

**APPLICATION BY KEADBY NEXT GENERATION LIMITED FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE KEADBY NEXT GENERATION POWER STATION PROJECT**

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS FOLLOWING S.51 ADVICE**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Detail</b>	<b>Response</b>
Consultees identified on a precautionary basis	Consider including bodies listed in Box 6 of s.55 checklist on s.56 list	<p>The Applicant has included the identified bodies in s.56 list.</p> <p>As well as detailed Land Registry investigations, the Applicant has completed a comprehensive Line Search Before U Dig (LSBUD) enquiry of the entire project area, obtaining a list of all companies identified by LSBUD as having an interest in the area, along with a list of 'Non-LSBUD members (asset owners not registered on LSBUD)'. All listed utility companies were subsequently contacted with Land Interest Questionnaires (LIQs). For those that did not respond, a s.42 Consultation Letter was dispatched. INOVYN Enterprises Limited was included in the 'List of not affected LSBUD members' from LineSearch, whereas all other parties were not mentioned.</p> <p>Additionally, the Applicant has cross-referenced all parties identified as having an interest in the Keadby 3 DCO against the interests identified for The Keadby Next Generation Project.</p> <p>The Applicant's searches have not identified any interest in the land held by the utility companies referenced in box 6 of the s.55 advice.</p> <p>As a precautionary measure, these parties have been added to the Section 56 mailing list and will receive a consultation notification.</p>

Issue	Detail	Response
Indicative Landscape and Biodiversity Plan (Doc 2.18)	Missing a key plan	Key Plan added – see Indicative Landscape and Biodiversity Plan Rev 1.
Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (Doc 3.1)	Query as to why a Deemed Marine Licence (DML) included in K3 but not for KNGPS.	<p>No works are proposed within the marine area, as part of the water discharge corridor that requires a DML to be in place for the purposes of constructing the Proposed Development.</p> <p>As noted in the s.51 letter of 22 September 2025, no river water abstraction option is proposed as part of this Application. The Application includes Work No.6 which is similar in scope to Work No. 5 of the Keadby 3 consent. These works include:</p> <p>i) connection works to an existing pipeline, which will occur on land (the Connection Works),</p> <p>ii) potential upgrades to an existing pipeline and associated structures (the Upgrade Works).</p> <p>Discharge from the existing pipeline would be regulated by the environmental permitting regime, and not the marine licensing regime. Therefore, no marine licence is required in this regard.</p> <p>Since the Connection Works will occur on land, they are not within the ‘marine area’ and therefore do not fall under the MMO's jurisdiction and therefore do not require a marine licence.</p> <p>The Upgrade Works have been included within Schedule 1 of the draft DCO to ensure that the Applicant has the ability to upgrade and replace the outfall structure and connecting pipeline as necessary during the lifetime of the development. These are not works that are required to be undertaken as part of the initial construction stage.</p>

Issue	Detail	Response
		<p>Any such works would be carried out 'as and when needed' during the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>To the extent that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Upgrade Works are classified as 'construction' under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009; and</li> <li>- take place within the marine area which forms part of the MMO's jurisdiction</li> </ul> <p>a MMO licence would be required and if so that licence would be sought as and when such works need to be undertaken. However, it should be noted that only the outfall point itself (and not the pipeline connection) may be within the marine area. At this point there is no certainty that works to the outfall point will be required at all. Given the lack of certainty as to the need for, scope and timing of such works no deemed marine licence has been sought.</p> <p>This differs from the Keadby 3 DCO where works within the marine area as part of the abstraction connections works were required. On the basis that a DML may have been required in the future to upgrade the existing outfall pipeline it was also included within the DML at the same time, for completeness.</p>

Issue	Detail	Response
Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (Doc 3.1)	Remove Plots 1-11 and 1-22 from Schedule 7 and amend Sch.5 Works 8A and 8C to include Work No.9B.	In respect of Work No. 9B, both the power of temporary possession and the compulsory acquisition of rights is sought in respect of 1-06, 1-07, 1-08, 1-10-12, 1-13, 1-14, 1-16, 1-17, 1-18, 1-20, 1-23, 1-24, 1-25, 1-28, 2-29, 2-30, 2-31, 2-32, ,2-33, 2-34, 2-36, 2-37, 2- 38, 2-39, 2-84, 2-93. The Applicant has amended article 33(10) of the DCO to more clearly permit this approach. This approach is intended to provide clarity on the purposes for which temporary possession may be taken, whilst still enabling rights to be acquired. This approach follows article 35(10) of the Lower Thames Crossing Order 2025 (where, in that scheme, plots were included in both the temporary possession schedule, and the schedule relating to the acquisition of permanent rights). The provision ensures that the prohibition on acquiring rights does not apply to the aforementioned plots.

Issue	Detail	Response
Book of Reference (BoR) (Doc 4.3)	Some inconsistency between BoR and s.44 consultee list.	<p>All utility companies identified in the LineSearch ('LSBUD') response as 'Non-LSBUD members (Asset owners not registered on LSBUD)' within the project area were proactively sent a Land Interest Questionnaire and an s.42 Consultation Letter to ensure Statutory Undertakers had the opportunity to provide feedback during the consultation period. This precautionary measure included companies such as Utility Assets Limited.</p> <p>Despite the Applicant's follow-up efforts, which included multiple attempts to obtain responses, or in some cases, direct confirmations of no interest from the companies, no further land interests were identified for inclusion in the Book of Reference. Consequently, this has resulted in the noted discrepancy.</p>
Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 19 Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc 6.2.19)	No table summarising consultee activities	ES Chapter 19 has been updated to add a Consultation section which summarises comments relevant to Major Accidents and Disasters assessment from the Scoping Opinion.
Outline Construction Workers Travel Plan (Doc 7.6)	Worst case scenario for construction would be for work to run from 2034 to 2037, which would be outside of the seven years sought for implementation	The ES assumes the DCO could be granted in late 2026 and construction could then start in 2027. The Transport Assessment assumes the latest construction start date could be up to 7 years later (2034) and assesses this as a worst case. However, if the DCO were to be granted in 2026 then construction would need to commence in 2033, not 2034, at the latest. The Transport Assessment therefore assesses a precautionary scenario, which reflects a conservative worst case scenario, one year later. The Applicant does not propose to amend this as the assessment is robust.

Issue	Detail	Response
Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Doc 7.7)	Confirmation needed that geoarchaeological assessment will be submitted to the Examination.	The Applicant confirms that the geoarchaeological assessment is progressing well and will be submitted to the Examination.
Land Plans (Doc 2.2)	Plot 3.191 mislabeled in BoR	<p>The description for Plot 1-191 has been revised to refer to the private road (Trent Road) rather than the public highway (Chapel Lane).</p> <p>The updated Book of Reference has been provided along with a Schedule of Changes. This document also details several updates that were made following an edition date check prior to Section 56 notification.</p>
Land Plans (Doc 2.2)	Plots 3-163 and 3-164 not referenced in dDCO	Schedule 7 of the dDCO has been updated to include reference to these plots which are required for the temporary cofferdam and related works. In reviewing the plots, the Applicant has also clarified that Work 8D includes widening, as shown on the Site Plan.
Works Plans (Doc 2.3)	A18 not listed on various sheets	A18 labels added – see Works Plans Rev.1
Works Plans (Doc 2.3)	Consider how to clearly differentiate between layers	We have reviewed overlap of layers and whilst the summary sheet is complex, the areas are more clearly shown on the subsequent sheets for clarity. The Applicant therefore welcomes any further feedback on whether additional clarification is required.
Access and Rights of Way Plans (Doc 2.4)	A18 not listed for locations A and B	An additional A18 label has been incorporated into the ARoW Plans. The Applicant has provided Rev.1 of this document alongside this submission.
Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) (Doc 3.1)	Minor discrepancies in naming/numbering	Where naming and numbering discrepancies have been identified, these have been updated. The Applicant has provided Rev.1 of this document alongside this submission.
Planning Statement (Doc 5.6)	Repetition of text and missing paragraph number	This formatting error has been corrected and the Applicant has provided Rev.1 of this document alongside this submission.

Issue	Detail	Response
Combined Heat and Power Assessment (Doc 5.8)	Minor naming discrepancy between document title and Schedule 11 of the DCO	'Readiness' has been removed from document title - and the Applicant provided Rev.1 of this document alongside this submission.
Outline Lighting Strategy (Doc 5.11)	Inconsistency between pages 1 and 2 and Sch.11 of the dDCO.	This document has been updated and Rev.1 provided alongside this submission.
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Statement (Doc 7.8)	Formatting error	This formatting error has been corrected and the Applicant has provided Rev.1 of this document alongside this submission.
ES Chapter 9 Noise and Vibration (Doc 6.2.9)	Error in Table 9.26 - reference to absorbers (not included in s.51 letter or s.55 checklist but identified following applicant review).	The Applicant has amended this and provided Rev.1 of this document alongside this submission.
ES Chapter 12 Appendix 12A Flood Risk Assessment (Doc 6.3.16)	Error in heading for Annex 1	The Applicant has amended this and provided Rev.1 of this document alongside this submission.