



Immingham Green Energy Terminal

TR030008

8.7 Table of Errata

March 2024

Since the submission of the application for development consent a limited number of errors or omissions in the application documentation have been identified.

For each erratum we have identified the document to which the error relates along with a statement about the nature of the amendment and the additional or corrected text shown in bold.

Errata listed in this document are errors which are minor in nature. Errata is not included in the list below for application documents which are going to be updated during the course of the DCO application. Instead in those cases the errors will be picked up when an updated version of the particular DCO application document is provided to the Examination.

Application Document Reference	TR030008/APP/8.7
Author	Air Products BR

Version	Date	Status of Version
Revision 1	06 February 2024	Procedural Deadline A
Revision 2	13 March 2024	Deadline 1

Immingham Green Energy Terminal DCO Application Table of Errata

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
1	Statutory and Non-statutory Nature Conservation Plans [APP-020]	Document properties title in PDF	N/A	The document properties title for the PDF states A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements. This is an administrative error	A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvements TR030008_Immingham_Green_Energy_Terminal_4.10_Statutory and Non-statutory Nature Conservation Plans	A
2	ES Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) [APP-050]	8.1.4	8-1	In Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) it states that there was an Appendix 8F: Draft Protected Species Licences however this wasn't required and therefore wasn't included within the application. Reference to it should therefore be removed from Chapter 8.	Appendix 8.F: Draft Protected Species Licences Appendix 8.F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment	A
3	ES Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) [APP-050]	Table 8-1	8-7	Text incorrectly refers to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as Appendix 8.G instead of Appendix 8.F .	Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which covers the impacts of the Project on the TPO woodland is provided at Appendix 8.G Appendix 8.F [TR030008/APP/6.4].	A

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
4	ES Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) [APP-050]	Table 8-1	8-7	Text incorrectly refers to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as Appendix 8.G instead of Appendix 8.F .	The loss of part of the woodland from Long Strip is fully assessed in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Appendix 8.G Appendix 8.F [TR030008/APP/6.4] and in this chapter Environmental Statement (“ES”) Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) [TR030008/APP/6.2] in Section 8.8 as well as ES Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual Impact [TR030008/APP/6.2] .	A
5	ES Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) [APP-050]	Table 8-1	8-9	Text incorrectly refers to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as Appendix 8.G instead of Appendix 8.F .	A single veteran ash tree was located in the TPO woodland of the Long Strip during arboricultural surveys (see Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Appendix 8.GF Appendix 8.F [TR030008/APP/6.4] for full details).	A
6	ES Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) [APP-050]	Table 8-1	8-12	Text incorrectly refers to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as Appendix 8.G instead of Appendix 8.F .	The extent of tree removal is presented in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Appendix 8-G Appendix 8.F [TR030008/APP/6.4] .	A

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
7	ES Chapter 8: Nature Conservation (Terrestrial Ecology) [APP-050]	Table 8-1	8-24	Text incorrectly refers to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as Appendix 8.G instead of Appendix 8.F .	A single veteran ash tree was located in the TPO woodland of the Long Strip during arboricultural surveys (see Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Appendix 8.G Appendix 8.F [TR030008/APP/6.4] for full details).	A
8	ES Figure 22.1: Major Accidents and Disasters Study Area, Key Receptors and Locations	N/A	N/A	ES Figure 22.1 was mistakenly not submitted with the application and needs to be added into the application.	N/A	A
9	ES Chapter 21: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [APP-063]	Table 21-12	21-42	The text relating to the depth encountered column for Granular Glacier Till Deposits reads "Between 16.76.4m bgl and 22.5m bgl" in error. The .4m should be deleted.	Between 16.76.4m bgl and 22.5m bgl Between 16.76m bgl and 22.5m bgl	A
10	ES Appendix 8.B: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report [APP-181]	Paragraph 2.3.14	13	Paragraph 2.3.14. states that a narrow band of woodland approximately 40m in width is located on the north side of Laporte Road and that the same woodland band also continues south from Laporte Road and is essentially split into two halves by the road. The paragraph then states that only the northern section of the woodland is within the Site Boundary, but this is	Paragraph 2.3.14 A narrow band of woodland approximately 40m in width located on the north side of Laporte Road; the same woodland band also continues south from Laporte Road and is essentially split into two halves by the road; although only the northern section is within the Site Boundary. Both sections of woodland are within the Site	A

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
				incorrect. The section of woodland to the south of Laporte Road is included in the redline site boundary however this is solely to temporarily restrict access to this area while construction works in the vicinity are being constructed.	Boundary. References in this document to Long Strip woodland relate to the section north of Laporte Road only.	
11	ES Chapter 9: Nature Conservation (Marine Ecology) [APP-051]	Paragraph 9.8.148	9-122	ES Chapter 9 [APP-051, Paragraph 9.8.148] refers to a distance of 1-2 m from the source of impact marine piling 1.5m diameter piles. This should be 1-2km.	The range at which the Ref 9-102 TTS and Ref 9-107 quantitative instantaneous peak SPL behaviour thresholds for percussive pile driving are reached indicates that there is a risk of a behavioural response in fish within around 2-3km from the source of impact marine piling for 2.3m diameter piles and 1-2 m 1-2km from the source of impact marine piling 1.5m diameter piles.	A
12	ES Appendix 18.A: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209]	Paragraph 3.2.27	23	The FRA [APP-209, Paragraph 3.2.27] states compliance with the Sequential Test is demonstrated in the Planning, Design and Access Statement. However, there is no such document title in the application and should refer instead to Planning Statement.	Given the above, the Sequential Test to site selection is technically required to ensure compliance with the NPSfP, the NPPF and PPG. Compliance with the Sequential Test is demonstrated in the Planning, Design and Access Statement Planning Statement (TR030008/APP/7.1).	A

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
13	ES Chapter 2: The Project [APP-044]	Paragraph 2.4.79	2-39	The ES [APP-044, Paragraph 2.4.79] refers to ES Table 2-9 in error and should refer to ES Table 2-10.	There would be six phases of development in total (see Table 2-9 Table 2-10).	A
14	Non-technical summary [APP-042]	Paragraph 3.4.13	10	Paragraph 3.4.13 of the Non-Technical Summary needs to be updated to; the Nitrogen generated in the hydrogen production unit will be (harmlessly) emitted with the flue gas rather than being used on site. The nitrogen which is used to purge pipelines, pipes and vessels will be generated on site and this is referenced in Paragraph 3.4.4 [APP-042].	The Nitrogen (which makes up 98% of the composition of ambient air) would be used across all operational areas to purge pipelines, pipes and vessels. harmlessly emitted with the hydrogen production unit flue gas.	A
15	ES Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-060]	Table 18-1: Consultation summary table	18-31 and 18-37	The responses to North East Lindsey Drainage Board and the Canal and River Trust consultation response incorrectly refers to correspondence from Anglian Water on 27 July 2023 confirming the offer for non-potable supply.	The offer now received from Anglian Water (dated 27 July 25 May 2023) for a non-potable supply in excess of that required for the IGET project Phases 1 to 6.	A
16	ES Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-060]	18.8.9	18-94	Incorrect reference to correspondence from Anglian Water on 27 July 2023 confirming the offer for non-potable supply.	A response received by Air Products from Anglian Water in late July on 25 May 2023 indicates that a commercial offer has been made which would	A

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
					provide the water needs for the full Project (Phases 1 to 6).	
17	ES Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-060]	Table 18-1: Consultation Summary Table	18-35 and 18-36	Table 18.1 incorrectly states that a 1m buffer for maintenance purposes is no longer required.	Correspondence from the Environment Agency has confirmed that the requirement of a 1 m buffer for maintenance purposes is no longer required is not required for the sea defence but is required for the fluvial defences at Stallingborough for the duration of the Bridleway diversions.	1
18	ES Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-060]	18.6.1	18-62	Text incorrectly refers to Ref 18-35 instead of Ref 18-30	Humber Flood Risk Management Strategy (note that this strategy is currently being updated and will be incorporated into the assessment should the update be complete and made publicly available) (Ref 18-35) (Ref 18-30) .	1
19	ES Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-060]	18.6.30	18-68	Text incorrectly refers to the initial draft Humber Flood Risk Management Strategy (2021 – 2027) instead of the Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2021-2027. Text incorrectly states that the improvements to Humber Estuary modelling have been completed.	The initial draft Humber Flood Risk Management Strategy Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2021-2027 (2021-2027) (Ref 18-35) advises that improvements to Humber Estuary modelling are ongoing have been completed as part of the developing Humber 2100+ project, which is redefining the strategic	1

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
					approach to managing tidal risk on the Humber.	
20	ES Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-060]	Table 18-11: Importance of Receptors	18-80	Text incorrectly states that North Beck Drain is a non-WFD surface waterbody with limited aquatic fauna and biodiversity.	The importance of the North Beck Drain is considered to be Low, this is a non-WFD surface water body with limited aquatic fauna and biodiversity with no associated economic or social use. The North Beck Drain is a high certainty chalk river, part of CaBA catchment 40, Lincolnshire Chalk Streams. Chalk rivers are listed as Priority Habitat under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. The North Beck Drain (unique WFD waterbody identifier GB104029067575) is designated as a Heavily Modified Water Body due to its uses for Flood Protection, Land Drainage and Urbanisation. It was classified as Moderate (2019). Although, the North Beck Drain (in terms of Water Quality) is now considered as a High importance receptor, it is nonetheless the case that the effects on this watercourse remain as per ES Chapter 18 [APP-060] and remain not significant.	1

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
21	ES Chapter 18: Water Use, Water Quality, Coastal Protection, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-060]	18.8.74	18-104	Text incorrectly references a “Hold the Line” management policy in the Humber Flood Risk Management Plan.	In line with Shoreline Management Plan (“SMP”) (Ref 18-39) and the Humber Flood Risk Management Plan (“FRMP”) (Ref 18-35) ‘Hold the Line’ management policy it is assumed that the crest height of the Environment Agency flood defences will be raised to maintain the 0.5% AEP standard of protection afforded by the flood defences over the operation of the development. the Environment Agency will progress the Halton Marshes Phase 2 flood alleviation scheme taking an adaptive approach in Immingham to provide appropriate flood resilience to existing port development in line with predicted sea level rise in the Immingham, Humber Flood Risk Area.	1
22	ES Appendix 18.A: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209]	1.2.2	1	Text incorrectly states the Site’s Flood Zone 3a designation as being due to the presence of flood defences along the Port of Immingham and estuary frontage.	The Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning (“FMfP”) (Ref 1-1) identifies that the landside part of the Site is located entirely within Flood Zone 3a. For clarity, the Flood Zones do not take into account the presence of defences and represent the undefended scenario. (due to the	1

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
					presence of flood defences along the Port of Immingham and estuary frontage).	
23	ES Appendix 18.A: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209]	2.7.6	11	Text incorrectly refers to the initial draft Humber Flood Risk Management Strategy (2021 – 2027) instead of the Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2021-2027. Text incorrectly states that the improvements to Humber Estuary modelling have been completed.	The initial draft Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2021 to 2027 Humber Flood Risk Management Strategy (2021—2027) (Ref 1-18) (Ref 1-28) advises that improvements to Humber Estuary modelling are ongoing have been completed as part of the developing Humber 2100+ project, which is redefining the strategic approach to managing tidal risk on the Humber.	1
24	ES Appendix 18.A: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209]	3.3.10	31	Text contained out of date information relating to the current position of the Humber 2100+ Partnership	In parallel with ongoing investment on the ground , the Humber 2100+ project (Ref 1-29) is redefining the strategic approach to managing tidal risk on the Humber. It will identify the most sustainable, credible and cost-effective approach to managing tidal flooding over the next 100 years, with a particular focus on the first 25 years, taking into account predicted sea level rise and climate change. The Humber 2100+ partnership is made up of 12 local	1

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
					authorities, the Humber Local Enterprise Partnership (“LEP”) and the Environment Agency partnership (Ref 1-29), made up of 11 local authorities and the Environment Agency, is working together to safeguard the future of the Humber in the face of climate change, setting the direction for the next 100 years.	
25	ES Chapter 9: Nature Conservation (Marine Ecology) [APP-051]	9.8.222	9-150	Text incorrectly refers to Paragraph 9.8.106 instead of Paragraph 9.8.94	Paragraph 9.8.106 94	1
26	ES Chapter 2: The Project [APP-044]	Table 2-1: Parameters for Work No. 1a	2-15	Text omits reference to Sheet 2 of the Works Plans	Approach jetty between point “B” on Sheets 2 & 3 of the Works Plans [TR030008/APP/4.2]	1
27	ES Chapter 12: Marine Transport and Navigation [APP-054]	Table 12-1: Consultation Summary Table on Marine Transport and Navigation	12-5 and 12-10	Text incorrectly refers to a draught of 14m instead of 12.8m.	The Terminal would be able to accommodate vessels of length up to 250m and draught up to 412.8m .	1
28	ES Appendix 12.A: Navigational Risk Assessment [APP-191]	2.3	8	Text incorrectly refers to a draught of 14m instead of 12.8m.	The Terminal would be able to accommodate vessels of length up to 250m and draught up to 412.8m .	1

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
29	Appendix 8.F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-185]	Annex B Tree Survey Schedule	72	Text under column 'Tree works to facilitate the Project' incorrectly states '-' instead of 'remove' for Tree ID IT365.	Remove	1
30	Appendix 8.F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-185]	Annex B Tree Survey Schedule	75	Text under column 'Tree works to facilitate the Project' incorrectly states '-' instead of 'remove' for Tree ID IT390.	Remove	1
31	Appendix 8.F: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-185]	Annex B Tree Survey Schedule	27	Annex B Tree Survey Schedule has been duplicated and incorrectly inserted after Annex A: Tree Constraints	Delete Page 30 of 143 in the PDF	1
32	ES Chapter 21: Ground Conditions and Land Quality [APP-063]	21.8.10	21-74	<p>("ACMs2) - Replacement of '2' with closing quotation mark</p> <p>Text states that both samples found to contain asbestos during the 2023 Ground Investigation were from the East Site – Hydrogen Production (Work No 5). This is incorrect and only one of the samples found to contain asbestos was located in Work No 5. The other was located within Work No 3.</p>	<p>During the 2023 Ground Investigation two samples out of thirty analysed noted to contain asbestos or asbestos containing materials ("ACMs"2). Both samples came from the East Site, Hydrogen Production (Works No 5). One sample came from the 'East Site - Hydrogen Production Facility' (Work No 5) and one from the 'East Site - Ammonia Storage' (Work No. 3).</p>	1
33	ES Chapter 2: The Project [APP-044]	2.5.32	2-50	This paragraph incorrectly refers to "Paragraph 2.5.22", where this should read "Paragraph 2.5.24" and	Temporary closure will be required for the construction of all of the temporary and permanent	1

Errata List No.	Document Title and Reference Number	Paragraph Number	Page Number	Nature of Amendment/ Reason for Change	Correction	Deadline
				similarly, where this paragraph refers to "Paragraph 2.5.39", it should read "Paragraph 2.5.41".	accesses required for the Project to construct the accesses, further details of the accesses are provided in Paragraph 2.5.22 Paragraph 2.5.24 of this ES Chapter. Temporary closure and diversion of Public Rights of Way ("PRoWs") as well as temporary and permanent removal of informal access is required to facilitate the Project, further details relating to PRoWs are provided in Paragraph 2.5.39 Paragraph 2.5.41 of this ES chapter.	