noise, dust and in-combination effects?
11.2	The HRA report [APP-060] refers to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), which have since been replaced by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Can the Applicant confirm that the revisions made to the legislation would not affect the conclusions of the HRA?
11.3	What further mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations does NE have in mind, pursuant to its WR [REP1-074] and response to FWQ?

## Dredging and Navigation

9.1	Does the Environment Agency (EA) accept the analysis of the likely very limited relationship between the potential discharge of cooling water effluent from the proposed Tilbury Energy Centre (TEC) and intended maintenance dredging operations at the proposed port set out in the Applicant's high level Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) of the TEC with Tilbury2? How would this affect the Water Framework Directive (WFD) compliance of proposed maintenance dredging operations, and drafting of the Deemed Marine Licence (DML)?
9.2	What consideration has been given to the impact of capital dredging proposals for the port on the foreshore of Tilbury Fort?
9.3	Is National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) satisfied with the Applicant's response to FWQ 1.9.11 [REP1-016] about dredging implications for the 400kV cable tunnel from Kingsnorth to Tilbury?
9.4	Does the Applicant agree with the Port of London Authority (PLA)'s [REP1-080] and MMO's [REP1-073] WR that maintenance dredging should continue to be regulated by the PLA under the 1968 Act, governed by protective provisions and included in the DML as a licensable activity and not a power in the DCO?
9.5	Is all dredging to be restricted to the ebb tide only, or just WID?
9.6	Is the PLA content with the revised Limits of Dredging Plan submitted at Deadline 1? [REP1-013]