



Application by Net Zero Teesside Power Limited and Net Zero North Sea Storage Limited for the Net Zero Teesside Project
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on 19 May 2022.

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) first round of written questions and requests for information – ExQ1. 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 11 April 2022. 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 reference number which starts with an alphabetical code and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on general matters is identified as GEN.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table is available in [Microsoft Word](#).

On 28 April 2022 the Applicants submitted a formal change request in respect of the DCO application. Full details can be found on the [project page on the National Infrastructure Planning website](#) with [Examination Library](#) references AS-047 to AS-195. As the following written questions were largely prepared before the change request was submitted some of the references in the questions do not correspond with those in the documents submitted as part of the change request. Nevertheless, in responding, parties are asked to use the updated document references where appropriate.

Responses are due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022.



Abbreviations used:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| AELs | Associated Emission Levels |
| AOD | Above Ordnance Datum |
| AP(s) | Affected Person(s) |
| AS(s) | Additional Submission(s) |
| BoR | Book of Reference |
| BAT | Best Available Techniques |
| BEIS | Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy |
| CA | Compulsory Acquisition |
| CCGT | Combined Cycle Gas Turbine |
| CCC | Climate Change Committee |
| CCR | Carbon Capture Readiness |
| CCS | Carbon Capture and Storage |
| CCUS | Carbon Capture Usage and Storage |
| CEMP | Construction Environmental Management Plan |
| CHP | Combined Heat and Power |
| CO | Carbon monoxide |
| CO₂ | Carbon dioxide |
| CIEEM | Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management |
| CHP | Combined Heat and Power |
| COMAH | Control of Major Accidents and Hazards |
| DAS | Design and Access Statement |



| | |
|--------------|--|
| DCO | Development Consent Order |
| dDCO | Draft Development Consent Order |
| EA | Environment Agency |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| EM | Explanatory Memorandum |
| ES | Environmental Statement |
| ExA | Examining Authority |
| HBC | Hartlepool Borough Council |
| HDD | Horizontal Direct Drilling |
| HE | Highways England |
| HGV | Heavy Goods Vehicle |
| HRA | Habitats Regulations Assessment |
| HRSG | Heat Recovery Steam Generator |
| HSE | Health and Safety Executive |
| IP(s) | Interested Party (Parties) |
| LCA | Landscape Character Assessment |
| LIR | Local Impact Report |
| LLFA | Lead Local Flood Authority |
| LVIA | Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment |
| LWS | Local Wildlife Site |
| m | metre |
| MMO | Marine Management Organisation |
| MBT | Micro-Bored Tunnels |



| | |
|------------------------|---|
| MLWS | Mean Low Water Springs |
| MEA | mono-ethanolamine |
| NE | Natural England |
| NDMA | N-nitrosodimethylamine |
| NH₃ | Ammonia |
| NO₂ | Nitrogen dioxide |
| NO_x | Nitrogen oxides |
| NPPF | National Planning Policy Framework |
| NSIP | Nationally Significant infrastructure Project |
| NWL | Northumbrian Water Limited |
| NZT | Net Zero Teesside |
| NPSs | National Policy Statements |
| PC | Process contribution |
| PEC | Predicted environmental concentration |
| PM₁₀ | Particulate matter less than 10 micrometres in diameter |
| PCC | Power Capture and Compression |
| PRoW | Public Rights of Way |
| R | Requirements |
| RCBC | Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council |
| RPAs | Relevant Planning Authorities |
| RR | Relevant Representation |
| SAC | Special Area of Conservation |
| SoCGs | Statements of Common Ground |



| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| SPA | Special Protection Area |
| SSSI | Site of Special Scientific Interest |
| STBC | Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council |
| STDC | South Tees Development Corporation |
| TPA | Tonnes per annum |
| WFD | Water Framework Directive |
| WSI | Written scheme of investigation |
| WwTW | Wastewater Treatment Works |
| ZTV | Zone of Theoretical Visibility |

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010103/EN010103-001182-NZT%20EL.pdf>

Citation of Questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg GEN.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| GENERAL AND CROSS-TOPIC QUESTIONS | 6 |
| AIR QUALITY AND EMISSIONS | 18 |
| BIODIVERSITY AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT | 22 |
| CLIMATE CHANGE | 32 |
| COMBINED AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS | 32 |
| COMPULSORY ACQUISITION AND TEMPORARY POSSESSION | 33 |
| DESIGN, LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL | 42 |
| DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER | 48 |
| GEOLOGY HYDROGEOLOGY AND LAND CONTAMINATION | 48 |
| HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT | 51 |
| MAJOR ACCIDENTS AND NATURAL DISASTERS | 55 |
| NOISE AND VIBRATION | 58 |
| PLANNING POLICY AND LEGISLATION | 60 |
| POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH | 63 |
| SOCIO-ECONOMICS AND TOURISM INCLUDING MARINE USERS | 63 |
| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT | 66 |
| WATER ENVIRONMENT | 69 |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| GENERAL AND CROSS-TOPIC QUESTIONS | | |
| GEN.1.16 | Interested Parties (IPs) | <p>Section 5.10 of the Framework CEMP [APP-246] describes how various tasks will be undertaken by the Environmental Site Officer and Environmental Manager / Project Manager. Are the local authorities and other regulatory bodies such as the EA content that the roles of different personnel with regard to checking and corrective action are appropriately defined?</p> <p>No objection to this section of the CEMP</p> |
| GEN.1.21 | Applicants All IPs | <p>Paragraphs 4.2.11-4.2.20 of the Planning Statement [APP-070] discuss whether the DCO Application should be determined under s104 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008), s105 of PA2008 or both. It concludes at paragraph 4.2.20 that the Proposed Development should be determined under s104 for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Secretary of State's (SoS's) decision in respect of the Wheelabrator Kemsley K3 Generating Station ('WK3') and Wheelabrator Kemsley North Waste-to-Energy Facility ('WKN') Order (PINS Ref. EN010083). The case was subsequently considered by the High Court under the reference: EFW Group Ltd v Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy [2021] EWHC 2697 (Admin).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The Applicants are asked to comment on the High Court judgment and whether or not it changes their position in respect of the current application. ii) With reference to any other documents which may have relevance to this matter since submission of the application (including consultation drafts of the National Policy Statements (NPSs), do the Applicants consider that their comments in section 4.2 continue to apply to the Specified Elements of the Proposed Development, notably the CO₂ gathering network (Work no. 6), or is any there any change the ExA needs to be aware of? <p>IPs are also invited to comment.</p> <p>No comments to make</p> |
| GEN.1.37 | Applicants | <p>Table 3.1 of the Planning Statement [APP-070] and the Long and Short Lists of Developments Table 24-5 and Figures 24-2 and 24-3 [APP-106, APP-235 and APP-236] include a number of</p> |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022**Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022**

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC) Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council (STBC) | <p>relevant development proposals in the vicinity of the Order Limits which were known as of March 2021.</p> <p>The Applicants are asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Update the tables and figures to include decisions made and relevant planning applications submitted since production of the Planning Statement; ii) Present the relevant proposals on an Ordnance Survey map base; iii) Confirm whether any such updates would affect the conclusions reached in the ES in particular with regard to in-combination effects. <p>The Relevant Planning Authorities (RPAs) are asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provide an update to the status of the referenced planning applications including whether a decision has been made and development timescales, in particular whether development has commenced; ii) List details of any additional relevant planning applications and Development Consent Orders (DCOs) which have been submitted since production of the Planning Statement (March 2021); and iii) Provide details of development at Teesworks (No's 3 and 5 to 10 inclusive of Table 3.1 and any others submitted since), including site location and layout plans, and (if available) officer reports and decision notices. <p>Table 3.1 does not appear in the Planning Statement (APP-070). The LPA are happy to provide comments once the table is available to view</p> |
| AIR QUALITY AND EMISSIONS | | |
| AQ.1.13 | Applicants EA/ NE RCBC STBC | <p>The assessment of cumulative effects described in Annex B of Appendix 8B [APP-248] suggests that the predicted environmental concentration (PEC) would increase to 72% of the critical load and would therefore exceed the threshold for significance for NO_x at Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA, SSSI and Ramsar.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6.17 of Appendix 8B [APP-248] states that emissions would be regarded as insignificant if less than 70% of the critical level. The Applicants are asked how can this be resolved with the conclusion that 72% is not significant in Annex B?</p> |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022**Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022**

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|--|--|
| | | EA/ NE/ RCBC/ STBC are asked to comment on the Applicants' conclusion that because the predicted NO _x concentration remains below the critical level it is not significant. |
| AQ.1.14 | EA/ NE RCBC STBC | Paragraph 8.6.18 of Appendix 8B [APP-248] states that the impact of stack emissions can be regarded as insignificant at sites of local importance if the long and short term Process Contribution is less than 100% of the critical level. Do the named parties have any comments to make on this threshold? |
| AQ.1.16 | EA/NE RCBC STBC UK Health Security Agency | Appendix 8B [APP-248] describes the approach taken to the assessment of the effects of the development on air quality during the operational phase. Do the named parties you have any additional comments that you would like to bring to the ExA's attention regarding the overall approach? |
| BIODIVERSITY AND HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT | | |
| BIO.1.20 | RCBC STDC/ Teesworks Estate Management Company | A brief monitoring report will be prepared in each year and provided to RCBC and the Teesworks Estate Management Company as a record of compliance (paragraph 6.1.4 of the Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy [APP-079]). Are relevant parties content with this approach? Happy with the approach generally. Does would this be required to be signed off by RCBC and Teesworks Estate Management Company |
| CLIMATE CHANGE | | |
| COMBINED AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS | | |
| The ExA does not wish to ask any further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination. | | |
| COMPULSORY ACQUISITION AND TEMPORARY POSSESSION | | |
| CA.1.4 | RCBC STBC | Are the RPAs in their role as the Local Planning Authority and the Highway Authority aware of: i) any reasonable alternatives to CA or TP sought by the Applicant; and |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | | ii) any areas of land or rights that the Applicant is seeking the powers to acquire that they consider would not be needed? |
| DESIGN, LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL | | |
| DLV.1.4 | Applicants RCBC STBC | No specific requirement for monitoring of the quality of the materials and finishes during construction is identified in the dDCO [AS-135], DAS [APP-190], ES Chapter 17 [APP-099] or ES Volume 3, Appendix 25A [APP-347]. Can the Applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Explain what process would be in place for monitoring the quality of materials and finishes as the proposed buildings and structures are constructed to ensure that the design quality envisaged in ES Chapter 17 [APP-099] is attained? Can RCBC and STBC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) Provide comment on the need to have a mechanism in place for monitoring of materials and finish quality during the construction period? <p style="color: red;">Requirement 3 of the draft DCO (AS-135) contains the need for the Local Authorities approval of the external appearance of permanent buildings and structures including colour materials and surface finishes. Following the discharge of this requirement it is then for the LPA to monitor the use of these materials. This could be included as part of requirement 3 that would require the developer to submit a compliance statement to ensure those materials discharged through the requirement have been implemented.</p> |
| DLV.1.5 | Applicants RCBC | Paragraph 4.5.2 of the DAS [AS-190] quotes policy STC1 and the intention to “realise an exemplar world class industrial business park”. How would the Proposed Development contribute to achieving that objective? <p style="color: red;">The proposed development would occupy a sizeable site on the eastern end of the Teesworks site. Subject to the implementation of suitable design phase including layout, landscaping etc, it is considered that the development has the potential to help in achieving the objective set out in STD1</p> |
| DLV.1.7 | Applicants RCBC | ES Chapter 17 [APP-099] section 17.4 and ES Appendix 17A [APP-335] set out the baseline conditions, including an assessment of landscape and seascape character. The baseline is |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|------|---|---|
| | STBC Hartlepool Borough Council (HBC) | <p>informed by local Landscape Character Assessments (LCAs) prepared by RCBC, STBC and HBC.</p> <p>The Applicants are asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Provide a copy of relevant extracts of the Redcar and Cleveland LCA, the Stockton-on-Tees LCA, the Hartlepool LCA, and the North East Marine Character Areas.ii) Review the baseline since the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and viewpoints were produced and provide an update to the description of the landscape character baseline to reflect any changes since the publication of the LCAs to the extent necessary to provide a robust position to undertake the impact assessment. For example, it is noted that the description of the East Billingham to Teesmouth landscape character area within STBC's LCA references SSSI at Seal Sands and Cowpen Marsh, which have subsequently been incorporated into the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SSSI and/ or been partially de-notified;iii) Has any significant demolition and/ or new buildings or infrastructure taken place since the viewpoint visuals were produced?iv) Confirm whether photography of the night-time baseline taken place?v) If so, are revised and/or additional visuals of the viewpoints required? <p>The RPAs are requested to confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) If they are satisfied with the assessment of the baseline conditions including the description of the site and its setting as set out in paragraphs 17.4.34 to 17.4.41 of Chapter 17 [APP-099]; andii) Are any amendments needed to reflect changes since it was produced, including demolition and new buildings or infrastructure?? <p>The overall summary of the site and its surroundings are considered to be appropriate. It is noted that at points 17.4.36 and 17.4.39 reference is made to the steel works that are now closed. Demolition is on-going of a number of buildings and structures across the site including those to the west of the site.</p> |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|----------|----------------------------|--|
| DLV.1.8 | RCBC STBC HBC MMO | <p>A range of viewpoints are listed at Table 17-1 of ES Chapter 17 [APP-099] and illustrated in Figures 17-7 to 17-30 [APP-181 to APP-228], the locations of which are shown at Figure 17-6 [AS-123].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Did RCBC, STBC and HBC all agree the viewpoints at pre-application stage? No formal comments were made with regard to the proposed viewpoints at pre-app stage ii) Are the authorities satisfied with the list of viewpoints listed in Table 17-1? Believe the viewpoints are detailed in table 17-3 and if these are those to comment on the Local Authority have no further comments to make. iii) Are the authorities satisfied with the quality of the visuals provided? The Local Authority are satisfied with the visuals provided iv) Do the authorities consider them to be representative of locations for sensitive receptors including tourists and recreational users? The view points at 7, 8 and 9 pick up the sensitive locations close to the site, while those at 10, 11 and 12 provide longer range views from areas where the public would be using sites for recreational purposes. v) Should night-time visuals of certain viewpoints be produced? Do not have any comments to make on the need for night time visuals vi) Further to the above, can you suggest any additional viewpoints (including any outside of the study area) and/ or amendments to the existing viewpoints necessary? No further viewpoints to suggest <p>MMO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vii) Are any viewpoints of the seascape necessary? If so, from where? <p>Could all RPAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> viii) Provide any comments they have on the conclusions of the assessment of likely significant effects arising landscape and visual impacts as presented in section 17.6 of ES Chapter 17 [APP-099]. |
| DLV.1.17 | Applicants | The ZTV and potential viewpoints plan at Figure 17-4 [AS-121] indicates that views of the PCC would be possible from Saltburn-by-the-Sea and the surrounding high ground, which is on the |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022**Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022**

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| | RCBC | <p>edge of the landscape study area. The ExA noted on their USI [EV1-001] that there are clear views of the existing steel works structures from the seafront and the pier. No part of this area is indicated on Figure 17-4 as a potential viewpoint location. The Landscape Character Plan at figure 17-3 [AS-120] indicates that this is on the boundary of a number of different national and local LCAs as well as the North Yorkshire Coastal Waters marine character area.</p> <p>Can the Applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Explain why the Saltburn-by-the-Sea area was not considered as a potential viewpoint? <p>Can RCBC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) Provide comment whether a viewpoint is necessary from this area, and if so, from what location. <p style="color: red;">It is acknowledged that the applicant has sought a 5km buffer for view points on which Saltburn is on the edge of. While the ZTV at figure 17-4 shows some potential for views these have been referenced and considered as part of the Conservation Area Appraisals which make reference to nearby heavy industry.</p> |
| DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER | | |
| The ExA does not wish to ask any further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination. | | |
| GEOLOGY, HYDROGEOLOGY AND LAND CONTAMINATION | | |
| GH.1.1 | Applicants EA RCBC STBC | <p>Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-092] states that ground investigation will take place in Q2/Q3 of either 2021 or 2022. Annex A of Appendix 10A [APP-292] shows the proposed preliminary exploratory hole locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The Applicants are asked to confirm the scope and timetable for the ground investigations, risk assessments and any remediation required. ii) Requirement 13 of the dDCO does not allow commencement of the development until a scheme to deal with contamination has been approved. How does the timetable in (i) relate to the proposed date for commencement of construction on the site? |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Should ground investigation results not be available prior to the close of the Examination, what certainty can the ExA have that subsequent assessment would not demonstrate that the site is unsuitable for the Proposed Development? iv) Are the EA and LPAs content with the proposed locations and scope of the preliminary investigation outlined in Annex A of Appendix 10A [APP-292]? |
| GH1.3 | Applicants EA RCBC STBC | Paragraph 10.6.4 [APP-092] states that assessment of the significance of impacts will take into account the principles of assessment in CIRIA Report C552 (2001) and the EA's Guiding Principles for Land Contamination (2010). Appendix 10C [APP-294] and Table 10A-28 of Appendix 10A [APP-293] contain an environmental risk assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The Applicants are asked to explain how the risk assessments take into account the EA's Guiding Principles for Land Contamination. ii) Please could all parties confirm that these are the most up to date and appropriate approaches for undertaking an assessment of the risks to controlled waters and human health iii) If this is not the case, then the Applicants should justify why it has taken this approach. |
| GH1.7 | Applicants RCBC STBC | Paragraph 10.4.17 of the ES [APP-092] states that 7 nearby mineral sites are 'highly unlikely' to resume extraction and 2 sites may require new planning permission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Can the Applicants provide the evidence for this conclusion and a map showing the location of all of these sites? ii) Do the local authorities agree with this assessment of the future of these sites? |
| | | |
| HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT | | |
| HE.1.2 | Historic England MMO RCBC HBC | ES Chapter 19 [APP-101] relates to marine heritage. It notes at Table 19-7 that there are two known undesignated heritage assets (shipwrecks) within the site boundary and at paragraphs 19.4.26 to 19.4.32 refers to a range of potential historic environment receptors. Confirmation is sought from Historic England, the MMO, RCBC and HBC (archaeology): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Whether or not the Applicants' assessment is accurate, and whether there are likely to be any additional previously unrecorded heritage assets; |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--------|---|---|
| | | <p>ii) If the mitigation and enhancement measures set out in section 19.7 of the ES [APP-101] (including a pre-construction geoarchaeological assessment) would be appropriate; and</p> <p>iii) Whether R14 of the dDCO could be applicable to marine heritage assets as well as terrestrial archaeology, and any suggested amendments to wording.</p> <p><i>It is understand the landward site is reclaimed estuarine land from the mid 19th century onwards, so it may be reasonable to assume that those operations are likely to have obliterated any substantial wreckage. Requirement 14 makes reference to any part of the development there could include marine heritage if potentially impacted upon by the development</i></p> |
| HE.1.3 | Historic England RCBC STBC HBC | <p>ES Chapter 18 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100] section 18.6 refers to likely impacts and effects on a number of non-designated heritage assets within the Order Limits. ES Figure 18-2 [APP-230] indicates the location of non-designated heritage assets within the 1km study area. ES Appendix 18B [APP-339] at Table 18.5 includes a gazetteer of these non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Historic England, RCBC, STBC and HBC (archaeology) are asked to confirm:</p> <p>i) Is the 1km study area sufficient?</p> <p>ii) Do Figure 18-2 and ES Appendix 18B provide an accurate and up-to-date record of non-designated heritage assets within the site and 1km study area? Are there any others that should be added?</p> <p>iii) Is the Applicants' assessment of impacts to the non-designated heritage assets within the site boundary at section 18.6 of the ES acceptable?</p> <p>iv) Would R14 of the dDCO be appropriate in safeguarding any known and unknown archaeological features, and if not please suggest amendments to the wording?</p> <p><i>No adverse comments to make however guidance from Cleveland Industrial Archaeology Society (CIAS) would also be recommended</i></p> |
| HE.1.4 | Historic England RCBC STBC HBC | <p>ES Chapter 18 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100] paragraph 18.3.11 notes that a 5km study area has been applied for designated heritage assets, and a 1km search area for non-designated assets. These are illustrated in ES Figures 18-1 [APP-229] and 18-2 [APP-230]. ES Appendix 18B [APP-339] includes a gazetteer of the heritage assets.</p> |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--------|--|--|
| | | <p>Section 18.6 of APP-100 sets out that there are no designated heritage assets within the Order Limits and refers to likely impacts and effects on a number of non-designated heritage assets within the site.</p> <p>RPA's and Historic England are asked to respond to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Whether the 1km and 5km study areas are sufficient; ii) Whether Figures 18-1, 19-2 and Appendix 18B provide an accurate and up-to-date record of heritage assets within the site and study areas; iii) If not, are there any other heritage assets that should be added?; iv) Whether the Applicants' assessment of impacts to the assets within the site boundary at section 18.6 of the ES is sufficient. In particular, paragraphs 18.6.14 to 18.6.24 relating to setting of nearby designated heritage assets. Has their significance been adequately identified, and has the effect on their setting and significance been adequately assessed?; and v) Would R14 of the dDCO be appropriate in safeguarding any known and unknown archaeological features? If not, please suggest amendments to the wording. <p>There is potential for greater impact on setting, for example even from Huntcliff overlooking Saltburn. The Heritage Assets identified were already characterised by nearby heavy industry so it is considered significance and impacts on setting of those assets is assessed appropriately.</p> |
| HE.1.5 | RCBC Historic England Applicants | <p>The Redcar blast furnace is identified on Figure 18-2 [APP-230]. The structure and associated steel works infrastructure is assessed in ES Chapter 18 paragraph 18.6.2 [APP-100].</p> <p>Paragraphs 18.8.3 and 18.8.4 of the Cultural Heritage Baseline Report [APP-338] state that '<i>Standing structures associated with Redcar blast furnace and ancillary buildings are present within the proposed Site boundary. The buildings are indicative of the region's industrial heritage and are of local and possibly regional interest</i>', and that the structures are well-preserved and provide a functional setting to the furnace structure as well as being a well-known landmark of value to the local community through their historical associations and contribution to local identity.</p> |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022**Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022**

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|---------------------|--|
| | | <p>The former steel works are noted in the Stage 2 consultation responses from Save our Steel Heritage Group dated 14.09.20 and Historic England dated 15.09.20 [APP-068]. Historic England identify the former steel works as a key heritage issue, and that it would be appropriate for consideration to be given to the retention of its key features as part of the Proposed Development and recording prior to demolition.</p> <p>RCBC's Climate Change group in their pre-application consultation response dated 18.09.20 refers to ensuring the heritage legacy of steel making, as well as the South Tees Area SPD, principle STDC8 – Preserving Heritage Assets.</p> <p>Can the Applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Identify the location of the blast furnace in relation to the Order Limits around the PCC Site;ii) Confirm if the blast furnace and any other associated former steel works infrastructure are considered to be non-designated heritage assets;iii) If considered to be non-designated heritage assets, provide an assessment of their significance or signpost where this can be found in the submitted documents;iv) Provide an update on the timescales for demolition and clearance of the Redcar blast furnace and associated infrastructure; andv) Confirm whether pre-demolition recording has taken place/ will take place as suggested by Historic England in their pre-application consultation response [APP-068]. <p>The Applicants may wish to answer this question together with GEN.1.11.</p> <p>Can Historic England and RCBC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">vi) Provide comment on whether the blast furnace and/or any other associated former steel works infrastructure are considered to be non-designated heritage assets;vii) If considered to be non-designated heritage assets, provide an assessment of their significance;viii) Provide comment on whether pre-demolition recording has been agreed and carried out (or whether it should take place and on which particular elements of the former steel works); andix) Provide further detail of any conflict with national and local policy including the South Tees Area SPD. |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| HE.1.6 | RCBC HBC Applicants | <p>ES Figure 18-1 [APP-229] shows conservation areas at Coatham, Kirkleatham, Yearby, Wilton and Seaton Carew which are proximate to the PCC Site.</p> <p>Could RCBC and HBC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) provide a map of each of the conservation areas and a copy of any conservation area appraisals and management plans, if available.ii) If no conservation area appraisals are available, provide an assessment of their significance. <p>The Council is currently going through a review of its website and the plans are currently unavailable to view. Once these have been reinstated the Local Authority are happy to provide these potentially through a later set of questions from the examining authority</p> <p>Could the Applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">iii) provide an assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development on the setting of each of the conservation areas. |
| MAJOR ACCIDENTS AND NATURAL DISASTERS | | |
| NOISE AND VIBRATION | | |
| NV.1.1 | RCBC Applicants | <p>ES Chapter 11 [APP-093] paragraph 11.4.2 states that the baseline data are considered 'conservative' due to Covid-19 restrictions at the time of surveys. Paragraph 11.4.14 refers to the future baseline.</p> <p>Can the Applicants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Confirm if any further surveys been carried out since restrictions were lifted, or are any planned?ii) Explain what type of activities and sound levels will/would have increased once covid restrictions were lifted and would subsequently affect the baseline data? <p>Can RCBC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Provide comments on whether the baseline data and monitoring locations are reasonable and representative; and |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022**Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022**

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|--------------------|---|
| | | ii) Provide comments on whether further surveys should be undertaken now restrictions have been lifted. |
| NV.1.3 | RCBC Applicants | <p>Redcar Beach Caravan Park is noted at paragraphs 20.4.25 and 20.6.27 of ES Chapter 20 [APP-102] as a popular tourism destination and is located over 1km from the PCC Site. Cleveland Golf Links is located directly east of the PCC Site.</p> <p>The ExA noted an additional caravan park nearby at York Road in Coatham on their unaccompanied site visit [EV1-001]. This caravan park is close to the PCC Site but does not appear to have been specifically noted in the ES in terms of noise effects.</p> <p>Can RCBC and the Applicants provide comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Does the location of NSR2 [AS-103] correspond with the caravan park at Coatham; ii) Is there any residential use of these units and/or any planning conditions limiting them to holiday occupation? Provide a copy of such conditions if available; and iii) Have noise effects on tourists and recreational users been appropriately considered in Chapter 11 of the ES, including those at the nearby caravan parks, golf course, beach and other recreational facilities, and if not should they? |
| PLANNING POLICY AND LEGISLATION | | |
| PPL.1.1 | RCBC STBC | <p>Table 6.4 at section 6 of the Planning Statement [APP-070] lists the relevant development plan policies.</p> <p>Can RCBC and STBC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provide to the Examination full copies of any Development Plan policies that have or will be referred to in any submissions. Please find a link to the Local Plan on the Council website Local Plan Adopted May 2018.pdf (redcar-cleveland.gov.uk) ii) Confirm whether there been any relevant updates to the statutory Development Plan since the compilation of the application documents? No relevant changes since submission iii) Provide copies of any relevant Supplementary Planning Documents. Please find a link to the South Tees Area SPD |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---------|----------------------------|---|
| | | <p>South Tees Area SPD Redcar and Cleveland (redcar-cleveland.gov.uk)</p> <p>iv) Confirm whether there are any relevant made or emerging neighbourhood plans that the ExA should be aware of, and if so provide details. No neighbourhood plans emerging</p> <p>v) Confirm whether the Applicants' policy analysis set out in Table 6.4 of the Planning Statement [APP-070] is acceptable? No objection to this</p> |
| PPL.1.4 | Applicants RCBC STBC | <p>The current 2021 version of the NPPF has been published since the application documents were produced.</p> <p>Can the Applicants and RPAs confirm whether there would be any implications for the application arising from the July 2021 revision of the NPPF?</p> <p>No comments to add</p> |
| PPL.1.6 | Applicants RCBC STBC | <p>In September 2021, as part of a review of the energy NPSs, the Government published draft NPSs EN-1 to EN-5 for consultation.</p> <p>i) Do these change the analysis of policy set out in the application documents, particularly the Planning Statement and the relevant sections of the ES? If so, are revised versions required for the Examination?</p> <p>ii) In particular, is there any information within them which is important and relevant to the SoS's decision on applications for Carbon Capture infrastructure?</p> <p>No comments to add</p> |
| PPL.1.7 | Applicants RCBC STBC | <p>Are there any other new documents, updates or changes to Government Policy or Guidance relevant to the determination of this application that have occurred since it was submitted? If yes what are these changes and what are the implications, if any, for the application?</p> <p>No comments to add</p> |
| PPL.1.8 | Applicants RCBC STBC | <p>The Environment Act passed into law on 9 November 2021. While many of its provisions await detail and implementation, does this have any implications for the application documentation submitted for the Proposed Development?</p> |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022**Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022**

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|---|---|
| | | No comments to add |
| PPL.1.9 | RCBC STBC All IPs | <p>Section 3 of the Project Need Statement [APP-069] refers to the UK energy and climate change policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Do you have any observations on the Applicants' analysis of energy and climate change policy? ii) Do you have any comments relating to other new documents or updates or changes to relevant Government Policy or Guidance on climate change which is relevant to the determination of this application that has been published since submission? <p>No comments to make</p> |
| POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH | | |
| The ExA does not wish to ask any further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination. | | |
| SOCIO-ECONOMICS AND TOURISM INCLUDING MARINE USERS | | |
| SET.1.1 | RCBC STBC UK Health Security Agency | <p>ES chapter 20 [APP-102] at paragraphs 20.3.10 to 20.3.16 defines a Study Area for the socio-economic assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Is the extent of the Local Super Output Areas and Travel to Work Areas identified in the document reasonable or does it need to be drawn wider? <p>The LSOA identified seems reasonable, as does the TTWA though the TTWA could be drawn wider to include the whole of the Tees Valley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) Is the assessment of socio-economic baseline conditions set out at section 20.4 [APP-102] acceptable or does anything further need to be included? <p>The assessment is acceptable</p> |
| SET.1.3 | RCBC STBC | Further to the question above, section 20.6 of ES Chapter 20 [APP-102] and Appendix 20A (Economics Benefits Report) [APP-340] set out the estimated employment opportunities arising from the Proposed Development. |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---------|----------------------------|--|
| | | <p>i) Provide comments on the estimated employment figures. Are they reasonable having regard to the assumptions on the TTWA, displacement, and multiplier of 1.85 (paragraph 20.6.10 and footnote 1)?</p> <p>The assumptions are considered to be reasonable</p> <p>ii) Is the assessment of employment reasonable when compared to other major and infrastructure projects which you are aware of in the area?</p> <p>The assessment is considered to be reasonable</p> |
| SET.1.4 | Applicants RCBC STBC | <p>Appendix 20A (the Economics Benefits Report) [APP-340] at section 5 refers to skills and labour gaps in the Tees Valley labour market, especially during the construction phase. 'Upskilling' is recommended in the report including targeted interventions with the opportunity to partner with local education providers.</p> <p>R30 of the dDCO includes provision for an employment, skills and training plan.</p> <p>Can the Applicants:</p> <p>i) Provide an update on any 'targeted interventions' carried out so far, as recommended in the Economic Benefits Report [APP-340].</p> <p>RCBC and STBC:</p> <p>i) Are the recommendations for upskilling and targeted interventions and the wording of R30 reasonable?</p> <p>ii) What activities are currently being undertaken/ planned by the local authorities in this respect?</p> |
| SET.1.6 | RCBC STBC HBC | <p>A range of tourism and recreational destinations and activities in the area are set out at paragraphs 20.4.23 to 20.4.25 of ES Chapter 20 [APP-102]. Paragraph 20.6.28 and Table 20-8 summarise potential impacts on tourism to be negligible adverse during the construction phase.</p> <p>i) Do paragraphs 20.4.23 to 20.4.25 of the ES adequately describe the baseline so that effects on tourism and recreational users can be fully assessed? Are there other destinations which have been omitted that might be affected, in particular by the PCC Site?</p> <p>An additional destination would be Redcar Town Football Club</p> <p>ii) Should tourism and recreational destinations north of the Tees be assessed?</p> |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---------|--------------|---|
| | | <p>iii) Would leave this comment to Local Authorities north of the Tees If any additional tourism and recreational destinations are identified, please provide a plan to show their locations.</p> <p><u>Welcome to the official website of Redcar Town FC Redcar, North Yorkshire</u></p> <p>iv) Is the Applicants' assessment that potential impacts on tourism would be negligible adverse during the construction phase only reasonable? Yes no objection to this Should any effects during operation be considered? Not considered to be necessary</p> |
| SET.1.8 | RCBC STBC | <p>R29 of the dDCO [AS-135] relates to the establishment of a local liaison group. Could the RPAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provide comment on this requirement in terms of whether it would meet the aims of keeping the community informed of the construction; Satisfied with the requirement ii) Confirm whether they would take an active role in such a group; and Yes the Local Authority would take an active role in such a group iii) Provide examples of where such groups have been established successfully for other major developments in the locality. <p>While not for a specific development the Council have involvement with the Wilton International and Associated Industries Industrial Briefing Group Community Partnership - a respectful, non-political liaison process which is jointly owned by the resident representative groups, elected representatives of the community and the participating industrial partners on and around Wilton International Site aimed at strengthening the relationships between these parties to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable industry to share relevant and accurate information with the communities local to its operations 2. Enable the communities local to the industrial companies to share their views on those operations and activities 3. Provide a forum to discuss, exchange views and information on issues that impact industry and the communities |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>The Council also work actively with developers on the Wilton site as well as engaging with prospective developers on the wider Teesworks site.</p> |
| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT | | |
| TT.1.4 | Highways England Highways Authorities | <p>The methodology, baseline data and assessment of for assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on traffic and transport are set out in Chapter 16 [APP-098]. Highways England and the Highways Authorities are asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Whether the methodology, baseline data and assessment are acceptable? ii) Whether junction surveys at MCC1, MCC2, MCC3 over one day are sufficient to provide a reliable measure of baseline conditions? <p>Upon reflection, we would now prefer junction surveys over three days within the period Tuesday to Thursday, with a fortnight duration automatic traffic counter process to establish the baseline traffic flows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Is Highways England now satisfied with the junction capacity assessments in the vicinity of the site? iv) Paragraph 16.4.18 of the ES [APP-098] states that a quantitative assessment of operational traffic, which would include a predicted 200 additional staff for approximately 3 months during outages, has not been undertaken. Are Highways England and the Highways Authorities satisfied with this approach? <p>The approach is acceptable, as long as the temporary staff employed during outages are covered by an employee travel plan as agreed with us.</p> |
| TT.1.5 | Highways England Highways Authorities | <p>Are Highways England and the Highways Authorities content that Chapter 16 [APP-098] and associated framework plans form an appropriate basis for the 'Construction traffic management plan' and 'Construction workers travel plan' as written? If not, please provide details of your concerns.</p> <p>The approach used is acceptable.</p> |

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>The CTMP & CWTP themselves are acceptable if delivered in full with formal monitoring. Any further mitigation measures to be introduced in consultation with us as required.</p> |
| TT.1.7 | <p>Applicants Highways England Highways Authorities</p> | <p>Confirm that the list of other 'committed developments', and additional traffic generated referred to in paragraphs 16.4.23, 16.4.24 and Table 16-10 [APP-098] are up to date and that it is still appropriate to omit the developments in Table 16-A-44 of Appendix 16A.</p> <p>The list of other committed developments is still acceptable. Traffic flows for application R/2016/0484/FFM have still to be determined (junction counts are being undertaken in June 2022).</p> |
| WATER ENVIRONMENT | | |
| WE.1.4 | <p>RCBC STBC</p> | <p>Confirm whether the plans and projects used in the assessment of cumulative effects on the water environment, identified in paragraph 9.9.1 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-091] are acceptable.</p> <p>Acceptable no further comments to make</p> |
| WE.1.14 | <p>Applicants EA Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs)</p> | <p>Paragraph 9.4.21 of the ES [APP-091] states that parts of the site are in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and a sequential test has been undertaken, as described in paragraphs 9.6.16 to 9.6.31 of Appendix 9A of the ES [APP-250]. Paragraph 9.6.21 of the ES [APP-250] states that all of the alternative sites listed are entirely in Flood Zone 1. Although reasons are given why the current site is preferable overall, this section does not explain why the other sites were not viable alternatives in the context of the flood risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Please provide an update to the flood risk assessment in light of the change request. Do any Above Ground Installations or work areas remain within Flood Zones 2 and 3? ii) Explain why the current site is preferable in the context of the sequential test and how the sequential test is passed. iii) The assessment should clearly separate out the components of the sequential and exception tests. |

ExQ1: 19 May 2022

Responses due by Deadline 2: 9 June 2022

| ExQ1 | Question to: | Question: |
|---------|---------------------------|---|
| | | <p>iv) With regard to test 3 of the exception test (project safety), are the EA and LLFAs content that the development has been demonstrated as safe for its lifetime and that the Flood Emergency Response Plan is appropriate?</p> <p>Climate change allowance applicable to the proposed development. This will be taken into account in the calculations of surface water runoff rates and volumes in the drainage strategy for the site (9.6.49)</p> |
| WE.1.21 | Applicants EA LLFAs | <p>Paragraph 9.9.31 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-250] concludes that the access to and from the PCC Site would be flooded during higher return period events. It is proposed that members of staff either remain within the PCC Site area or are evacuated via the northern gate onto South Gare Road.</p> <p>i) Are the EA and LLFAs satisfied with this solution?</p> <p>ii) How is access to the north secured?</p> <p>iii) Does this route remain above the worst-case cumulative flood levels?</p> <p>The LLFA agree that flooding of the highway at the A1085/West Coatham Lane roundabout does occur during. The access would remain on private land (South Gare Road), the LLFA would make no comment on the suitability of this emergency access route.</p> |