

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal](#)  
**Subject:** TR030007 - Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal - Section 51 Advice - Chapter 6 Glossary and Plans  
**Date:** 17 March 2023 15:12:18  
**Attachments:** [TR030007 IERRT 2.6 Engineering Sections Drawings and Plans.pdf](#)  
[8.2.6 IERRT ES Vol1 Chapter 6 Impact Assessment Approach version 2.pdf](#)

---

Dear Lily,

Further to my two emails earlier this week dealing with points raised in your section 51 Advice, I now attach the following for inclusion/substitution in the Project page library.

First, you have pointed out that break lines have been used in the engineering Sections, Drawings and Plans (Doc. 2.6) in sections E-E and G-G. These plans have now been revised so as to remove the break lines and the attached pdf provides updated Doc 2.6 Engineering Sections Drawings and Plans. Drawings 0740, 0741 and 0742 have been updated to reflect your advice and I am pleased to say with a little spreading of the sections we have kept the number of drawing sheets the same.

Secondly you pointed out that the Glossary attached to Chapter 6 of the ES "Impact Assessment Approach" is somewhat limited. The Glossary has now been expanded and for ease of inclusion on the web page, I have provided the whole chapter with the amended Glossary but in so doing, I can confirm that no amendments have been made to the body of the chapter – only to the Glossary itself which has simply been expanded.

The only outstanding section 51 points concern the use of "Undertaker" in the draft DCO and the question regarding the identification of the dredge disposal grounds. Whilst these queries will clearly have to be dealt with, I am minded at present not to make any change now but deal with them, possibly in the run-up to the Examination in that I do not believe they affect or impede the pre-examination consultation that is now underway – but please let me know if this causes any difficulties for PINS.

[REDACTED]

I hope the above is of assistance.

Kind regards,

Brian

**Brian Greenwood**  
Partner | Clyde & Co LLP

**CLYDE&CO**

The St Botolph Building | 138 Houndsditch | London EC3A 7AR | UK  
Main +44 207 876 5000 | Fax +44 207 876 5111 [REDACTED]

---

**If our account details change, we will notify these to you by letter, telephone or face-to-face and never by email.**

**Clyde & Co's privacy notice can be found here [Privacy notice: Clyde & Co](#)**

Please could we request that all correspondence with us is sent electronically where possible. For matters subject to the jurisdiction of England & Wales and where you have agreed with the lawyer with the conduct of the case that email service is appropriate, please use this address [service@clydeco.com](mailto:service@clydeco.com) for service, subject to the restrictions set out [here](#) . Please copy your email to the lawyer with conduct of the case and include our Clyde & Co reference.

This email is sent for and on behalf of Clyde & Co LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC326539 and with its registered office at The St Botolph Building, 138 Houndsditch, London, EC3A 7AR, United Kingdom (Tel: +44 20 7876 5000. Fax: +44 20 7876 5111). Clyde & Co LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority under number 460690 and uses the word "partner" to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of members is available at: [www.clydeco.com](http://www.clydeco.com).

This email and any attachments are confidential and may also be privileged. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately, destroy this email and any attachments, and do not use, copy, store and/or disclose to any person this email and any attachments.

# IMMINGHAM EASTERN RO-RO TERMINAL



Environmental Statement: Volume 1  
Chapter 6: Impact Assessment Approach  
Document Reference: 8.2.6

APFP Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5(2)(a) and 5(2)(e)  
PINS Reference – TR030007

March 2023





# Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal

Environmental Statement: Volume 1  
Chapter 6: Impact Assessment Approach

March 2023



## Document Information

Document Information	
<b>Project</b>	Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal
<b>Document title</b>	Environmental Statement: Volume 1 Chapter 6: Impact Assessment Approach
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Associated British Ports
<b>Document ref</b>	8.2.6
<b>APFP Reg 2009</b>	Regulation 5(2)(a) and 5(2)(e)
<b>Prepared by</b>	ABPmer

Date	Version	Revision Details
10/02/2023	1	
17/03/2023	2	Glossary updated

# Contents

6	Impact Assessment Approach.....	6.1
6.1	Introduction.....	6.1
6.2	Scope of assessment.....	6.1
6.3	Impact assessment methodology.....	6.32
6.4	Study area.....	6.34
6.5	References.....	6.34
6.6	Abbreviations/Acronyms.....	6.34
6.7	Glossary.....	6.36

## Tables

Table 6.1.	Comments received during scoping and public consultation stages and actions undertaken in ES.....	6.2
Table 6.2.	Topics or receptors scoped out of the ES.....	6.31
Table 6.3.	EIA team and topic leads.....	6.33

## 6 Impact Assessment Approach

### 6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 This chapter presents the outcome of the scoping and statutory consultation phase of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. It also details the general impact assessment methodology that has been followed in this Environmental Statement (ES) in order to identify and assess the significant environmental effects likely to be generated by the Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal (IERRT). This general methodology is, however, then supplemented by a description in each of the individual chapters (Chapters 7 to 20) of the specific assessment methodology that has been applied in respect of the relevant topic.
- 6.1.2 The scope and approach presented in this chapter and within Chapters 7 to 20 has been followed in carrying out the assessment of likely significant environmental effects of the proposed development.

### 6.2 Scope of assessment

#### Scoping and consultation

- 6.2.1 An application for a Scoping Opinion was made to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in September 2021 to confirm the scope of the ES for the proposed development (ABPmer, 2021). The Scoping Opinion subsequently received from PINS is included in Appendix 6.1 in Volume 3 of the ES (Application Document Reference number 8.4).
- 6.2.2 Statutory consultation on the preliminary environmental information, as presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), was also undertaken as required under Sections 42 and 47 of the Planning Act 2008. A further statutory consultation then took place following the publication of the Supplementary Consultation Report (SCR).
- 6.2.3 A summary of comments received from consultees during both consultations that apply generally to the EIA or relate to topics that have been scoped out of the EIA are included in Table 6.1. Specific comments raised during the consultations that relate to a particular topic scoped into the assessment are covered in the respective EIA topic chapters (Chapters 7 to 20 of this ES).

**Table 6.1. Comments received during scoping and public consultation stages and actions undertaken in ES**

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
Proposed Development				
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 1.2.3	It is recommended that a table is provided in the ES summarising the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in the ES.	Tables have been provided summarising how scoping responses have been addressed.	Chapter 6, Section 6.2, Table 6.1 (this table). Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 4 of each chapter).
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 2.3.1	The ES should include information on the site, design, size and other relevant features of the development, diagram(s) which provide clearly labelled locations for the various structures proposed for the marine environment, and a description of the location and physical characteristics of the whole development, including any requisite demolition works and land-use requirements during construction and operation phases.	Information has been provided.	Chapters 1 to 3
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 2.3.2	Information should be provided on the location and dimensions of the landside structures in the project description of the ES (or, if not confirmed, the ES should clearly explain the assumptions used to provide a robust assessment of the	Information has been provided.	Chapters 2 and 3

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		Proposed Development's effects on the environment).		
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 2.3.3	If the development consent order (DCO) makes provision for the decommissioning of the Proposed Development then the ES should provide an assessment of the effects on the environment.	The DCO does not make provision for the decommissioning of the proposed development as explained in the ES.	Chapter 3
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 2.3.4	The ES should include a comprehensive glossary to aid the understanding of the Examining Authority and the general reader. The Applicant may also wish to include diagrams or figures within the project description chapter of the ES where this would provide greater clarity.	Information has been provided in the Glossary of each chapter of the ES.	Glossary of each chapter
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 2.3.6	The Inspectorate would expect to see a discrete section in the ES that provides details of the reasonable alternatives studied and the reasoning for the selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects.	Information has been provided.	Chapter 4
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 2.3.7	In the event that some elements of the Proposed Development have not been fixed the ES must explain the parameters which have been used in the assessment and how	The information provided in this ES is based on the design described in Chapters 2 and 3. Where	Chapters 2 and 3

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		<p>these represent the worst case scenario that would arise during all phases of the Proposed Development (see Advice Note Nine ‘Rochdale Envelope’ on the approach to follow when incorporating flexibility into a draft DCO).</p>	<p>elements of the proposed development have not been fixed, a reasonable worst case scenario has been adopted and described in this ES, following the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach.</p>	
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Environment Agency response</p>	<p>The applicant suggests there could be some beneficial use of the arisings from the capital dredge for habitat enhancement. We are supportive of this, should a suitable opportunity arise.</p>	<p>A Waste Hierarchy Assessment (WHA) has been completed to consider the best practicable environmental option (BPEO) for the dredge arisings.</p>	<p>Appendix 2.1. Chapters 2 and 3.</p>
<p>Anglian Water</p>	<p>Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Anglian Water response</p>	<p>Anglian Water would welcome the instigation of discussions with ABP prior to the project layout and initial design fix for the onshore infrastructure and to assist the applicant before the submission of the Draft DCO for examination.</p>	<p>ABP has consulted Anglian Water with a view to establishing and subsequently agreeing that no existing Anglian Water assets will be affected by the proposed scheme, confirming also that ABP is not connecting to Anglian</p>	<p>Further reference to surface and foul water drainage is provided in Chapter 11.</p>
<p>Anglian Water</p>	<p>Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Anglian Water response</p>	<p>It is recommended that the ES should include reference to identified impacts on the water supply, sewerage network and</p>		



Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		sewage treatment both during construction and operation.	Water surface or foul water drainage systems. Protective Provisions have been provided by Anglian Water for inclusion in the draft DCO.	
Anglian Water	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Anglian Water response	The location and design of the onshore Ro-Ro infrastructure should be refined by the applicant and will need to be defined with the assistance of Anglian Water.		
Anglian Water	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Anglian Water response	We would expect that the ES would include reference to existing water supply infrastructure managed by Anglian Water and, if necessary, water supply and wastewater infrastructure near the site in terms of construction impacts, the provision of replacement infrastructure and the requirements for new infrastructure.		
Natural England	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Natural England response	The EIA should consider potential impacts on access land, public open land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. We	The Port of Immingham is not accessible to the public. The England Coast Path is routed	N/A

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		would encourage any proposed development to include provision for the England Coast Path, where appropriate, to maximise the benefits this can bring to the area.	inland of the port estate and will not interact with the proposed development.	
Natural England	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Natural England response	The proposed development is within an area that Natural England considers could benefit from enhanced green infrastructure provision. As such, Natural England would encourage the incorporation of green infrastructure into this development.	Biodiversity enhancement measures are proposed as part of the development.	Chapter 2, Section 2.3. Woodland Enhancement and Management Plan (WEMP) (Application Document Reference number 9.4).
<b>ES approach</b>				
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.1.4	Where relevant, the ES should provide reference to how the delivery of measures proposed to prevent/ minimise adverse effects is secured through DCO requirements (or other suitably robust methods) and whether relevant consultation bodies agree on the adequacy of the measures proposed.	Proposed mitigation measures have been included in each of the individual topic assessment chapters, including reference to consultations that has taken place and how they will be secured where appropriate.  A Schedule of Mitigation is also submitted with the DCO application	Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 9 of each chapter).  Schedule of Mitigation (Application Document Reference number 9.7).

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
			which details where and how proposed mitigation measures will be secured.	
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.1	<p>The Inspectorate recommends that in order to assist the decision-making process, the Applicant uses tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ to demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion;</li> <li>▪ to identify and collate the residual effects after mitigation for each of the aspect chapters, including the relevant interrelationships and cumulative effects;</li> <li>▪ to set out the proposed mitigation and/ or monitoring measures including cross-reference to the means of securing such measures;</li> <li>▪ to describe any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; and</li> <li>▪ to identify where details are contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (where relevant), such</li> </ul>	Tables have been used throughout the ES.	Throughout ES.

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		as descriptions of National Site Network sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, that inform the findings of the ES.		
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.2	The ES should include a description of the baseline scenario with and without implementation of the development as far as natural changes from the baseline scenario can be assessed with reasonable effort on the basis of the availability of environmental information and scientific knowledge. Future baselines used in the ES assessments should be clearly defined and justified.	A description of the existing and future baseline environment has been included in each assessment chapter in the ES.	Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 7 of each chapter)
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.3	The ES should clearly explain how the zones of influence for each assessment have been defined and how they relate to the study area.	The study area has been described in each assessment chapter in the ES.	Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 2 of each chapter)
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.4	The Applicant should clearly state which developments will be assumed to be under construction or operational as part of the future baseline.	The approach to considering other developments has been described in the cumulative and in-combination effects assessment.	Chapter 20

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.5	The Applicant is referred to the advice in section 3.1 of the Inspectorate's Advice Note 17 on using the zone of influence of the Proposed Development to identify other developments which could lead to cumulative environmental effects (rather than a distance of 2 km, as stated in the Scoping Report).	The study area has been defined for each topic as the spatio-temporal coverage of all the potential effects associated with the proposed development. Zones of influence have been used in the cumulative and in-combination effects assessment to identify other developments which could lead to cumulative environmental effects. Full note has been taken of PINS Advice Note 17.	Chapter 20
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.6	The ES should contain the timescales upon which the surveys which underpin the technical assessments have been based. For clarity, this information should be provided either in the introductory chapters of the ES (with confirmation that these timescales apply to all chapters), or in each aspect chapter.	This has been provided in each assessment chapter, where relevant.	Chapters 7 to 19

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.7	The Inspectorate expects the ES to include a chapter setting out the overarching methodology for the assessment, which clearly distinguishes effects that are 'significant' from 'non-significant' effects. Any departure from that methodology should be described in individual aspect assessment chapters. Each aspect chapter of the ES should explain the specific criteria used to determine the significance of effects.	The overarching approach to the assessment has been provided. In addition, topic specific assessment methodologies have been included in each assessment chapter.	Chapter 6 (Section 6.3) and Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 3)
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.8	The ES should include details of difficulties (for example technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered compiling the required information and the main uncertainties involved.	A description of the assumptions and limitations associated with the assessment has been included in the topic assessment chapters.	Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 10)
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.9	The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions (water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced). This information should be provided in a clear and consistent fashion and	This information has been provided in the 'Proposed Development' chapter and 'Details of Project Construction and Operation' chapter, as well as in relevant assessment chapters.	Chapters 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		<p>may be integrated into the relevant aspect assessments.</p>		
<p>PINS</p>	<p>Scoping Opinion Paragraphs 3.3.11 and 3.3.12</p>	<p>The National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSfP) states that applicants should set out the arrangements proposed for managing any waste produced and prepare a Site Waste Management Plan. The ES should include an assessment of the types of waste to be produced by the construction and operation of the Proposed Development and the effects related to its disposal, final use or a justification as to why no Likely Significant Effect (LSE) would arise.</p>	<p>The generation of waste during construction is considered in the ‘Details of Project Construction and Operation’ chapter, and an assessment of the effects related to the dredge and disposal of marine sediment are included in the relevant topic chapters.</p> <p>A WHA, and a Site Waste Management Plan have also been prepared and are submitted with the ES and DCO application, respectively.</p> <p>The potential for an LSE as a result of operational waste is considered in the</p>	<p>Chapters 3, 7, 8, and 9.</p> <p>WHA (Appendix 2.1 to this ES)</p> <p>Site Waste Management Plan appended to Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Application Document reference number 9.2).</p> <p>Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (section headed ‘Final ES scope’)</p>



Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
			‘Final ES scope’ section in this chapter.	
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.13	Any mitigation relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained in detail within the ES. The likely efficacy of the mitigation proposed should be explained with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation proposed is secured, with reference to specific DCO requirements or other legally binding agreements.	Mitigation measures, and how they will be secured, and residual effects have been considered in each assessment chapter.  A Schedule of Mitigation is also submitted with DCO application which details where and how proposed mitigation measures are secured.	Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 9 and 11, respectively).  Schedule of Mitigation (Application Document Reference number 9.7).
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.14	The ES should identify and describe any proposed monitoring of significant adverse effects and how the results of such monitoring would be utilised to inform any necessary remedial actions.	Proposed monitoring of effects has been considered as part of the identification of mitigation measures and presented in each assessment chapter, where relevant.	Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 9 and 11, respectively)
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.15 and 3.1.16	The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects resulting from	Potential accidents and disasters have been considered in relation to land use	Chapters 10, 11, 15, 18 and 19

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		<p>accidents and disasters applicable to the Proposed Development. The description and assessment should consider the vulnerability of the Proposed Development to a potential accident or disaster and also the Proposed Development’s potential to cause an accident or disaster. The assessment should specifically assess significant effects resulting from the risks to human health, cultural heritage or the environment. Any measures that will be employed to prevent and control significant effects should be presented in the ES. Where appropriate, this description should include measures envisaged to prevent or mitigate the significant adverse effects of such events on the environment and details of the preparedness for and proposed response to such emergencies.</p>	<p>planning, commercial and recreational navigation, coastal protection, flood defence and drainage, cultural heritage, and climate change.</p>	
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.17	<p>The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects the Proposed Development has on climate (for example having regard to the</p>	<p>The effect of the proposed development on the climate and the vulnerability of the proposed</p>	<p>Chapters 11 and 19</p>

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		nature and magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions) and the vulnerability of the project to climate change. Where relevant, the ES should describe and assess the adaptive capacity that has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development.	development to climate change has been considered in the assessment chapters on climate change and coastal protection (including adaptive capacity), flood defence and drainage.	
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.20	The Inspectorate recommends that the ES should identify whether the Proposed Development has the potential for significant transboundary impacts and if so, what these are, and which European Economic Area (EEA) States would be affected.	The Secretary of State was of the initial view that the proposed development is likely to have significant impacts on the environment in an EEA State, namely Iceland and Denmark. However, the detailed assessments undertaken indicate that effects to EEA states are not anticipated given the predicted localised and insignificant effects of the	Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (Final ES scope)  Chapter 9

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
			proposed development.	
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.3.21	A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	A reference list has been provided at the end of each chapter.	Throughout ES
PINS	Scoping Opinion Paragraph 3.4.1	The ES should explain any limitations in obtaining relevant environmental information in light of measures adopted in response to COVID-19, and any assumptions made relating to the environmental information on which it relies.	A description of the limitations and assumptions associated with the assessment have been included in assessment chapters.	Chapters 7 to 19 (sub-section 10)
North Lincolnshire Council	Scoping Opinion North Lincolnshire Council response	It is recommended the applicant submit a light impact assessment with any subsequent planning applications.	A Concept Lighting Design Stage Summary Report has been prepared and is included as an appendix to the ES. It presents the proposed lighting scheme with methods of mitigation against potential light pollution onto neighbouring properties and infrastructure and details compliance with various guidance	Concept Lighting Design Stage Summary Report (Appendix 2.2 to this ES)  PEA (Appendix 6.2 to this ES)  Chapter 9, Section 9.8, Table 9.25

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
			documents. The impact of lighting is also considered within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and marine ecology assessment.	
North Lincolnshire Council (PI38)	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	It remains unclear whether lighting is to be included within the proposals. However, if lighting is proposed this should be factored into the ES.	See above.	See above.
South Killingholme Parish Council PTC3	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	There is a need to improve the lighting on A160, especially near the roundabout.	The comment has been passed to the National Highways and local highway authority. The IERRT project does not include works to the A160.	N/A
Network Rail (PI29)	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	Any lighting on the site should be designed so that it does not cause glare/distraction to train drivers.	The proposed Lighting Strategy has been sent to Network Rail for comment. The new lighting concept design has been prepared to limit any light pollution onto neighbouring properties, including	N/A

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
			the rail lines operated by Network Rail. Negotiations are ongoing with Network Rail in the context of a Protective Provision.	
EX20	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	Suggest amending the direction of the Border Control Post (BCP) lights as currently they create a dark area.	The existing BCP does not part of the IERRT project, however, the comment has been noted by ABP.	N/A
<b>Terrestrial ecology</b>				
PINS	Scoping Opinion Table ID 4.4.1	The Scoping Report does not consider the potential for indirect effects on ecological receptors within the Proposed Development's zone of influence. The Scoping Report states that potential air quality impacts on ecological receptors from both construction and operational activities will be assessed. The ES should include an assessment of these matters or information demonstrating agreement with the relevant consultation bodies and the absence of an LSE.	Potential air quality impacts on ecological receptors from both construction and operational activities are assessed in the air quality chapter.	Chapter 13

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
Natural England	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Natural England response	The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on terrestrial protected species (including, for example, great crested newts, reptiles, birds, water voles, badgers and bats).	A PEA has been undertaken by an ecologist in accordance with Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) guidance (CIEEM, 2017). This PEA underpins the conclusion to scope out terrestrial ecology from the ES.	Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (Final ES scope)  Appendix 6.2
Natural England	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Natural England response	Natural England notes that a Phase 1 Habitat survey and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal have been carried out and have reported low ecological value of the habitats identified. Without the detailed results presented, Natural England advises that a habitat survey (equivalent to Phase 2) may be required, in order to identify any important habitats present. In addition, ornithological, botanical and invertebrate surveys should be carried out at appropriate times in the year, to	The PEA has been included as an appendix to this ES and underpins the conclusion to scope out terrestrial ecology from the ES.	Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (Final ES scope)  Appendix 6.2



Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		establish whether any scarce or priority species are present.		
Natural England	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Natural England response	<p>The Environmental Statement should include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Any historical data for the site affected by the proposal (e.g., from previous surveys);</li> <li>▪ Additional surveys carried out as part of this proposal;</li> <li>▪ The habitats and species present;</li> <li>▪ The status of these habitats and species (e.g., whether priority species or habitat);</li> <li>▪ The direct and indirect effects of the development upon those habitats and species;</li> <li>▪ Full details of any mitigation or compensation that might be required.</li> </ul>	Terrestrial ecology has been scoped out of the ES following the conclusions reached in the PEA. Habitats and species present, their status, the potential effects from the development, and details of mitigation measures have been provided in the PEA.	Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (Final ES scope)  Appendix 6.2
North Lincolnshire Council Natural Environment Policy Specialist	Scoping Opinion North Lincolnshire Council response	In terms of landscape and terrestrial ecology, the proposal is not likely to have any significant effects of relevance to North Lincolnshire.	Noted.	N/A
<b>Landscape/seascape and visual impact</b>				
PINS	Scoping Opinion Table ID 4.13.1	The Inspectorate agrees that impacts on landscape/seascape character and visual amenity can be scoped of further assessment	A comprehensive project description which includes dimensions of	Chapters 2 and 3

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		but advises the Applicant to provide a comprehensive project description in the ES including the maximum dimensions of all structures associated with the Proposed Development and visual representations to give the Examining Authority confidence that no significant environmental effects would arise.	structures and visual representations of the proposed development is provided.	
Natural England	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Natural England response	<p>Natural England would wish to see details of local landscape character areas mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. The EIA should include assessments of visual effects on the surrounding area and landscape together with any physical effects of the development, such as changes in topography.</p> <p>The EIA should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies.</p>	<p>In line with the Scoping Opinion from PINS and comments provided by West Lindsey District Council and North Lincolnshire Council (NLC), and North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC), landscape/seascape and visual impacts have been scoped out of the ES. This approach was also confirmed and agreed with Natural England during a subsequent pre-application</p>	Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (Final ES scope)

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		The assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas	meeting on 28 April 2022.	
Natural England	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 Natural England response	<p>Natural England encourages all new development to consider the character and distinctiveness of the area, with the siting and design of the proposed development reflecting local design characteristics and, wherever possible, using local materials.</p> <p>The EIA process should detail the measures to be taken to ensure the building design will be of a high standard, as well as detail of layout alternatives together with justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>The need and alternatives for the IERRT project are also provided in the ES.</p>	<p>Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (Final ES scope)</p> <p>Chapter 4</p>
West Lindsey District Council	Scoping Opinion Appendix 2 West Lindsey District Council response	The location of the proposed Ro-Ro Terminal would be approximately 3.3 miles (5.4 kilometres) from the shared North East Lincolnshire and West Lindsey district boundary. The scale of the development in terms of height is unknown but it is considered that the development	Noted.	N/A

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		<p>would be in context with the existing Immingham Port Structures and the large settlement of Immingham sits between Immingham Port and parts of West Lindsey. It would therefore be highly unlikely to be in view from any parts of the West Lindsey District. Therefore, it is not considered that any viewpoints from West Lindsey are necessary and no residential properties in West Lindsey would be affected.</p>		
<p>North Lincolnshire Council Natural Environment Policy Specialist</p>	<p>Scoping Opinion North Lincolnshire Council response</p>	<p>In terms of landscape and terrestrial ecology, the proposal is not likely to have any significant effects of relevance to North Lincolnshire.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>North East Lincolnshire Council</p>	<p>Scoping Opinion North East Lincolnshire Council response</p>	<p>From a landscape perspective there are no concerns about [the proposed development]. Given the location of the docks and the proposal, the impacts on the landscape character are very low on the priority list.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>North East Lincolnshire Council (PI45)</p>	<p>Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022</p>	<p>No major concerns were raised but opportunities to improve visual amenity should not be overlooked.</p>	<p>Being part of the statutory and operational port estate, the vast majority of the</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
			<p>landside area associated with the IERRT project will only require a simple upgrade. The proposed buildings have also been designed to generally resemble the style of buildings that already exist within the port estate. The marine infrastructure will also be similar to existing port infrastructure extending into the Humber Estuary.</p>	
EX10	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	Suggest tree planting along A160 to act as a visual and acoustic barrier.	The comment has been passed to the National Highways and local highway authority. The IERRT project does not include works to the A160.	N/A
Other				
UK Health Security Agency	Scoping Opinion October 2021	We request that the ES clarifies whether the application will require the installation or redirection of electric substations or transmission	Noted. The project will not be changing any over-head mains cables/transmission	N/A

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		lines and if necessary, the proposer should confirm either that the proposed development does not impact any receptors from potential sources of Electric Magnetic Fields (EMF); or ensure that an adequate assessment of the possible impacts is undertaken and included in the ES.	lines or Northern Powergrid Substations. It will only be altering internal port substations and small power distribution networks. Hence, it is not anticipated that the proposed development will impact any receptors from potential sources of EMF.	
UK Health Security Agency (PI37)	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	The current submission does not consider any risk of impacts that might arise as a result of electric and magnetic fields associated with the development; we acknowledge that this is unlikely to occur but would prefer to see this formally addressed as previously detailed in our scoping submission.	See above.	N/A
Humberside Police (PI15)	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	Query raised regarding the contingency if ordnance is discovered during dredging.	Initial geophysical surveys have been undertaken including magnetometry surveys to reduce the risk of unexploded ordnance (UXO)	N/A

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
			discovery during the works. The main contractor will carry out further detailed surveys on pile locations and dredged area prior to works commencing.	
National Air Traffic Services (NATS)	Statutory Consultation - 19 Jan - 23 Feb 2022	Anticipate no impact from the proposal and no comments to make on the application.	Noted.	N/A
National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (PI 7)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	Confirm that National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC has no existing apparatus within or in close proximity to the proposed site boundary. Highlighted projects proposed and outlined in the Holistic Network Design that fall within close proximity to the proposed site boundary – would like to be kept informed as this proposal progresses.	Noted.	N/A
Environment Agency (PI 11)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	We also request the final Environmental Statement confirms the difference in the number of piles that was originally thought to be required, as opposed to the 58 now required for the realigned/lengthened access jetty	The maximum number of piles required for the proposed development in the marine environment totals 214 (6 for the abutment structure,	Chapter 2



Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		from shore to linkspan and pontoons.	46 for the approach jetty, 6 for the linkspan bankseat, 28 for the pontoon restraint dolphins, 54 for each finger pier, 20 for vessel impact protection (if required)). At PEIR stage, the number of piles were not specified.	
Northern Powergrid (PI 14)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	In reviewing the latest proposals, little has changed with regard to where the Ro-Ro proposals may interact with Northern Powergrid assets, therefore we were not looking to respond to the latest consultation.	Noted.	N/A
Natural England (PI 22)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	Natural England welcomes the commitment by ABP to include one hectare of land owned by ABP within the Skeffling managed realignment site as a marine environmental enhancement (for clarity, this will not be compensation or mitigation). It will be important to include this marine environmental enhancement within the overall objectives for ABP's	Noted.	Further information is provided in Chapter 2, Section 2.3.

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		section of Skeffling managed realignment site to ensure that the site can be monitored effectively and to avoid 'double counting' for other objectives such as compensation.		
Natural England (PI 22)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	Natural England welcome the inclusion of woodland enhancement through the proposed development of a targeted management plan. The 'Long wood' is an area of woodland that is noted as part of a much larger strip of Priority habitat that grows towards the Humber Estuary. It is also part of the National Forest Inventory; therefore, we would advise consultation with Forestry England when considering management principles.	The WEMP submitted as part of the DCO has been discussed and agreed with the Local Planning Authority (LPA). This included a meeting on the site between the applicant, the applicant's ecologist and the LPA tree officer, prior to the development of the document.	Woodland Enhancement and Management Plan (WEMP) (Application Document Reference number 9.4)
North Lincolnshire Council (PI 26)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	North Lincolnshire Council has reviewed the Supplementary Consultation Report (SCR). Having considered this document and the proposed changes to the project NLC has no additional comments to raise in addition to those raised in our response to the initial round of statutory	Noted.	N/A

Consultee	Comment Reference	Comment	Action	Chapter or Section of ES
		consultation dated 23 February 2022. Overall, the revisions to the scheme will reduce the scale of the development and are considered to be positive changes that are unlikely to result in any additional or materially different impacts.		
North East Lincolnshire Council (PI 27)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	Following this consultation, it is confirmed that NELC has no further comments to make over and above those made on the first consultation. NELC welcome the on-going engagement and collaborative working with ABP throughout the DCO process.	Noted.	N/A
Scarborough Borough Council (PI 28)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	Scarborough Borough Council in its role as a Local Planning Authority has no comment to make.	Noted.	N/A
Selby District Council (PI 28)	Supplementary Statutory Consultation – 28 Oct – 27 Nov 2022	The District Council can confirm that they have no comments to make.	Noted.	N/A

6.2.4 ABP has held a number of meetings and communications with regulators and key stakeholders during the pre-application phase of the IERRT project, including:

- North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC);
- North Lincolnshire Council (NLC);
- Lincolnshire County Council;
- West Lindsey District Council;
- East Lindsey District Council;
- East Riding of Yorkshire;
- Kingston upon Hull;
- Stallingborough Parish Council;
- Immingham Town Council;
- North Killingholme Parish Council;
- South Killingholme Parish Council;
- Natural England;
- Health and Safety Executive (HSE);
- Environment Agency;
- PINS;
- National Highways & Systra;
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB);
- Marine Management Organisation (MMO);
- Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas);
- Port stakeholders (customers, tenants, land interests, service providers and competitors);
- Port of Immingham Harbour Master (ABP) as Statutory Harbour Authority (SHA) and Humber Estuary Services (ABP) as Competent Harbour Authority (CHA);
- Utility companies (Gas, Electricity, Water and Communications)
- Witham and North East Lindsey Drainage Boards;
- The Coal Authority;
- Historic England;
- UK Health Security Agency;
- The Crown Estate;
- Royal Mail;
- Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd;
- Humberside Fire and Rescue;
- Humberside Police;
- National Air Traffic Services (NATS) Safeguarding;
- Ministry of Defence;
- Maritime Coastguard Agency;
- British Transport Police;
- Trinity House;
- Technical organisations and Interest Groups;
- Members of the public; and
- Local Businesses.

6.2.5 The principal purpose and outcomes of the consultation that has been undertaken is summarised in the Consultation Report submitted as part of the DCO application (Application Document Reference number 6.1).

6.2.6 Consultation with a number of bodies has also been carried out to obtain baseline information and further advice on the environmental assessments (e.g., confirming survey methodologies, approach to the assessment for each environmental topic, discussing impact assessment outcomes) in support of the applications for the proposed development where required. This additional and ongoing consultation is detailed within each individual topic chapter.

## Final ES scope

6.2.7 Based on expert judgement together with feedback provided by PINS in their Scoping Opinion, the following EIA topics or receptors have the potential to be affected by the proposed development and have been scoped into this ES:

- Physical processes (Chapter 7 of this ES);
- Water and sediment quality (Chapter 8 of this ES);
- Nature conservation and marine ecology (Chapter 9 of this ES);
- Commercial and recreational navigation (Chapter 10 of this ES);
- Coastal protection, flood defence and drainage (Chapter 11 of this ES);
- Ground conditions, including land quality (Chapter 12 of this ES);
- Air quality (Chapter 13 of this ES);
- Airborne noise and vibration (Chapter 14 of this ES);
- Cultural heritage and marine archaeology (Chapter 15 of this ES);
- Socio-economic receptors (Chapter 16 of this ES);
- Traffic and transport (Chapter 17 of this ES);
- Land use planning (Chapter 18 of this ES);
- Climate change (Chapter 19 of this ES); and
- Cumulative and in-combination effects (Chapter 20 of this ES).

6.2.8 The above EIA topics or receptors are assessed in Chapters 7 to 20 of this ES.

6.2.9 Regulation 32 of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 relates to transboundary effects on other European Economic Area (EEA) States. The Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State undertook a first screening assessment under Regulation 32 in January 2022 following ABP's request for a scoping opinion. From the assessment undertaken at that first screening stage the Secretary of State was of the view that the IERRT development is likely to have significant impacts on the environment in an EEA State. This is considered to apply to Iceland and Denmark given that bird species within the Humber Estuary, which are qualifying features of the Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), migrate to these countries for the summer months. In reaching this view PINS applied the precautionary approach (as explained in Advice Note 12: Transboundary Impacts). Therefore, the states of Iceland and Denmark have been notified of the proposed development.

6.2.10 However, based on the evidence and assessment presented in this ES (see the Natural Conservation and Marine Ecology chapter (Chapter 9) of this ES), effects on EEA states are not anticipated given the predicted localised and insignificant effects of the proposed development on the relevant qualifying features of the SPA.

6.2.11 A number of topics/receptors have been scoped out and have not been specifically assessed in detail in the ES. The rationale for not undertaking further assessment is presented in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.2. Topics or receptors scoped out of the ES**

Topic or Receptor	Justification
Terrestrial ecology	<p>Most of the land within the northern and eastern parts of the proposed development site is hardstanding / roads within the operational port that is of negligible ecological value. The southern part of the proposed development site comprises ephemeral / short perennial vegetation and some peripheral areas of grassland, scrub and trees in less disturbed parts of the site. The site may support protected species (bats, otter and breeding birds). Standard best practice mitigation measures are proposed to confirm the presence of protected species and avoid any significant effects during construction and operation. For example, vegetation to be cleared during construction will be checked for the presence of active breeding bird nests prior to removal. Where active nests are found, an appropriate buffer will be established around the nest and no clearance will be undertaken within the buffer until any young have fledged and the nest is no longer occupied. Such measures are captured in the CEMP submitted with the DCO application (Application Document reference number 9.2). A PEA has been undertaken by an ecologist in accordance with CIEEM guidance (CIEEM, 2017). This PEA report is provided at Appendix 6.2 of the ES and has informed the conclusion to scope out direct impacts to terrestrial ecological receptors from the ES.</p> <p>Potential indirect air quality impacts on terrestrial ecological receptors are scoped into the assessment, in accordance with the Scoping Opinion summarised in Table 6.1 and are considered in the Air Quality chapter (Chapter 13 of this ES).</p>
Landscape and visual	<p>The existing port infrastructure and other adjacent industrial development has a strong influence on the existing landscape/seascape character and views. Potential change to such characteristics and to views as a result of the IERRT development will be limited and largely consistent with existing surrounding port operations. While new structures and features will be added, these will be within the existing port area and will be similar to existing elements already present. Due to the existing context and limited nature of change it is considered that there is no potential for any</p>

Topic or Receptor	Justification
	<p>significant effects and, therefore, landscape/seascape and visual impacts have been scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>The PINS Scoping Opinion summarised in Table 6.1 (and presented in full in Appendix 6.1 of the ES) agrees that this topic can be scoped out of the ES.</p>
Operational waste	<p>All vessel waste will be handled outside of the UK under existing arrangements. General waste from the Terminal buildings and operations will be managed through an operational waste management plan. Furthermore, an existing Ro-Ro freight operator on the Humber, which already produces operational waste managed in line with a waste management plan, will move to the IERRT once operational (see Need and Alternatives chapter (Chapter 4) of this ES). Therefore, the majority of operational waste produced as a result of the IERRT project is already accounted for in the existing baseline.</p> <p>On the basis of the above information, no significant effects due to operational waste are considered likely to arise from the proposed development and, therefore, this matter is not further assessed within the ES.</p>

6.2.12 It should be noted that the Scoping Opinion was based upon an earlier iteration of the proposed IERRT development. Since the Scoping Opinion was issued further work has been undertaken on the design of the IERRT project, taking account of the ongoing assessment work and the consultation responses as necessary and appropriate. However, as the iterations made to the development relate to reducing further its potential impacts and providing further clarity on certain aspects of the project they do not affect the conclusions reached on the scope of the ES set out within the Scoping Opinion.

## 6.3 Impact assessment methodology

6.3.1 All of the technical aspect assessments have been undertaken on the basis of a common understanding of the proposed development as detailed in Chapters 2 and 3 of this ES. The spatial and temporal extent of each specialist assessment varies depending upon the environmental aspect being considered. Technical appendices provide further information, where appropriate, and these are included in Volume 3 of this ES. A glossary of common terms used are provided at the end of each chapter, where relevant, in Volume 1 of the ES.

6.3.2 For some disciplines, specific guidance on EIA and the approach to assessment is available, whilst others rely on best practice. Each individual assessment chapter details whether the assessment methodology is based on published guidance and industry standards or whether a specific methodology has been followed based on professional judgment.

6.3.3 Each topic assessment chapter of this ES has, however, been written to include the following general common elements:

- Introduction;
- Definition of the study area;
- Assessment methodology;
- Consultation;
- Implications of legislation, policy and guidance;
- Description of the existing environment;
- Future baseline environment;
- Consideration of likely impacts and effects;
- Mitigation measures;
- Limitations and assumptions;
- Conclusions on residual effects;
- Abbreviation and acronyms;
- Glossary; and
- References.

## EIA team

6.3.4 The EIA team consists of ABPmer, Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd, AECOM Ltd, Wessex Archaeology, David Tucker Associates (DTA) and Kent Energies UK Ltd. Table 6.3 details the consultancies that are responsible for each topic. ABPmer has the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Quality Mark, as does AECOM Ltd and Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd, demonstrating their commitment to excellence in leading the co-ordination of statutory EIAs in the United Kingdom (UK).

**Table 6.3. EIA team and topic leads**

Topic	Lead
EIA coordination	ABPmer
Legislation, policy and consenting framework	Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd
Need and alternatives	Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd
Physical processes	ABPmer
Water and sediment quality	ABPmer
Nature conservation and marine ecology	ABPmer
Terrestrial ecology	AECOM Ltd
Commercial and recreational navigation	ABPmer
Coastal protection, flood defence, and drainage	AECOM Ltd
Ground conditions, including land quality	AECOM Ltd
Air quality	AECOM Ltd
Airborne noise and vibration	AECOM Ltd
Cultural heritage and marine archaeology	Wessex Archaeology
Socio-economic receptors	AECOM Ltd
Traffic and transport	DTA
Land use planning	Kent Energies UK Ltd
Climate change	AECOM Ltd
Landscape/seascape and visual	AECOM Ltd
Cumulative and In-combination	All



6.3.5 Regulation 14(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 (as amended) requires:

- The applicant to “ensure that the environmental statement is prepared by competent experts”; and
- The environmental statement to be “accompanied by a statement from the applicant outlining the relevant expertise or qualifications of such experts.”

6.3.6 The relevant expertise and qualifications of the competent experts who have prepared this ES are documented through the pen profiles provided in Appendix 6.3 to this ES.

## 6.4 Study area

6.4.1 The scope of the study areas considered has been defined on the basis of the proposed design of the development. It has also taken into account the spatial and temporal extent (zone of influence) of the likely significant effects that could arise from the proposed development, their importance in a geographical context, as well as the sensitivities of the relevant topics/receptors. Areas outside the range of any potential impacts are representative of the wider natural environment and are therefore outside of the study areas identified.

6.4.2 A study area has been defined for each assessment topic and is specified within each individual assessment chapter (Chapters 7 to 20).

## 6.5 References

ABPmer. (2021). Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal, Scoping Report, ABPmer Report No. R.3712. A report produced by ABPmer for Associated British Ports, September 2021.

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. [Online] Available at: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (accessed 25 November 2021).

## 6.6 Abbreviations/Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
ABP	Associated British Ports
BCP	Border Control Post
BPEO	Best Practicable Environmental Option
Cefas	Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CHA	Competent Harbour Authority
CIEEM	Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management

---

COVID	Coronavirus
DCO	Development Consent Order
DTA	David Tucker Associates
EEA	European Economic Area
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMF	Electric Magnetic Fields
ES	Environmental Statement
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
ID	Identification
IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
IERRT	Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LSE	Likely Significant Effect
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
N/A	Not Applicable
NATS	National Air Traffic Services
NELC	North East Lincolnshire Council
NLC	North Lincolnshire Council
NPSfP	National Policy Statement for Ports
PEA	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
PLC	Public Limited Company
Ro-Ro	Roll-on/Roll-off
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SCR	Supplementary Consultation Report
SHA	Statutory Harbour Authority
SPA	Special Protection Area
UK	United Kingdom
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WEMP	Woodland Enhancement and Management Plan
WHA	Waste Hierarchy Assessment

Cardinal points/directions are used unless otherwise stated.

SI units are used unless otherwise stated.

## 6.7 Glossary

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Bankseat	End support for the approach jetty, forming the foundation for the linkspan bridge
Baseline conditions	Existing conditions and past trends associated with the environment in which a proposed activity may take place
Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management	Professional membership body which represents and supports ecologists and environmental managers in the UK, Ireland and internationally
Cumulative effects	Combined effects of multiple developments or the combined effect of individual impacts (e.g., where different project elements in different locations have a cumulative impact on a particular feature)
Dolphin (structure)	A group of piles arranged together in a dock, waterway or along a shore (or similar) to serve variously as a protective hardpoint, as a means or point of stabilisation, as a mooring point, and/or as a base for navigational aids
Electric Magnetic Fields	Invisible areas of energy, often referred to as radiation, that are associated with the use of electrical power and various forms of natural and man-made lighting. Electric Magnetic Fields are typically grouped into one of two categories by their frequency – non-ionizing (low-level radiation which is generally perceived as harmless to humans) and ionizing (high-level radiation which has the potential for cellular damage)
Ephemeral (plant)	Any short-lived plant, usually one that has one or more generations per year, growing only during favourable periods and passing the unfavourable periods in the form of seeds
Greenhouse gas emissions	Total mass of greenhouse gases, which absorb and emit radiant energy causing warming, released to the atmosphere over a specific period of time.
Invertebrate	Animals which lack a vertebral column / backbone
Land use planning	The approach used to ensure that proposed developments are not located in areas where the risks to people would be unacceptable
Linkspan	Type of bridge used mainly in the operation of moving vehicles on and off a roll-on/roll-off (Ro-Ro) vessel or ferry, particularly to allow for tidal changes in water level

---

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Major accident	An accident resulting in significant harm to people or the environment
Major hazard pipeline	A pipeline carrying a dangerous substance which could lead to harm to people or the environment
Major hazard site	An installation where the presence of one or more dangerous substances could lead to harm to people or the environment
Managed realignment	The process of allowing controlled tidal flooding across low-lying coastal areas by realigning existing seawalls, embankments or dikes
Perennial	Any plant that persists for several years, usually with new herbaceous growth from a part that survives from growing season to growing season
Risk	The likelihood of a specified level of harm occurring within a specified period of time
Statutory Harbour Authority	Statutory Bodies responsible for the management and running of a harbour
Topography	The arrangement of the natural and artificial physical features of an area
Unexploded ordnance	Explosive weapons (bombs, shells, grenades, land mines, naval mines, cluster munition, and other munitions) that did not explode when they were employed and still pose a risk of detonation
Zone of influence	Spatial and temporal extent of the changes and likely significant effects that could arise from a proposed development

## Contact Us

ABPmer

Quayside Suite,

Medina Chambers

Town Quay, Southampton

SO14 2AQ

T +44 (0) 23 8071 1840

F +44 (0) 23 8071 1841

E [enquiries@abpmer.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@abpmer.co.uk)

