



Application by Associated British Ports for the Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 7 August 2023

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the Examination Timetable (published at the same time as ExQ1) enables the ExA 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 Annex C to the Rule 6 letter of 20 June 2023 [PD-006]. 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 ExA 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 topic prefix identifier (capital letters), a reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then a question number. For example, the first question on Navigation and Shipping issues is identified as NS.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

ExQ1 has been issued prior to receipt of, amongst other things, comments on Relevant Representations and the post ISH1 and ISH2 submissions, due at Deadline 1 (D1) in the Examination Timetable. If you are asked a question but it has been fully addressed through the making of a D1 submission, it will be sufficient to provide a cross-reference to any such D1 submission.

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 to set out your responses.

Unless otherwise specifically stated in a particular question, all responses should be made no later than Deadline 2: 5 September 2023



Abbreviations used:

ABP	Associated British Ports
ALARP	As Low As Reasonably Practicable
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CLdN	CLdN Ports Killingholme Limited
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DFDS	DFDS Seaways Limited
DML	Deemed Marine Licence
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EM	Explanatory Memorandum
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
HE	Historic England
HOTT	Humber Oil Terminals Trustee Ltd
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HRAr	Applicant's Habitats Regulation Assessment report
IERRT	Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal (proposed development)
IOT	Immingham Oil Terminal
IOT Operators	Associated Petroleum Terminals (Immingham) Limited and Humber Oil Terminals Trustee Limited



IP	Interested Party
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
LHA	Local highway authorities (North East Lincolnshire Council and North Lincolnshire Council)
LIR	Local Impact Report
MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Agency
MGN	Marine Guidance Note
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MSMS	Marine Safety Management System
NE	Natural England
NELC	North East Lincolnshire Council
NLC	North Lincolnshire Council
NRA	Navigation Risk Assessment
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
PMSC	Port Marine Safety Code
Proposed Development	The proposed Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal
RIES	Report on the Implications for European Sites
Ro-Ro	Roll on roll off
RR	Relevant Representation
SAC	Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation
SHA	Statutory Harbour Authority



SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoST	Secretary of State for Transport
SPA	Humber Estuary Special Protection Area
WR	Written Representation

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:

[TR030007-000415-Examination Library .pdf \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](https://www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/tr030007-000415-Examination%20Library.pdf)

It will be updated as the Examination progresses.

Citation of Questions

Questions in this table should be cited with the full question number. For example, 'BGC.1.1' refers to Broad, General and Cross-topic in ExQ1, question 1 in this table.



Index

BGC	Broad, General and Cross-topic+ questions.....	6
CA	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and other Land Rights Considerations	10
CC	Climate Change	10
DCO	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	12
LHE	Historic Environment including Marine Archaeology.....	16
BNE	Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment.....	16
NS	Navigation and Shipping	22
SE	Socio-Economic	27
TT	Terrestrial Transport and Traffic.....	27
WE	Water Environment, Flood Risk and Drainage.....	29

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
BGC Broad, General and Cross-topic+ questions		
BGC.1.1	North East Lincolnshire Council (NELC) and North Lincolnshire Council (NLC)	<p>Development Plan policies</p> <p>NELC and NLC are requested to confirm whether they are content with the Applicant's policy analysis. The local planning authorities in responding to this question should also advise on whether there have been any changes to the Development Plan operative in their respective areas further to the submission of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) application and/or as to whether any changes are anticipated prior to 25 January 2024, the latest date by which the Examination must be completed.</p>
BGC.1.2	NELC and NLC	<p>Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>Are there any relevant made or emerging neighbourhood plans that the ExA should be aware of? If there are, please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide details, confirming their status and, if they are emerging, the expected timescales for their making. Provide copies of the relevant parts of any made plan or emerging plan. Indicate what weight it is considered the ExA should give to these documents.
BGC.1.3	NELC and NLC	<p>Updates on other development</p> <p>Provide an update on any planning applications that have been submitted or any permissions that have been granted following the NSIP Application's submission which could either affect the Proposed Development or be affected by the Proposed Development and advise whether those developments would affect the conclusions reached in the Environmental Statement (ES).</p>
BGC.1.4	Applicant and any other Interested Party (IP)	<p>Central Government Policy and Guidance</p> <p>Are you aware of any updates or changes to Government Policy or Guidance relevant to the consideration of this application that have been made since it was submitted? If yes, what are those changes and what implications, if any, would they have for the consideration of the Proposed Development?</p>
BGC.1.5	Stena	<p>Stena operations at Killingholme</p> <p>Stena to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> explain when and why it will be ceasing all of its operations at the Port of Killingholme; and

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		b) comment on whether, in its view, there are any operational factors militating against the expansion of unaccompanied Ro-Ro freight capacity at the Port of Killingholme.
BGC.1.6	CLdN	<p>Evidence for suitability of an alternative to the Proposed Development</p> <p>Comment on the case made by the Applicant that the National Policy Statement for Ports places the onus for producing evidence about the suitability of an alternative on the person promoting an alternative [paragraph 4.3.5 in APP-040]?</p>
BGC.1.7	Applicant	<p>Effects of construction of impact protection</p> <p>Paragraph 16.87 in [APP-052] of the ES refers to the construction of the proposed vessel impact protection measures being “<i>timed to avoid works to the IOT finger pier berths 8 and 9 when they are in use</i>”. Elaborate on that statement and provide an outline method statement for the construction of the impact protection measures should it be determined they would be needed.</p>
BGC.1.8	Applicant	<p>Confirm to what depth berth pockets would be dredged</p> <p>The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [paragraph 1.3.3 of APP-111] states “... <i>The berth area will be dredged with the appropriate side slopes to a depth of 9m below Chart Datum (CD), including an allowance for over dredge</i>”. Elsewhere in the ES it is stated that the dredge pocket would be dredged to a depth of 7m below CD. Please confirm if the impact assessment throughout allows for impacts of dredging to a depth of 7 metres depth or 9 metres including over dredge. Provide signposting to all places in the ES where the dredge depth is relevant to the impact assessment.</p>
BGC.1.9	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	<p>Disposal at sea of dredged material</p> <p>The CEMP [paragraph 1.3.9 in APP-111] states “... <i>it is considered that the dredge material is suitable for disposal at sea</i>”. Would the MMO confirm whether it does or does not agree with that statement.</p>
BGC.1.10	Applicant	<p>Future shore-to-ship power supply:</p> <p>Appendix 13.1 of the ES on Air Quality assessment states “<i>When docked, the primary power source for the Ro-Ro vessels will be a shore-to-ship power supply...</i>” [paragraph 13A.4.4 in APP-101].</p> <p>Elaborate on what is meant by “<i>Provision for future ship to shore power</i>” in the Planning Statement [paragraph 3.36 in APP-019] and when the power supply would be expected to be brought into regular service for the proposed new Ro-RO berths.</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		<p>Signpost where provision for future ship to shore power supply is confirmed in Chapter 13 [APP-049] and where provision of the infrastructure for shore-to-ship power supply is incorporated in the Project Description and the draft DCO.</p> <p>Is the supply of shore-to ship power to be secured by the DCO or only the infrastructure for supply? Is use of shore power to be made a requirement of operators?</p>
BGC.1.11	Applicant	<p>Inter-active effects consequent on “stemming” of waiting shipping traffic:</p> <p>Respond in detail (with signposting of where the assessment of likely effects has been made) to the Relevant Representation made by DFDS [paragraphs 5.2 and 5.4 in RR-008] that maintains that adverse effects both to shipping and to the environment would result from “stemming” (waiting) of shipping traffic.</p>
BGC.1.12	Applicant	<p>Air quality impact mitigation</p> <p>Confirm if the assessment in ES chapter 13 (Air Quality) accounts for additional marine tug activity arising from the operation of the Proposed Development and if the marine tugs to be used would comply with relevant MARPOL emission standards [paragraph 13.3.18 in APP-049].</p>
BGC.1.13	Applicant	<p>Waste landfill void capacity</p> <p>Review the phrase “<i>Information on future non-hazardous and non-hazardous waste landfill void capacity...</i>” in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [paragraph A.3.6 APP-111] and confirm if a correction is needed to omit the second occurrence of “<i>non-hazardous</i>”.</p>
BGC.1.14	Applicant	<p>Impact protection measures for the Immingham Oil Terminal (IOT)</p> <p>Should the CEMP [APP-111] include wording in the tables of mitigation measures, most particularly Table 3.4, to provide for the potential construction of the IOT impact protection measures, should those measures be required?</p>
BGC.1.15	Applicant	<p>Cumulative and In-Combination Effects (Intra-Project)</p> <p>Explain why in Table 20.6 in [APP-056] there is neither an assessment for underwater noise as an operational phase impact pathway nor navigation and shipping effects and consider whether those matters need to be addressed.</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
BGC.1.16	Applicant	<p>CEMP Remediation Strategy</p> <p>Check and correct as necessary the sentence beginning “<i>A final Remediation Strategy will be prepared...</i>” regarding contamination risk management measures in [Table 3.6 in APP-111].</p> <p>For the CEMP in its entirety, undertake a general sense check and update as necessary and re-issue at Deadline 2.</p>
BGC.1.17	Applicant	<p>Potential impact of sediment transport</p> <p>With the proposed dredge pocket expected to require maintenance dredging, explain why the “<i>magnitude of change</i>” for future sediment transport has been rated as “<i>small</i>” [paragraphs 7.8.64 and 7.8.65 in APP-043]?</p>
BGC.1.18	Applicant	<p>Rochdale Envelope</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.3.6 and 2.3.7 in Chapter 2 of the ES (Project Description) [APP-038] state that the Proposed Development has been assessed using the worst-case scenario through adopting a “<i>Rochdale Envelope</i>” and maximum parameters. The building envelopes for landside works are provided in ES Appendix 2.3 [APP-078], however, Chapter 2 of the ES includes phrases such as “<i>an area just over</i>”, “<i>approximately</i>”, “<i>a number of</i>” and “<i>some 240 trailer parking bays</i>” which do not provide certainty about the nature of the Rochdale Envelope that has been relied on to assess the impacts for the Proposed Development. The Applicant is requested to provide a revised version of Chapter 2 of the ES which includes a definition of the worst-case scenario used for the assessment of the Proposed Development’s impacts and confirms that the assessment is based on the parameters derived from the worst-case scenario.</p>
BGC.1.19	Applicant	<p>Immingham Green Energy Terminal application</p> <p>Provide an indication of when it is expected that the NSIP application for the Immingham Green Energy Terminal scheme will be submitted for Examination.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
CA Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and other Land Rights Considerations		
CA.1.1	Affected Persons	<p>Any Book of Reference etc inaccuracies</p> <p>Are any Affected Persons aware of any inaccuracies in the Book of Reference [APP-016], Statement of Reasons [APP-017] or Land Plans [APP-006]? If so, please identify what those inaccuracies are and provide the correct details.</p>
CA.1.2	Statutory Undertakers and Interested Parties identified to benefit from Protective Provisions in Schedule 4 of the draft Development Consent Order	<p>Protective Provisions</p> <p>Please advise of the progress you are making to negotiate Protective Provisions with the Applicant, highlighting any areas of disagreement with the Applicant in terms of agreeing the wording for Protective Provisions.</p>
CA.1.3	Crown Estate Commissioners	<p>Crown land consent</p> <p>Can the Crown Estate Commissioners provide an update regarding the discussions between it and the Applicant about the giving of its consent for the use of the Crown land affected by the Proposed Development. Most particularly whether agreement will be reached before the close of the Examination which will be not later than 25 January 2024.</p>
CC Climate Change		
CC.1.1	Interested Parties	<p>Green House Gas (GHG) emission sources considered</p> <p>Are you content with the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions sources considered by the Applicant in the lifecycle GHG Impact Assessment? If not, why not?</p>
CC.1.2	Interested Parties	<p>Climate parameters considered for Climate Change Review (CCR)</p> <p>Are you content with the climate parameters considered by the Applicant in the CCR? If not, why not?</p>
CC.1.3	Interested Parties	<p>Determination of current baseline for climate change</p> <p>Do you consider the desk-based review of information as set out in Chapter 19 of the ES [APP-055] is adequate to determine the current baseline conditions? If not, why not?</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
CC.14	Interested Parties	<p>GHG emission calculations</p> <p>Do you consider that GHG emissions have been calculated in line with the most up to date available guidance?</p>
CC.15	Applicant	<p>Approach to identifying GHG emissions hotspots</p> <p>Explain in more detail what you mean by the approach “...has taken a project lifecycle approach to identify GHG emissions hotspots ...and correspondingly enable the identification of priority areas for mitigation. This approach is consistent with the principles set out in IEMA guidance (IEMA, 2022)”. How is the approach taken considered to be consistent with the principles set out in the IEMA guidance?</p>
CC.16	Applicant	<p>Use of local carbon budgets</p> <p>Explain more about your reasoning not to use local carbon budgets in contextualising emissions, particularly as [APP-055] section 19.3.6] states “IEMA (2022) recommends ...” Explain the difference between a recommendation and a requirement in this context.</p>
CC.17	Applicant	<p>Future use of electrical shore-to-ship power and site plant and equipment</p> <p>You state the use of electrical power to ships at berth and the use of other electric-powered site plant and equipment are to become more common in future years, thereby contributing towards reducing operational energy use and GHG emissions in line with the trajectory towards net-zero. Paragraphs 19.9.2 and 19.9.3 in [APP-055].</p> <p>Advise on how and over what timeframe these adaptations would be implemented and put into use and by whom and they could be secured in a made the DCO.</p>
CC.18	Applicant	<p>Ecological enhancement and mitigation measures and climate change implications</p> <p>ES Chapter 9 [APP-045] and the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal [APP-082] detail ecological enhancement measures which are proposed to be delivered offsite. No reference has been made as to whether the proposed ecological enhancement measures would be resilient to climate change. The Applicant should explain whether the potential for the proposed ecological enhancement and mitigation measures to be affected by climate change has been assessed.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
DCO Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)		
DCO.1.1	Applicant	<p>General editing</p> <p>Check and confirm that the dDCO [APP-013] is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) fully audited to ensure that there are no internal inconsistencies in the draft DCO and its constituent parts including the Deemed Marine Licence (DML) (which should not permit works outside the scope of those that would be permitted by the DCO itself) and that all legislative references in the draft DCO are to extant provisions and that all of the schedules refer to the correct articles; b) drafted so that any registered company is referred to in the draft DCO and/or DML and is defined using its full and precise company name and company registration number (as those appear on the register held by Company House); c) to be kept under constant review throughout the Examination to ensure that all document referencing and cross referencing to documents and other parts of the dDCO are kept up to date; and d) ensure that the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-014] is always consistent with any changes made to the dDCO and updated as necessary.
DCO.1.2	Applicant	<p>Explanatory Memorandum</p> <p>Ensure that the EM provides comprehensive case specific justifications for all of the Articles and Schedules included in the dDCO, including any Requirements in Schedule 2 or licence requirements in Schedule 3. It is not sufficient to quote precedents from other made DCOs without explaining precisely why the precedented Articles or Requirements etc should be included in a made DCO. With respect to Articles 3 (Incorporation of the 1847 Act) and 22 (Power to appropriate) the Applicant must provide an explanation for why each section of the 1847 Act intended for incorporation in a made DCO would need to be incorporated and what the consequence for the operation of the Proposed Development would be if those section were not to be incorporated.</p> <p>In the event of a fully reviewed version of the EM not being submitted as a post ISH1 action at Deadline 1, then a comprehensively updated EM must be submitted at Deadline 2.</p>
DCO.1.3	Applicant	<p>Definition and certification of the ES</p> <p>Schedule 6 of the dDCO [APP-013] (documents to be certified) includes the ES, without a definition. Article 2 of the dDCO [APP-013] defines the ES as “<i>the document submitted under regulation 5(2)(a) of</i></p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		<p><i>the 2009 Regulations certified as the environmental statement by the Secretary of State for the purposes of this Order.”</i></p> <p>Consider and advise as to whether an expanded definition of what comprises the ES at the close of the Examination will be required in Schedule 6 of the dDCO, including how any amended or additional documents submitted during the Examination will be clearly recorded as documents to be certified. For example, some documents forming part of the ES [AS-005 and AS-008] have been accepted by the ExA as Additional Submissions following the Application’s original submission.</p>
DCO.14	Applicant	<p>Drafting precedent from made DCOs</p> <p>Where drafting precedents from made DCOs have been relied on, these should be checked to identify whether they have been subsequently refined or developed in more recently made DCOs so that they reflect the Secretary of State’s recent decision making. If any general provisions (other than works descriptions and other drafting that is bespoke to the Proposed Development) differ in any respect from corresponding provisions in recently made DCOs, an explanation must be provided as to why they differ from the approach taken in connection with recent decision making.</p>
DCO.15	Applicant	<p>Definition of vessel</p> <p>a) Does the Applicant intend to adopt the definition for Vessel promoted by the MMO in paragraph 3.1.1 of its Relevant Representation [RR-014]? If not, then the Applicant must provide a justification for departing from the definition preferred by the MMO.</p> <p>b) Explain why the definition for vessel employed in the dDCO is inconsistent with the definition that has been used in recently made DCOs.</p>
DCO.16	Applicant	<p>Article 2 interpretation of commencement</p> <p>Is there a comma missing after “<i>monitoring</i>”? Does the interpretation of “<i>environmental surveys</i>” within “<i>commencement</i>” include archaeological surveys and other marine surveys? Comment on whether the erection of construction plant and equipment seaward of mean high water springs should be considered a material operation with regard to the Proposed Development’s environmental impact.</p>
DCO.17	Applicant	<p>Article 2 interpretation of order limits</p> <p>Clarify why the interpretation of “<i>Order limits</i>” makes reference to limits of deviation and limits of construction activity rather than simply stating the Order limits shown on the works plans.</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
DCO.1.8	Applicant	Article 2 need for a definition of the Secretary of State Comment on any need for a definition for the Secretary of State for Transport to be incorporated into Article 2.
DCO.1.9	Applicant	Article 3 disapplication of legislative provision Confirm if express consent is required from any of the consenting authorities responsible for administering the legislation intended for disapplication under Article 3 of the dDCO. With respect to any instances when consent to disapply legislative provisions would be required, advise on the progress being made to obtain those consents.
DCO.1.10	Applicant	Article 3(2) Provide a summary of any extant planning conditions that it is intended would be disapplied by this article.
DCO.1.11	Applicant	Article 6 Powers to maintain Explain how Article 6(b) would be interpreted in practice in relation to judging whether any maintenance works “ <i>are likely to give rise to any materially new or materially different effects</i> ” such as to add to the assessment of cumulative or in-combination effects and in what circumstances reference would be made to the MMO and/or Natural England and/or Historic England in determining materiality. Please signpost in the ES if and where regard has been made to maintenance activities, predictable or otherwise.
DCO.1.12	Applicant	Article 7(b) vertical deviation Advise as to whether a limit upon downward deviation should be included in a made DCO. Should the Applicant conclude that such a limit is required, then wording to that effect should be incorporated into the dDCO. Otherwise, an explanation must be provided as to why the Applicant considers that it would be unnecessary for a made DCO to state a limit for downward deviation.
DCO.1.13	Applicant	Requirement 8 Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) Explain why the phrase “ <i>where applicable</i> ” has been inserted in the drafting. Remove or provide a full justification for the inclusions of tailpiece’ drafting concerning making amendments to the CEMP. Respond to the drafting requirements identified by the MMO for Article 8 in [RR-014].
DCO.1.14	Environment Agency	Requirement 9 Drainage: obstruction to Habrough Drain

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
	North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board	Provide confirmation that you are content with the provision of this Requirement that the developer should have 28 days to respond to a notice of obstruction to Habrough Drain.
DCO.1.15	Applicant	Requirement 14 Lighting Should Requirement 14(2) refer to the Lighting Plan [APP-012], which it is intended would be a certified document?
DCO.1.16	Applicant	Requirement 15 Plans and documents Should Requirement 15 include the draft Written Scheme of Investigation and/or the Materials Management Plan and should the reference to the CEMP be deleted?
DCO.1.17	Applicant	Schedule 2 Part 2 Paragraph 23 Paragraph 23(1)(a) appears to need “any” or “an” included rather than “and” after “refuses”. Review and redraft as necessary.
DCO.1.18	Applicant	Schedule 3 Part 1 – Interpretation Consider amending the definition of ‘vessel’ and ‘notice to mariners’ as suggested by the MMO in [RR-014].
DCO.1.19	Applicant	Schedule 3 Part 1 – Co-ordinates Confirm the accuracy of all of the quoted geo-spatial coordinates.
DCO.1.20	Applicant	Schedule 3 Part 1 – Licenced Marine Activities Confirm with signposting how potential works incorporated in Paragraph 3(2)(b) and 3(2)(c) have been assessed in the ES and Habitat Regulations Assessment report (HRAr) (including but not only works to install dolphins or berthing and mooring facilities). Respond to the drafting suggestions made by the MMO in [RR-014].
DCO.1.21	Applicant	Schedule 3 Part 1 Condition 11 – Marine written scheme of archaeological investigation (WSI) Should the draft WSI be a certified document in any made DCO? Should Paragraph 11 specify a time constraint for when consultation with Historic England must take place, prior to submission of method statements to the MMO?
DCO.1.22	Applicant	Schedule 3 Part 3 Procedure for the discharge of conditions – (MMO comments)

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		Respond to the drafting suggestions made by the MMO in [RR-014]. <i>(If not fully addressed in the Applicant's Deadline 1 response to Relevant Representations.)</i>
DCO.123	Applicant	<p>Schedule 4 Protective Provisions</p> <p>Provide at all Deadlines an update with respect to the progress being made to agree Protective Provisions with Interested Parties and any other parties.</p>
LHE Historic Environment including Marine Archaeology		
LHE.1.1	Historic England	<p>Comments on Draft Marine Written Scheme of Investigation</p> <p>Please comment in detail on whether the Draft Marine Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-107] provides sufficient detail about proposed management of effects for marine archaeological assets and if not, why not?</p>
LHE.1.2	Historic England	<p>Impact on setting of heritage assets</p> <p>Does HE accept the Applicant's assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on the setting of heritage assets [paragraphs 15.8.24 to 15.8.32 in APP-051] and if not, why not?</p>
LHE.1.3	Applicant	<p>Terrestrial heritage receptors</p> <p>Respond to paragraph 4.3.3 of the Relevant Representation made by CLdN [RR-007] which notes that "...terrestrial heritage receptors appear to have been erroneously scoped out of the ES. This is contrary to the advice in Historic England's response to the Scoping Opinion Request ...".</p>
LHE.1.4	Applicant	<p>Different role titles in draft WSI and in Annex 1 flowchart</p> <p>Review drafting inconsistencies between the role titles within the flowchart illustrated in Annex 1 of the draft WSI and the roles described in section 9.8 of the draft WSI (e.g. "Site Champion" and "Nominated Contact" [APP-107, section 9.8 and Annex 1].</p>
BNE Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment		
BNE.1.1	Applicant	<p>Updating the Habitats Regulations Assessment report</p> <p>In the light of the Relevant Representations made by Natural England (NE) [RR-015], as amended by [AS-011], [AS-015] and [AS-016], an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment report (HRAR) [APP-115] must be submitted not later than Deadline 5 (Monday 23 October 2023) to inform The Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) which the ExA will be publishing on 15 November 2023. That updating of the HRAR must address all of the matters raised by NE in its</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		<p>previously mentioned submissions together with any subsequent Examination submissions made by NE, as well as any related representations made by the MMO, up until Deadline 5, including the submission of the final and signed Statements of Common Ground between NE and the Applicant and the MMO and the Applicant which are to be submitted no later than Deadline 5.</p> <p>In updating the HRAR the Applicant is reminded of the ExA's Procedural Decision that that requiring clean and tracked copy versions of documents to be submitted – item 6 in Annex F of the Rule 6 letter [PD-006].</p>
BNE.12	Applicant	<p>Updating the HRAR, matters of detail</p> <p>As part of the updating of the HRAR by not later than Deadline 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Text must be included explaining how any decommissioning of the Proposed Development would be undertaken, most particularly demonstrating how the integrity of the designated sites would not be adversely affected. b) A map must be included showing the locations for each of the projects listed in Table 35 (projects and impact pathways relevant to the in-combination assessment) of [APP-115]. c) Text must be included stating whether the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site are each currently in a favourable or unfavourable condition. d) Include a table that identifies all of the mitigation measures relied upon by the Applicant in reaching its conclusion that there would be no adverse effects for the integrity of the SAC and SPA. e) Include text substantiating the view that the potential intertidal habitat loss associated with the proposed capital dredging would be similar in scale to the natural background changes to the intertidal habitat. f) With respect to the assessment of in-combination effects, quantification of the extent of the in-combination effects should be provided and clarification must be given about what is meant by phrases such as “de minimis” and “highly localised”. In connection with the in-combination assessment text must be added to clarify whether the Proposed Development in-combination with other plans and projects would or would not have a significant effect. g) With respect to the loss of intertidal habitat attributed to the Proposed Development, this must be assessed in-combination with any other expected loss of intertidal habitat arising from projects that are operational, under construction, subject to current applications for approvals or consents and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		<p>applications expected to be submitted for approvals or consents. Include text covering this in-combination assessment.</p> <p>h) In relation to the generation of underwater noise and vibration during the construction phase, text must be added explaining how the proposed mitigation measures, type of piling, duration and seasonal restrictions etc, would reduce the impacts on fish and grey seals.</p> <p>i) Provide clarification about the expectation that benthic communities would recover in a few years, having regard to the intention for there to be operational maintenance dredging three to four times every year.</p> <p>j) In connection with birds feeding regularly near the Eastern Jetty and Immingham Oil Terminal, confirm which bird species are being referred to, in what numbers and what survey data has been relied on.</p> <p>k) Clarify whether the high numbers of SPA qualify features, including black tailed godwit, found in “Sector B” are present in similar, lower or higher numbers in other sectors in the Humber Estuary.</p> <p>l) Text must be added quantifying firstly how many vessel movements there are currently within the vicinity of the Port of Immingham and secondly the predicted additional vessel movements associated with the construction and operational phases for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>m) With respect to airborne noise levels either incorporate into the HRAR details of the expected noise levels at 50, 200 and 300 metres from the works site or explain why that information should not be incorporated into the updated HRAR.</p> <p>n) Add text explaining the proximity of the bird roosting sites relative to the anticipated routes that vessels would use when arriving at or departing from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>o) Add text explaining why it is considered that it would only be necessary to install foreshore bird mitigation screening on the proposed linkspan and approach jetty for a period of two years rather than any longer period. In particular, what is the evidence for foreshore birds not being disturbed by the operation of the Proposed Development after a period of two years.</p> <p>p) In connection with the effects for grey seal, add text that assesses the in-combination effects of underwater noise.</p>
BNE.13	Applicant	<p>Consistency between the HRAR and relevant Chapters in the Environmental Statement</p> <p>Ensure that by Deadline 5 there are no inconsistencies between what is stated in the updated HRAR and the content of any of the chapters and/or appendices of the Environmental Statement (ES) which</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		address matters also covered in the HRAR. In the event of there being any need to update parts of the ES to achieve consistency with the HRAR, any updated parts of the ES must be submitted with sufficient time remaining within the Examination to permit any statutory publicity for those changes to be undertaken and/or to enable Interested Parties to make written submissions at appropriate Examination deadlines.
BNE.14	Applicant	<p>Proposed restrictions for piling</p> <p>The proposed hours for marine piling within a four week period have been stated to be “140 hours of piling for a single rig or 196 hours of piling by two or more rigs” [paragraph 9.9.3 in APP-045]. Explain the rationale for the setting of those timeframes and clarify how many rigs it is intended would be operated at any one time during the 196 hour period, including providing a schedule setting out the number of rigs in operation at any one time and the anticipated operating hours per rig. (If not fully addressed in the Applicant’s Deadline 1 response to Relevant Representations and/or post ISH2 submissions).</p>
BNE.15	Applicant	<p>Assessment of underwater noise</p> <p>In assessing underwater noise reliance has been placed on the results of pre-construction and construction noise monitoring undertaken in 2014 undertaken in the Humber Estuary at Green Port Hull, section 5.6 in [APP-088]. Explain why the monitoring undertaken at Green Port Hull is considered to be representative of the marine noise levels applicable at the site for the Proposed Development?</p>
BNE.16	Applicant	<p>Accidental spillages and effects for the SAC and Ramsar site</p> <p>Within the HRAR [APP-115] likely significant effects for the SAC and Ramsar site arising from accidental spillages have been assessed as being negligible as a result of applying established industry guidance. Further to the People Over Wind and Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta judgement (Case C-323/17) explain why the application of the industry guidance to control accidental spillages have not been considered to constitute mitigation.</p>
BNE.17	Applicant	<p>Seabed sediment deposition during maintenance dredging</p> <p>Natural England in its Relevant Representation [RR-015], as amended by AS-011 and AS-015, has raised a concern about seabed sediment deposition arising during maintenance dredging. In the light of that representation describe and quantify the amount of sediment deposition on the seabed that would be expected to arise during maintenance dredging.</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
BNE.1.8	Natural England	<p>Effects arising from the use of artificial lighting</p> <p>With respect to effects for the qualifying features of the SAC, SPA and Ramsar site arising from the use of artificial lighting during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development, please identify which qualifying features it is considered would be affected, as referred to in key issue 10 in your Relevant Representation [RR-015], as amended by [AS-01]1 and [AS-015].</p>
BNE.1.9	Applicant	<p>Further assessment of impacts on fish during operation</p> <p>Explain the reasons for not carrying out the recommendation made by the MMO at the pre-app stage, noted in paragraph 4.2.3 of [RR-014] that <i>“habitat loss and disturbance as well as underwater noise impacts on fish during operation should be further assessed within the ES, taking into account other developments in the area”</i>. (If not fully addressed in the Applicant's Deadline 1 response to Relevant Representations.)</p>
BNE.1.10	Applicant	<p>Potential suspended sediment concentration (SSC) impact to migratory fish species</p> <p>Address the comments made by the MMO in [RR-014 - section 4.2.4] that <i>“whilst salmonids and migratory species which inhabit estuarine environments do have some tolerance to moderately elevated levels of SSC, given the natural fluctuations in SSC expected within estuarine environments, this does not preclude a significant impact.”</i> (If not fully addressed in the Applicant's Deadline 1 response to Relevant Representations.)</p>
BNE.1.11	Applicant	<p>MMO comments on modelling approach.</p> <p>Respond to the comments made by the MMO in [RR-014] that the modelling approach in the ES assessment can only be used to predict magnitude of risk, rather than to determine range of impact and the MMO's understanding that the range of impacts may be higher. (If not fully addressed in the Applicant's Deadline 1 response to Relevant Representations.)</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
BNE.1.12	Applicant	<p>Absence of commercial shellfish beds</p> <p>Provide evidence for the absence of commercial shellfish bivalve beds or other shellfish (e.g. crab, lobster) grounds in the area.</p>
BNE.1.13	Applicant	<p>Biodiversity net gain</p> <p>Respond to the comments regarding biodiversity net gain made by Natural England in [RR-015], as amended by [AS-011] and [AS-015] and provide additional information to demonstrate a measurable 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>(If not fully addressed in the Applicant's Deadline 1 response to Relevant Representations.)</p>
BNE.1.14	Applicant	<p>Post-construction monitoring and remedial measures</p> <p>Clarify how biodiversity mitigation and net gain measures would be monitored and what factors would be used to determine whether they are working or not and whether remedial actions or other measures would be necessary.</p>
BNE.1.15	Natural England	<p>References to the Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies toolkit</p> <p>In your Relevant Representation [RR-015], as amended by [AS-011] and [AS-015], concern has been raised about the Applicant's use of the Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies water disturbance mitigation toolkit. Please elaborate on what the concern is about the use of the toolkit and how that might have affected the assessment undertaken by the Applicant.</p>
BNE.1.16	Natural England	<p>Effectiveness of construction mitigation measures</p> <p>In your Relevant Representation [RR-015], as amended by [AS-011] and [AS-015], concern has been raised about the proposed construction mitigation measures. Please elaborate on what additional information would be required to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed construction mitigation measures.</p>
BNE.1.17	Natural England	<p>In-combination assessment</p> <p>In terms of the matters raised in your Relevant Representation [RR-015], as amended by [AS-011], [AS-015] and [AS-016] and the assessment of in-combination effects, is there any additional information that you consider should be submitted by the Applicant to enable the ExA to comprehensively report on this matter when it makes its recommendation to the SoST? In answering this question Natural England should identify and submit any information that the Applicant has provided to it following the submission of the application on 10 February 2023. Should any such</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		information have already been submitted as an Examination document then it will only be necessary to cite the Examination Library document reference number for that documentation.
BNE.1.18	Natural England	<p>Identification of matters needing to be addressed by the Applicant before a DCO could be made</p> <p>Further to: 1) your Relevant Representation [RR-015], as amended by [AS-011], [AS-015] and [AS-016]; and 2) the requirement placed on the Applicant by the ExA to submit an updated version of the HRAR by not later than Examination Deadline 5, please identify the matters in your view needing to be addressed by the Applicant before the ExA could recommend that a DCO could be made. (If not fully addressed in any Written Representations to be made by Natural England at Deadline 2.)</p>
BNE.1.19	Applicant Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	<p>Mitigation of suspended sediment impacts on fish species</p> <p>Applicant to clarify whether further assessment and mitigation relating to suspended sediment impacts for fish is proposed, and, if not, why not?</p> <p>What is the MMO's position on this?</p>
NS Navigation and Shipping		
NS.1.1	DFDS and Immingham Oil Terminal (IOT) Operators	<p>Stakeholder consensus in NRA</p> <p>Expand on the views made at ISH2 that the Applicant is required to produce a Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA) with stakeholder consensus. (If not already included in written note following representations made at ISH)</p>
NS.1.2	CLdN	<p>Need for Protective Provisions</p> <p>Expand on the point made at ISH2 that Protective Provisions for Port of Killingholme are needed to cover the eventuality that restrictions on use of the river following a marine accident or incident would affect operations at the Port of Killingholme. (If not already included in written note following representations made at ISH)</p>
NS.1.3	Applicant	<p>Safety Case and Duty Holder at Port of Immingham</p> <p>Confirm:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) if there is a Harbour Master for the Port of Immingham distinct from the Humber Harbour Master, if so identify that individual or body/organisation; and b) if there is a specific Marine Safety Management System (MSMS) for the Port of Immingham separate from that for the Humber Statutory Harbour Authority (SHA) and if so who is the Duty Holder, who is the Designated Person and how does the production and maintenance of that MSMS

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		relate to the duties exercised by the Humber Harbour Master? (If not already fully answered in written submission following ISH2)
NS.1.4	CLdN	<p>Safety Case and Duty Holder at Port of Killingholme</p> <p>Is there a specific MSMS for the Port of Killingholme and if so, who is the Duty Holder, who is the Designated Person and how does the production and maintenance of that MSMS relate to the duties exercised by the Humber Harbour Master?</p>
NS.1.5	Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)	<p>Port Marine Safety Management Systems and Risk Assessment process</p> <p>Please advise on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether port developers are required by UK government or International Maritime Organisation (IMO) policy to produce a Navigational Risk Assessment (NRA) with stakeholder consensus to assess the safety for a proposed development? Whether use of Marine Guidance Note (MGN) 654 guidance would be appropriate or inappropriate alongside the Port Marine Safety Code (PMSC) guidance in the production of a NRA for a port development proposal? Whether a port MSMS may be wholly withheld from stakeholders if there are security considerations concerning aspects of the MSMS. In the production and maintenance of a MSMS, is there a process for referring differences of opinion relating to acceptability or tolerability of risk to an authority higher than the Port or Harbour Board such as an independent arbitrator or regulatory body? If yes, who is the body or person in higher authority? If the Duty Holder's Designated Person would normally attend HAZID workshops and/or workshops to agree parameters for navigational pilotage simulations in connection with the planning for new developments concerning a port(s)/harbour(s)? Any other comments from the MCA on the normal process for assessing safety risks for a proposed development, such as the Proposed Development, where port stakeholders have concerns about the process and conclusions relating to the tolerability of risks identified.

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
NS.1.6	Applicant	<p>Marine Incident in vicinity of IOT</p> <p>Confirm/signpost how a marine incident reported in recent years involving allision of a tanker with a mooring buoy in the vicinity of the Proposed Development has been taken into account in the submitted NRA [APP-089] and the MSMS to date.</p>
NS.1.7	Applicant	<p>Historical allision of cargo vessel with vessel moored at IOT</p> <p>With regard to DFDS' Relevant Representation, paragraph 3.5.1 in [RR-008], provide detailed commentary on the marine accident referenced, specifically noting: information on the wind and tide conditions; the details of the cargo vessel involved; the context of the navigation taking place; and the Marine Accident Investigation Branch's conclusions as to why the pilot was unable to maintain control despite having tugs made fast.</p>
NS.1.8	Applicant	<p>Effects on navigation adjacent to the Proposed Development</p> <p>With regard to Risk O.6 in the NRA [APP-089], elaborate on the embedded controls assessed for collision risk with another vessel for a Ro-Ro vessel on passage to/from the Proposed Development.</p>
NS.1.9	IOT Operators	<p>Bunkering from barges</p> <p>Do vessels at the finger pier berths 8 and 9 ever need to be bunkered from barges rather than the jetty's infrastructure?</p>
NS.1.10	IOT Operators	<p>Tug assistance at IOT Berths 8 and 9</p> <p>How frequently is it necessary to use a tug or tugs for arriving or departing vessels and what are the factors that determine when and how many tugs will be required?</p>
NS.1.11	Applicant	<p>Learning from simulation runs</p> <p>Comment, with examples, on how learning to date from the aborted or failed simulation runs for the Proposed Development has been captured and fed back into re-assessing the rating of risks in the NRA and how that would be fed into the MSMS for an extended port.</p>
NS.1.12	Applicant	<p>Reducing Risk of Allision with IOT trunkway to ALARP</p> <p>Is it correct that the submitted NRA [APP-089] states that the implementation of impact protection measures for the IOT trunkway, proposed Work Number 3, as additional mitigation for allision risk would be necessary to control the risk of allision with the trunkway to attain "as low as possible reasonably practicable" (ALARP)?</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
NS.1.13	Applicant	<p>Decision process flow for implementation of Impact Protection to IOT</p> <p>Provide a note with a flow-diagram explaining the process for determining whether or not impact protection measures for the Immingham Oil Terminal would be installed. The information provided should explain, amongst other things, precisely who would be involved in the decision making process and how and when the decision making process would be initiated. (If not already fully answered in written submission following ISH2)</p>
NS.1.14	Applicant, DFDS and IOT Operators	<p>Consequences of decision to abort berthing manoeuvre</p> <p>If a pilot or ship's master with a pilot exemption certificate for Immingham decides dynamically that conditions would make it unsafe to continue with a berthing manoeuvre or entry into the Port's lock, what are the consequences for that physically and administratively?</p>
NS.1.15	Applicant	<p>Pilot and tug availability</p> <p>Explain how many pilots and tugs are currently available to serve vessel arrivals and departures at the existing Port Immingham and what implications the operation of the Proposed Development might have for the availability of pilots and tugs.</p>
NS.1.16	Applicant	<p>Contingency management of tug availability for berthing in limiting conditions</p> <p>Based on conclusions reported in NRA Appendix Part 1 [APP-090, page 3] if multiple tugs would be required to enable Ro-RO berthing in certain conditions, how could that risk control be secured in a made DCO or how would the consequences be managed if they were not available.</p>
NS.1.17	Applicant	<p>Societal Risk Assessment</p> <p>Explain what risks have been assessed in the application with respect to the potential impact of the Proposed Development's proximity to Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) sites, including collateral societal risk for energy supply in the United Kingdom and how any necessary mitigation would be secured in a made DCO.</p>
NS.1.18	Applicant	<p>Direction of current between the IOT and the Proposed Development's berths</p> <p>With regard to paragraphs 3.21 and 3.22 in DFDS' Relevant Representation [RR-008], comment on any expected change arising from the formation of the proposed dredge pocket and berthing infrastructure on the direction of current within the area between the IOT and the lock mouth of the port at times of peak flow with reference to Figures 2.7 and 2.8 in [APP-090]. In responding to this question commentary relating to the relevance of simulation Runs 08, 26 and 29 of November 2022 and Runs</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		18, 24 of July 2022 should be provided. [If not already fully answered within response to action points at ISH2]
NS.1.19	DFDS	<p>Vessel types and manoeuvrability</p> <p>With regard to paragraph 3.1.9 of DFDS' Relevant Representation [RR-008], provide elaboration of what vessel types and sizes DFDS understands would use the Proposed Development, together with an explanation of their manoeuvrability in comparison with the vessels used in the simulation runs that have informed the Applicant's NRA.</p>
NS.1.20	DFDS	<p>Use of bow thrusters, tugs and pilots</p> <p>With regard to paragraph 3.1.10 of DFDS' Relevant Representation [RR-008], provide evidence to support the observation that "the Applicant over-relies on use of bow thrusters, tugs and pilots to achieve successful simulations".</p>
NS.1.21	DFDS	<p>Direction of current</p> <p>Explain the implications of the contention that the current direction north of the Proposed Development is different to that modelled in the navigation simulations presented by the Applicant.</p>
NS.1.22	DFDS	<p>Potential congestion of navigation</p> <p>Expand on the argument made at ISH2 that the operation of the Proposed Development would cause shipping movement congestion in and around the Port of Immingham. (If not already included in any post ISH2 submissions)</p>
NS.1.23	DFDS	<p>Admiralty Chart data on current direction</p> <p>With regard to paragraph 3.23 of DFDS' Relevant Representation [RR-008], submit a copy of the cited Admiralty Chart data and provide a commentary on how the direction of tidal current in the vicinity of the western end of the IOT jetty and pontoons might affect the safety of berthing manoeuvres for the Proposed Development and the IOT's berths. (If not already fully answered in written submission following ISH2)</p>
NS.1.24	DFDS	<p>Relationship of project lifetime to risk assessment</p> <p>With regard to paragraph 3.68 of DFDS' Relevant Representation [RR-008], expand on the contention as to why the lifetime of the project "<i>serves to downplay risk</i>".</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
NS.125	Applicant	<p>AIS transit density data</p> <p>Explain the "AIS Transect" pecked line in Figure 10.2 of [APP-066] and provide AIS transit plots on a disaggregated basis for: 1) the IOT and 2) the rest of the Port of Immingham for the same time period as depicted in Figure 10.2.</p>
NS.126	Applicant	<p>For Port of Immingham additional predicted vessel movements</p> <p>In terms of vessel movements to and from the Port of Immingham, for a typical week provide a summary of the existing vessel arrivals and departures and to that arrival and departure information add the vessel movements predicted to be generated by the Proposed Development.</p>
SE Socio-Economic		
SE.1.1	CLdN	<p>Socio-Economic indirect effects and potential displacement</p> <p>Consultation Report Appendices [APP-034, page 209] responds to comment PI41 made by C.Ro Ports Killingholme (now CLdN) by referring to paragraph 16.8.5 onwards and Table 16.9 of "<i>this ES chapter</i>", taken to mean [APP-052, ES Chapter 16). Does CLdN accept that relevant indirect affects have been assessed? If not, please clarify the point being made.</p>
TT Terrestrial Transport and Traffic		
TT.1.1	Applicant	<p>Accommodating throughput of HGVs</p> <p>With reference to [AS-008, paragraph 7.3.1], provide the evidence underpinning the assessment the conclusion that "<i>the number of HGV parking and storage provided on site means that all vehicles will be catered for on-site and there will not be any queuing on the local highway network. The facility includes for a significant amount of waiting areas and check in lanes, to specifically ensure that the design throughput of HGVs can be accommodated on site. There is no need therefore for mitigation.</i>"</p>
TT.1.2	Applicant	<p>Measures to accommodate HGV parking outside the Proposed Development</p> <p>With regard to terrestrial Traffic and Transport impacts [APP-053, section 17.9] for both the construction and operational phases:</p> <p>a) what security can be provided ensuring parking of HGVs overnight or during rest breaks would avoid any nearby residential areas or on any other local roads near to the Port.</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
		<p>b) provide a map showing the location of services or rest areas between the application site and the strategic highway network that might be used by HGV drivers together with details of the number of off-street parking available at each of the services or rest areas.</p> <p>c) what measures would be put in place to ensure that any HGVs that arrived early at either the East or West Gate or prior to being notified of a cancelled sailing did not park in laybys or on roads near to the Port or outside any designated service area or did not cause delays to accessing the Port of Immingham.</p>
TT.13	Applicant	<p>Relocation of bus stop</p> <p>With reference to bus stop noted on [APP-007] Works No. 12:</p> <p>a) In connection with relocating the Queens Road bus stop, would a temporary bus stop be provided during the construction works and if so the location for the temporary stop should be shown on a map.</p> <p>b) Has the proposed relocation of the bus stop been discussed with the bus service provider? If not, is there an intention to do so? If it has been discussed what has been the bus operator's response?</p>
TT.14	Applicant	<p>Internal port traffic movements</p> <p>Indicate on a plan or plans the likely internal roads between the East Gate and the West Gate that might be used by vehicles during the construction and operational phases.</p>
TT.15	Applicant	<p>Capacity analysis of road junctions within the port</p> <p>Signpost any capacity analysis for the Port of Immingham internal road junctions that has been undertaken. If such an analysis has not been undertaken explain why that is?</p>
TT.16	National Highways And local highway authorities (LHAs)	<p>Cumulative impact of HGV traffic if construction and operation is overlapped</p> <p>Advise as to whether or not you are content that any cumulative impact of HGV movements on strategic and local highway networks has been adequately assessed for the worst-case scenario of there being an overlap between a second phase construction period while the first phase of the Proposed Development would be operational?</p>
TT.17	LHAs	<p>Statutory compliance</p> <p>Do the LHAs have any comments to make with respect to the need for any off-site mitigation measures to assist the operation of the local highway network?</p>

ExQ1: 7 August 2023

Responses due by Deadline D2: 5 September 2023

ExQ1	Question to:	Question
TT.1.8	LHAs	Proposed Travel Plan Management, Measures, Monitoring and Remedial Measures Are the LHAs content with the proposed Travel Plan Management measures, the Monitoring and Remedial Measures identified in [APP-109]? If not please explain what that is?
WE Water Environment, Flood Risk and Drainage		
WE.1.1		No questions at this time