

Application by Able Humber Ports Ltd for Able Marine Energy Park Material Change 2
The Examining Body's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on 19 November 2021

The following table sets out the Examining Body's (ExB's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExB to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annexe B to the Regulation 27 and 28 letter of 19 October 2021. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExB would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on proposed changes generally is identified as Q1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA 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 AbleMarineEnergyPark@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include 'Able Marine Energy Park Material Change 2' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59

Abbreviations used:

AEol	Adverse Effect on Integrity	LIR	Local Impact Report
agl	above ground level	LPA	Local Planning Authority
App	Applicant	MMO	MMO
C.GEN	C.GEN Killingholme Limited	NE	Natural England
C.RO	C.RO Ports Killingholme Limited	NELDB	North East Lindsey Drainage Board
DAO	Draft Amendment Order	NLC	North Lincolnshire Council
DCO	Development Consent Order	NPS	National Policy Statement
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
EA	Environment Agency	PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	RR	Relevant Representation
ES	Environmental Statement	SoS	Secretary of State
ExB	Examining Body	UES	Updated Environmental Statement
HMBCE	Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England	WFD	North East Lindsay Drainage Board
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment	WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [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/TR030006/TR030006-000234-Able%20Marine%20Energy%20Park%20Material%20Change%202%20Examination%20Library.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of Questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ1 1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

ExQ1: 19 November 2021

Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59

Index

1. General and Cross-topic Questions	4
2. The Draft Amendment Order (DAO)	5
3. Operators and Harbour Operations.....	6
4. Hydrodynamics and Sedimentary Regime including Dredging and Deposition.....	7
5. Biodiversity.....	8
6. Water Framework Directive.....	11
7. Flood Risk	12
8. Drainage.....	13
9. Quayside Cranes.....	13
10. Footpath Diversion	14
11. Heritage Aspects.....	15
12. Climate Change.....	16
13. Cumulative and in-combination Effects	16

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1. General and Cross-topic Questions		
Q1.0.1	App	Please supply A3 size paper copies of all the current drawings associated with the Proposed Changes.
Q1.0.2	App	Does the Application involve two alternative approaches to construction of the quay in cross-section, as shown on drawing AME-036-00003 rev C, or three alternative approaches as shown on drawing AME-036-10004 Rev B? Under what circumstances would each alternative proceed?
Q1.0.3	App	Re: drawing AME-036-0003 rev C, no crane rail is shown in the Optional Design Section. Is this because the thicker RC slab would allow flexible crane location?
Q1.0.4	App	How would the number and diameter of piles vary in the alternative approaches?
Q1.0.5	App	Is the option available of using augered rather than percussion piles to reduce noise and disturbance?
Q1.0.6	App	Please develop UES 16.4 to show in detail that the ES envelope related to noise and disturbance covers all piling options, whatever the number and diameter of piles.
Q1.0.7	App	UES 16.4.3 compares anchor piles with quay piles in terms of noise and vibration. However, the comparison between anchor piles and flap piles, which they might replace, is not given. Please explain.
Q1.0.8	App	What uses is the site put to at present?
Q1.0.9	App, C.RO, C.GEN	Will the Able Marine Energy Project be fully built out? If not, what would the implications of mixed, retained, alternative, or interim uses be for other parties?
Q1.0.10	App	What phasing timetable is envisaged for the construction of the project and how would this relate to retained uses?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.0.11	App	How would this be affected by the various cross-sectional approaches, the proposed constructional sequence, the addition of a third cross dam within the reclamation area, and the possibilities of staged handover?
Q1.0.12	App	UES 4.3.6, has agreement been reached with Anglian Water concerning diversion of the two pipelines within the footprint of the reclamation area?
Q1.0.13	App	UES Table 4-3 indicates that the loss of saltmarsh would increase from a figure of 2ha agreed with NE in 2012 to 8.1ha assessed in UES Appendix 11-2. However, this does not appear to correlate with the figures in Table 13 of the HRA Part 1 Report. Why is this?
Q1.0.14	App	UES Table 4-4 shows a reduction in operational phase vessel movements because of the omission of Foundation Transfer Vessel movements. Please explain.
Q1.0.15	App, NLC	UES 3.3.6/7, Please set out relevant policies of the Local Development Framework and the saved policies from the Local Plan (2003) which are extant.
2. The Draft Amendment Order (DAO)		
Q2.0.1	App	Please supply the existing DCO overmarked with the changes arising from the DAO.
Q2.0.2	App	Should the Explanatory Note attached to the DAO be updated in accordance with paras 2.6.1 to 2.6.6 of the separate Explanatory Memorandum dated June 2021 rev 1?
Q2.0.3	App, MMO	Has an application for a variation to the deemed marine licence (DML) been submitted? Please report on progress.
Q2.0.4	App and other parties	Are new, additional, or amended protective provisions envisaged. Please report on progress in negotiations with the various parties.
Q2.0.5	App	How is the proposed footpath diversion covered in the DAO?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.06	App	How would the Order Limits be affected by the proposed footpath diversion and by the re-siting of the Mitigation Area A? Should the Order Limits include the Killingholme Branch Line, since it would not be subject to development works?
3. Operators and Harbour Operations		
Q3.01	App, C.RO	Please summarise the methods by which co-ordination of river traffic would take place, in the context of slower moving dredger and deposition vessels, and possible shortage of pilots. How would vessels be prioritised? How would arrangements be secured?
Q3.02	App, C.RO	What types of vessel would use the berth bay? What frequency of movement would occur and how would this interact with C.RO and other operator's vessel movements?
Q3.03	App, C.GEN	Please set out, or fully signpost, the anticipated environmental impact of the works on C.GEN's infrastructure, including the pumping station and cooling water intake/outfall. (Although the permit has been surrendered, I understand North Killingholme Generating Station could make use of it, (UES 6.3.3). Please describe proposed monitoring and mitigation during construction and operation.
Q3.04	App, C.GEN	Would related easements and rights be affected? Please confirm existing or agree modified protective provisions as appropriate.
Q3.05	C.RO, App	Please set out the details of any potential additional impacts on C.RO's operations arising from the Proposed Changes during construction and operation.
Q3.06	C.RO, App	Are these impacts covered by existing protective provisions? If not please agree amended provisions.
Q3.07	App	In their consultation response dated 19.5.21, National Grid note the proximity of the proposed development to Tower 2AJ006 and the associated overhead line. They requested more detail of work proposed near its assets and sought confirmation regarding protective provisions. Have these points been resolved?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q3.08	App	Re, Commercial and Recreational Navigation, Table 14-10: Further Embedded Mitigation Measures, and Table 14-11: Possible Alternate or Additional Risk Control Measures – how would it be decided whether and when to use these measures? How would they be secured?
4. Hydrodynamics and Sedimentary Regime including Dredging and Deposition		
Q4.01	App, EA, MMO	Please respond to the EA's, MMO's and other parties' concerns set out in their RRs and report on the current state of agreement.
Q4.02	App	UES 8.4.4 states that the location of the dredge disposal sites HU080, HU081, and HU082 is provided on drawing AME-036-10014 in Appendix UES4-1, but this does not appear to be the case. Please provide an updated drawing.
Q4.03	App	Hydrodynamic changes at Hawkins Point arising from deposition: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please explain the choice of wave conditions in modelling. Why was only one wave condition chosen (UES 8.4.34)?• Please explain why present-day conditions were chosen in the assessment rather than conditions reflecting future rise in sea level.• Please clarify the projected impact of increasing wave activity on erosion west of Hawkins Point and the risk to habitat and flood defences.
Q4.04	App	Regarding the additional mitigation set out in UES 8.5.2 required by the EA: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How long is monitoring to continue?• How will the monitoring results be assessed and acted upon and in what time frame?• What remedial action is to be taken if the risk is realised?• What programme of bespoke LIDAR services is intended and how would they be integrated with the bathymetric surveys?• What additional mitigation is available and under what circumstances might it be used?• How are these aspects to be secured?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q4.05	App	Dredging, UES 8.4.1 <i>et seq</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What time periods would dredgers be at work during the 24hr day, during what periods in the construction and maintenance programmes, and for how long overall?• Please summarise the risks of disturbance to wildlife through noise, turbulence, lighting, etc.
Q4.06	App	Have the impacts of the various dredging processes on the Uniper and C.GEN intakes and outfalls been assessed?
Q4.07	App	UES 9.5.2, How would the commitment to carry out ongoing maintenance dredging at discrete intervals to prevent sedimentation at the intakes be monitored, managed and secured?
Q4.08	App	Capital dredge disposal, UES 8.4.27 notes, 'In reality it would not be possible to place this full amount of material into the site...' This implies that some excavated material would be placed elsewhere, besides the site identified in the Estuary. Please clarify.
Q4.09	App	Ebb flow tide acceleration, UES 8.4.73: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What would be the effects of the projected increase in the worst scenario?• What mitigation is in place to counteract these effects?
Q4.010	App	Please comment on MMO's advice that plough dredging should be added to the list of formal mitigation measures should it be required as a last resort following monitoring of disposal activities.
Q4.011	App	UES Table 8-1: Scoping Opinion: 4.2.1 para 6.10 - Has the Applicant agreed the approach to wave modelling with the relevant consultation bodies?
Q4.012	App	UES 9.6.2, second and third bullets, overflowing during the trailing suction hopper dredger (TSHD) dredging of alluvium - overflowing for ten minutes on every load would result in increases in suspended sediment concentration of up to 630mg/l compared to 45mg/l without overflowing. How would overflowing be controlled? What would be the consequences of overflowing on biodiversity?
5.	Biodiversity	

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q5.01	NE	Is NE content with the particular qualifying features of the Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar sites for which the Applicant has identified a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) and taken forward for appropriate assessment? If not, please explain why.
Q5.02	NE	The ExB notes NE's position in its RR that an Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEol) cannot be ruled out, but that it considers this is due to lack of information and is capable of being overcome with further information. On a without prejudice basis, if these matters can be overcome, does NE agree with the App that there would be no harm to any European sites from the project in combination with other plans or projects? If not, please explain why.
Q5.03	App, NE	Please respond fully to the points made by NE in their RR dated 23.8.21, particularly section 2.3 and Part II generally. Please report on progress towards agreement.
Q5.04	App	The HRA Part 1 Report, at 9.13, identifies LSE to the estuarine habitat, intertidal mudflat, saltmarsh, grey seal, sea lamprey and river lamprey qualifying features of the Humber Estuary SAC. Please provide justification for concluding an absence of LSE for the remaining qualifying features (H1110 sandbanks, H1150 coastal lagoons, H2110 embryonic shifting dunes, H2120 shifting dunes, H2130 fixed dunes, and H2160 dunes).
Q5.05	App	Humber Estuary SAC: has an AEol been ruled out for Atlantic sea meadows (<i>Glauco-Puccinallietalia maritimae</i>)? Please signpost to the relevant information supporting the conclusions reached.
Q5.06	App	In Appendix 4 of the HAR Assessment Report Part 1, please distinguish between the risk of effects on birds at Killingholme Foreshore and at North Killingholme Haven Pits, consistent with the way the Bird Data tables have been assembled. Please also highlight the significant changes between the data in the ES and those in the updated analysis.
Q5.07	App	A LSE has been identified for river and sea lamprey and grey seals in the Humber Estuary SAC. Table 12 in the HRA Part 2 Report confirms that there would be no change to the previous conclusion of no AEol. Please justify this statement.
Q5.08	App, NE	Does NE agree with the Applicant's conclusion of no AEol for the grey seal, sea lamprey and river lamprey?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q5.0.9	App, NE	The HRA Part 1 Report, at 9.6, notes that LSE was excluded in respect of the effects of lighting on the remaining intertidal habitats at KMFS. Is this conclusion still valid, given the probable lighting requirements for tall structures such as the 200m cranes? Please comment on the potential for visual disturbance to Humber Estuary and Ramsar bird features.
Q5.0.10	App, NE	Mitigation and compensation areas – HRA Part 2, para 9.4, movement of the location of Mitigation Area A to Halton Marshes and WFD Assessment section 2.6, Habitat compensation scheme. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How are the mitigation and compensation sites, including the East Halton overcompensation site, intended to operate in conjunction with each other?• How would each be suitable for particular species?• Would there be overlapping time frames?• How would the monitoring provisions operate?• Can we be sure that any time lag in providing ecologically functioning habitat in relation to the progress of the works would not be harmful?
Q5.0.11	App, NE	Please provide evidence that the compensation habitat provisions would remain appropriate over the decades to come. What maintenance plans would be in place to ensure that they do?
Q5.0.12	App, NE	HRA Part 2, Table 12 states that the effects of capital and maintenance dredging and disposal on sub-tidal habitat and benthic communities are subject to ongoing discussions. NE indicates that additional mitigation for dredging impacts may be required to avoid or reduce impacts on European site features. What is the state of progress in the discussions?
Q5.0.13	App	Please distinguish clearly in the AA between the mitigation measures and the compensation measures and the stages in the assessment process to which they each apply.
Q5.0.14	App	Please summarise the impact on the extent of the areas of estuarine and intertidal mudflats and other habitats which would specifically be caused by the Proposed Changes, rather than by the consented scheme or by changes which have occurred naturally since the original ES was published.
Q5.0.15	App, NE	Please summarise the ways in which the Proposed Changes in the geometry of the quay and in the construction processes and sequencing would affect habitats and species (through, for instance change

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		in the location of noisy activities during construction and operation, changes in the areas of excavation activity, and so on). Would there be an impact on bird activity at North Killingholme Haven Pits through, for instance, the relocation of vessel movements and crane operations to the north of the quay (UES 16.4.10)?
Q5.0.16	App, NE	UES 4.3.9 to 4.3.11, notes that despite an additional 1.1M tonnes of clay now to be deposited at sea rather than on land as originally intended, the estimated marine construction vessel movements would remain within the figures set out in paragraph 14.6.27 of the original ES. We are told this is because, upon review, it was found that the figures reflected the deposit of all excavated material in the estuary. Does this also apply to the effects on biodiversity identified within the ES envelope or would the additional deposition give rise to further effects? Would changes to the Marine Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (MEMMP) and further assessment within the HRA consequently be required?
Q5.0.17	App	Has the principle in the Environment Act of achieving biodiversity net gain been incorporated in the Proposed Changes?
6. Water Framework Directive (WFD)		
Q6.0.1	App	Please respond to the EA's concerns set out in their RR dated 13.8.21 and consultation response dated 26.5.21 regarding the WFD Assessment.
Q6.0.2	App	RR 9.1, the EA refers to a new, short section added to the EA WFD guidance intended to show that the Applicant has considered other activities that could affect the same receptors. How is this reflected in the WFD Assessment?
Q6.0.3	App	Please develop the evidence for the effects of dredging and disposal on benthic receptors. What monitoring and mitigation measures are proposed to control the effects and how they would be secured?
Q6.0.4	App	WFD Assessment 5.3.3 Dissolved Oxygen, 4 th line, notes, '...to ensure percussive is not undertaken when DO levels are lower than 5mg/l.' Please explain.

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q6.05	App	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon exceedances – please respond to the EA’s request for further justification to better explain the time periods and scale of PAH exceedances using the modelled dispersion data.
Q6.06	App	Please submit the SediChem assessment work undertaken, or say where it can be found.
Q6.07	EA	Would the EA expand upon its concerns relating to the cumulative assessment undertaken for the WFD Assessment?
7. Flood Risk		
Q7.01	App, EA	Please respond to the EA’s concerns set out in their RR dated 13.8.21 and consultation response dated 26.5.21 and report on the current state of agreement.
Q7.02	App	Please explain fully how flood risk matters identified in UES 13.1.5 have been analysed and assessed, since UES Section 13.4 only explicitly addresses changes to overtopping rates and changes on wave reflection. UES 13.9.2 refers to the discharge of storm water run-off into the Humber Estuary but does not relate this to the changes set out in UES 13.1.5.
Q7.03	App	What account has been taken of the emerging flood strategy (Humber 2100+)? Has UKCP 18 been taken into account?
Q7.04	App, EA	Have the discrepancies in interpretation of the legal agreement between the EA and the Applicant been resolved?
Q7.05	App	How would the Proposed Changes affect flood risk in relation to the various options which would be available to the contractor regarding construction method and sequence (damming, piling, placing of backfill, etc.)?
Q7.06	EA	Is the EA satisfied with the Applicant’s qualitative assessment of wave reflection onto the strategic flood defences?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q7.07	App, EA	South Bank Flood Agreement Clause 9.1(i): Have the EA's concerns over whether all persons owning a legal estate in the quay have entered into a legal agreement in the same terms as the original agreement been resolved?
8. Drainage		
Q8.01	App, North East Lindsay Drainage Board (NELDB)	Please report on the state of agreement with the NELDB regarding the points made in their RR dated 2.8.21, including the need for a revised drainage strategy, approval for any realignments, design standards, capacities, access, monitoring, and maintenance provisions.
Q8.02	App	Would any of the Proposed Changes to drainage affect third parties?
Q8.03	App	When is the Applicant intending to submit for approval the detailed surface water drainage strategy required in NLC's discharge of condition notice dated 5 August 2020 (Appendix UES13-3). In the absence of detailed approval, the discharge of condition notice appears to contradict the assertions made in UES 13.2.22/23.
9. Quayside Cranes		
Q9.01	App	UES 22.4.9, How is the Civil Aviation Publications (CAP) 1096 requirement for lighting en-route objects 150m or more above ground level (agl) co-ordinated with the requirements arising from the Humberside Airport Obstacle Limiting Surface (OLS)/Outer Horizontal Surface (OHS)?
Q9.02	App	The photomontages in the original ES show turbines set upright on the site. Should consideration be given to lighting the turbines under construction which, at 165m, are more than 150m agl?
Q9.03	App	UES 22.5.6, third bullet, notes that for a crane of height 200m, four levels of lighting are recommended: medium intensity at the top and various intensities at intermediate levels. Would these recommendations be followed? Would there be a different regime for cranes above 200m in height?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q9.04	App	Has progress been made in consultations regarding the recommended white flashing day-time lighting to the cranes, in addition to the necessary continuous red night-time lighting?
Q9.05	App	Please fully assess the impacts of the various forms of lighting, and the contrasting, coloured patterned banding (a possible alternative to white flashing lighting) in relation to residential, avian, landscape, and heritage receptors.
Q9.06	App	Has responsibility for incorporating the tall features into air mapping been resolved?
Q9.07	App	Please prepare material showing zones of visibility for the cranes in relation to heritage assets, landscape, and residential receptors.
Q9.08	App	Please show descriptively and diagrammatically, including through photomontages updated from the original ES and new photomontages if necessary, the effects of the taller cranes and their lighting on these receptors, including their night-time effects. Show this with reference to the LVIA prepared for Chapter 20 of the original ES, and the analysis of Heritage setting effects undertaken for the ES (Annex 18.4).
Q9.09	App	Useful updated photomontages would be: VP1, VP2, VP3, VP4, VP8, VP13 and VP17. However, the choice may depend on the zone of visibility and it would be helpful to have sight of this in outline form as soon as possible.
Q9.010	App, NE	UES 22.4.4 notes that the potential for bird activity to migrate towards Humberside Airport because of the taller cranes is deemed MAJOR/intermediate. However, UES 22.5.2 (first bullet) tells us that birds displaced would be likely to move to the compensation site and mitigation site, both of which are further away from Humberside Airport. Accordingly (fourth bullet) the risk would be reduced to neutral. Please provide evidence that this would be so. Is NE content with this aspect?
10. Footpath Diversion		
Q10.01	App	How frequently is Footpath 50 used at various times throughout the year, and how often is the railway track crossed?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q10.02	App, Network Rail	It would be tempting for Footpath users to simply risk crossing the track to avoid the proposed 440m diversion. Would some form of automatic barrier be feasible to allow this to be done safely, bearing in mind the line is not currently in use?
11. Heritage Aspects		
Q11.01	App, NLC	NLC's consultation memo dated 25.5.21 indicates expected adverse impacts on paleo-land surfaces, maritime archaeology and aviation archaeology. Also, it considers the updated Marine WSI to be inadequate. However, UES 18.1.5 notes that no change to the WSI is proposed. Please provide an update on the current state of agreement regarding marine archaeology.
Q11.02	App	Why do the site numbers differ by one digit between UES Figure 18-1 and Appendix UES18-1, which contains the original WSI?
Q11.03	App	UES 18.4.6 notes that there would be no alteration to the depths of dredging (up to -11m CD in the berthing pocket, -9m CD in the approach channel and turning area). However, the berthing pocket would be repositioned to the north of the quay, requiring 2m greater depth of excavation. Does this have implications for marine archaeology, including geoarchaeology?
Q11.04	App	When will the pre-construction activities required under the 2012 WSI be carried out? When will the results of these activities give rise to an updated assessment?
Q11.05	App	In view of the difficulties in making observations during dredging operations, how would the WSI requirement at 5.2.12-14 for a watching brief, or any alternative monitoring during dredging, be fulfilled?
Q11.06	App	When is the Stage 3 assessment of the sample sediments obtained so far going to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the 2012 WSI (Appendix UES18-1, 5.1.10)?
Q11.07	App	What archaeological research agenda would be used to assess the material arising from the construction operations?
Q11.08	HMBCE	Are Historic England content to rely on the safeguards within the existing DCO? Does Historic England wish to comment on any of the ExQ1 questions?

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
12. Climate Change		
Q12.01	App	Would the Proposed Changes lead to additional carbon dioxide emissions either in construction (including that emitted in producing construction materials), or operation (including changes in the figures for the movement of vessels)?
Q12.02	App	Have the assessments made in the original ES been revised to take account of the Proposed Changes?
Q12.03	App	What impact would the 2035 sixth Carbon Budget target and the 2050 Net Zero Target have on the Proposed Changes?
13. Cumulative and in-combination Effects		
Q13.01	App	UES Table 8-1: Scoping Opinion, Item 4.19.1 Table 6 – Has the approach to cumulative assessment regarding the South Humber Bank Energy Centre been agreed with the relevant consultation bodies, bearing in mind possible hydrological effects?
Q13.02	App, MMO	The MMO states at 4.15 in its RR dated 19.8.21 that they cannot provide detailed comments regarding cumulative impacts without reviewing the specific activities and licence conditions associated with other developments. Please discuss and resolve this point with MMO.
Q13.03	App	The cumulative effects assessments in each aspect chapter are reported at a high level, with limited if any justification (for instance UES 13.4.9 regarding Flood Risk and Drainage). It would be helpful to have the justifications for conclusions on these effects in a more developed form.
Q13.04	App, EA	In their consultation response dated 26.5.21, the EA notes that there is little to evidence the cumulative impacts assessment. They express concern regarding the spatial area impacted for key habitat, lack of reference in the WFD assessment, and the absence of dredging projects from the cumulative assessment. Please discuss and resolve these matters.

ExQ1: 19 November 2021**Responses are due by Deadline 1: 14 December 2021 at 23:59**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q13.05	App	Have all recent permissions/consents, including those identified by NLC in their consultation response of 26.3.21, been considered? These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Immingham Open Cycle Gas Turbine Order 2020 (DCO – SI 2020 No 847).• PP (PA/2018/918) New gas fired power station, Rosper Road, Immingham.
Q13.06	App, NE	Has the scheme to create a managed realignment site at the Outstrays to Skefflington site and the South Humber Gateway strategic mitigation site been included in the assessments?
Q13.07	App	Has an assessment been made of any indirect effects on Cherry Cobb Sands compensation site of the Proposed Changes, for instance through vessel movements or hydrodynamic effects, together with the effects of consented schemes on the north bank of the Estuary?