



Application by Keadby Next Generation Limited for The Keadby Next Generation Power Station Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1): Issued on Wednesday 11 March 2026

Responses are due by deadline 3: Wednesday 1 April 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable 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 dated 15 December 2025. 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 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

You should respond to the questions by using the [Have your say](#) function on the [project page of the National Infrastructure website](#) and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1)'.

Download a copy of this Microsoft Word version of the ExA's written questions, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by choosing 'Make a comment' and selecting 'Upload files'.



Abbreviations used:

CEMP	Construction and Environmental Management Plan	draft DCO	the draft Development Consent Order
ES	Environmental Statement	ExA	Examining Authority
LA_{max}	Maximum A-weighted Sound Level	LA_{eq}	Equivalent Continuous Sound Level
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment	LBMEP	Landscape and Biodiversity Management Enhancement Plan
LIR	the Local Impact Report	NH₃	Ammonia
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxide	SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SPA	Special Protection Area	SSSI	Sites of Special Scientific Interest

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: [EN0110001-000310-Keadby Next Generation Limited Exam Library.pdf](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ1 1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
1. General Questions on all Topics		
Q1.0.1	<p><i>Noise Calculations in respect to birds at the Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar</i></p> <p>The applicant</p>	<p>In its response at deadline 2, the applicant stated [REP2-006] that matters raised by Natural England have now been resolved through the submissions of updated documents provided at deadline 1 in respect to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Appropriate Assessment Report [REP1-007], outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP1-022] as well as its responses to Natural England's relevant representation [REP1-028]. The applicant further asserts that sudden noise cannot be modelled reliably but that additional mitigation in the form of temporary construction noise barriers is possible. Natural England [REP2-010], nevertheless continues to have concerns regarding the correct use of noise calculation methods for birds in respect to construction and operational activities on the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar and requests that the assessment refers to LA_{max} (maximum A-weighted sound level) ratings rather than LA_{enq} (equivalent continuous sound level) ratings.</p> <p><u>For the applicant:</u></p> <p>Set out what additional mitigation is possible to combat sudden noise effects during construction and amend the documents accordingly.</p> <p><u>For Natural England:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) If the Secretary of State were minded to accept the applicant's position on noise calculations, set out what, if any, changes or amendments would be required to the draft DCO [REP1-003]. b) Clarify whether the concerns raised relate only to construction noise. If not, explain what the concerns are in respect to sudden noise generated from operational activities.
Q1.0.2	<p><i>Air Quality Assessment in respect to habitats at the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC), SPA and Ramsar</i></p> <p>The applicant</p>	<p>In its deadline 2 response [REP2-010], Natural England continues to raise concerns regarding the extent of an in-combination assessment on air quality.</p> <p>Provide a response, addressing specifically the required information and if necessary, update the application documents accordingly.</p>

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
Q1.0.3	<p><i>Air Quality Assessment in respect to Nationally Designated Sites</i></p> <p>The applicant</p>	<p>In its response at deadline 2, the applicant stated [REP2-006] that matters raised by Natural England have now been resolved by the updated documents provided at deadline 1 in respect to the HRA Appropriate Assessment [REP1-007], outline CEMP [REP1-022] as well as its responses to Natural England's relevant representation [REP1-028]. Natural England [REP2-010] nevertheless continues to have concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The adequacy of the data set out in environmental statement (ES) chapter 8 Air Quality [APP-042], ES Chapter 11 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation [APP-045], Air Quality Construction Assessment [APP-061] and in particular tables 8A.19, 8A.20 and 8A.21, the Air Quality Operational Assessment [APP-062] particularly table 8B.10 and 8B.14 in respect to construction traffic impact assessments from nitrogen oxide (NO_x), ammonia (NH₃) and nitrogen deposition change as a percentage of critical load on Hatfield Chase Ditches site of scientific special interest (SSSI), Crowle Borrow Pits SSSI, Broughton Far Wood SSSI and Broughton Alder Wood SSSI. • The adequacy of information in-combination assessment. <p>Provide a response, addressing specifically the required information and if necessary, update the application documents accordingly.</p>
Q1.0.4	<p><i>Waterborne Loads</i></p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>In its response at deadline 1 [REP1-028], the applicant stated that the number of ships using the River Trent would be considerably below the threshold whereby an assessment on the effects of the proposed development on the River Trent would be required. The response at deadline 2 [REP2-010] nevertheless still outlines this matter as an area of concern.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Explain why the applicant's response has not addressed the concern raised. If the Secretary of State were minded to accept the applicant's position in this regard, explain what, if any, changes or amendments would be required to the draft DCO [REP1-003].
Q1.0.5	<p><i>Strategic Significance to Habitats</i></p> <p>North Lincolnshire Council</p>	<p>In its Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-034], North Lincolnshire Council stated that the applicant's approach to assigning strategic significance to habitats in the statutory biodiversity metric is not correct, and that <i>"Instead, the approach should follow Table 8 of the Statutory Metric User Guide. Only habitat actions that have been mapped or are</i></p>

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		<p><i>described as ecologically important in a specific location, in a relevant plan should be ascribed high strategic significance”.</i></p> <p>The applicant responded at deadline 2 [REP2-006] stating that it has updated the outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan (LBMEP) [REP2-002] and Appendix D (Biodiversity Net Gain) which includes a full revision of the strategic significance method statement to assist transparency on the approach taken.</p> <p>Respond on whether these amendments have addressed the concern.</p> <p>NLC Response:</p> <p>The revised approach to assigning strategic significance to baseline habitats is correct, taking the Draft Greater Lincolnshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) map of “Areas that are of particular importance for biodiversity” (APIBs) as the source of information. Arguably, Keadby Ash Tip, having been identified as being of national importance for acid grassland and open mosaic habitats, should be an APIB, being of higher value than Local Wildlife Sites which are mapped. However, it appears that a GIS polygon for this site has not been available for the preparation of the LNRS. Thus, the applicant is entitled to rely on the mapped APIBs currently presented.</p> <p>In terms of post-development habitats, it is not correct to ascribe high strategic significance to all habitats created within the buffers to Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). Only those habitat actions that support the mapped actions in the LNRS merit high strategic significance. Many of the measures set out in Table D1 of the applicant’s revised Outline Landscaping and Biodiversity Management and Enhancement Plan Report (LBMEP) are proposed as supporting LNRS action 146 “Create buffers around existing LWSs and link to appropriate habitats to build resilience”. In this case, the LWSs are the Stainforth and Keadby and Canal LWS and Hatfield Waste Drain LWS. These sites have been selected for their species-rich aquatic flora, emergent vegetation and patches of species-rich bankside grassland vegetation. Lack of management, scrubbing-over and woody habitats shading the waterbodies are identified in the LWS citations as limiting biodiversity value in places. Therefore, any proposals to create or enhance botanically rich wetland or grassland</p>

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		<p>habitats in the mapped buffer zone could be useful to buffer and link LWS habitats. New woodland, scrub and/ or hedgerows would not provide this benefit and could actually be counterproductive if they replace, shade out our spreads into grassland, canals or drains.</p> <p>The Indicative Landscape and Biodiversity Plan drawings (pdf pages 64 to 67 of the revised Outline LBMEP) appear to show that woody habitats will not be created where they would shade out LWS habitats, so the effect is likely to be neutral, rather than harmful, but still not worthy of strategic uplift.</p> <p>The LPAs concerns outlined above were provided to the Applicant and further discussions have been undertaken in this regard. It has been agreed that wetland and grassland habitats coinciding with the LWS sites are suitable Strategic interventions. These habitats align with the bank vegetation described on the LWS citations and the citation for the Stainforth and Keadby Canal LWS emphasises that it is the diverse mix of dry, damp and wet habitats that underpins the diverse faunal interest of the LWS. This rationale would also apply to the Hatfield Waste Drain LWS. Given this, the retention of the Strategic Significance weightings for these habitats is agreed.</p> <p>The specific area of disagreement was identified to be the weighting currently applied to the scrub, hedgerow and woodland habitats. The Applicant has emphasised that the LBMEP provides the mechanism to manage the risk of scrub invading areas of grassland, and that the woodland planting is located to coincide with and extend an existing area of riparian woodland; but has otherwise confirmed acceptance of the LPAs position that Strategic Significance should not be applied to these habitats. Having reviewed the implications for the calculations, the Applicant has confirmed that these amendments would not prevent the Proposed Development from achieving the required minimum BNG requirement. With the removal of the weightings currently applied to these habitats, and subject to final confirmation through an updated LBMEP and BNG assessment, the Proposed Development is still anticipated by the Applicant to report a net gain in the order of:</p>

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12% for area habitats • 30% for hedgerows • 11% for watercourses <p>NLC has requested a copy of the updated biodiversity metric to confirm the anticipated net gain figures provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>Subject to this review of the updated biodiversity metric and final confirmation through an updated LBMEP and BNG assessment NLC are of the view that this issue will have been satisfactorily addressed. It is our intention to confirm this formally as part of our SoCG with the Applicant, which is at an advanced stage of preparation.</p>
Q1.0.6	<p><i>Keadby Ash Tip</i> North Lincolnshire Council</p>	<p>In its LIR [REP1-034], North Lincolnshire Council identified the importance of the Keadby Ash Tip in supporting priority open mosaic habitats on previously developed land, which has been ascribed national importance for its acid grassland and open mosaic habitats and its invertebrate communities. At Issue Specific Hearing 1 [EV3-001], the ExA welcomed the applicant’s proposal to create a flower-rich grassland across the whole site to meet biodiversity net gain but noted that the site lies outside of the Order limits and therefore questioned how this would be secured particularly as it was being promoted as a benefit of the scheme.</p> <p>In its response [REP2-005] (action point 5), the applicant stated that its commitment to deliver the biodiversity improvements would be secured via Requirement 6 (LBMEP) even though the land lies outside of the Order limits. The applicant explains that such a provision was given on the Keadby 3 Order and others.</p> <p>Confirm, or dispute with reasons to the Secretary of State, whether the draft DCO and Requirement 6 would adequately secure the delivery of the biodiversity enhancements on the Keady Ash Tip.</p> <p>NLC Response:</p>

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		<p>NLC agrees with the position of the Applicant with regards to securing the enhancement of Keadby Ash Tip via Requirement 6 (LBMEP) and has no concerns to raise in this regard. As the land is within the Applicants ownership/control the LPA believes that the Requirement would be both lawful and enforceable.</p> <p>Planning conditions may, in accordance with S72(1) of the TCPA 1990, be used to require works to be undertaken on land under the control of an applicant (whether or not it is land in respect of which the application was made) where it is expedient for the purposes of or in connection with the development authorised by the permission. It is logical that a similar approach would apply to the use of DCO Requirements to secure such works.</p> <p>It is also noted that previous decisions, including the Keadby 3 DCO, have taken a similar approach to securing off-site enhancement.</p> <p>Therefore, no separate mechanism is considered to be required to secure the enhancement of Keadby Ash Tip.</p>
Q1.0.7	<p><i>Biodiversity Net Gain</i> The applicant</p>	<p>Both Natural England [RR-013] and North Lincolnshire Council [REP1-034] requested biodiversity net gain monitoring takes place over 30 years and not 25 years as advanced by the applicant. Explain why 25 years is deemed sufficient or alternatively commit to 30 years and update, if necessary, the documentation accordingly.</p>
Q1.0.8	<p><i>Water Framework Directive</i> The applicant The Environment Agency</p>	<p>The Environment Agency stated at in its written response at deadline 2 [REP2-009] that landfill is not specifically mentioned and moreover, excavation within a landfill would constitute as expected rather than as unexpected contamination and that “<i>if historic landfills have not been identified or considered, then embedded mitigation cannot be employed to minimise or mitigate the risks prior to discovery. Adherence to piling and penetrative foundation design guidance would only apply where these specific activities are to be undertaken. Such controls may not be in place where other intrusive works are undertaken.</i>”</p> <p><u>For the applicant:</u></p>

ExQ1: Wednesday 11 March 2026

Responses due by deadline 3: Wednesday 1 April 2026

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		<p>Notwithstanding the response given at deadline 1 [REP1-028] that unexpected contamination procedures and the requirement to produce a piling and penetrative foundation design within the outline CEMP [REP1-022] would provide sufficiently robust protocols for mitigating the risk of contamination groundwater bodies, explain specifically why landfill cannot be specifically mentioned or included within the Water Environment Regulations Assessment [APP-074] as requested by the Environment Agency and what are the barriers to the project in doing so. Alternatively, update the Water Environment Regulations Assessment accordingly.</p> <p><u>For the Environment Agency:</u></p> <p>If the applicant stands by its response at deadline 1, advise the Secretary of State whether he should withhold consent on this matter or, if applicable, what amendments to the draft DCO they should consider.</p>
Q1.0.9	<p><i>Ground Investigation, Wheel Cleaning Facilities, Fuel and Chemical Storage</i></p> <p>The applicant The Environment Agency</p>	<p>In its response at deadline 1 [REP1-028], the applicant drew on comments from the Environment Agency’s relevant representation [RR-006] that suggested that they are satisfied with the information contained within ES Appendix 13A Phase 1 Desk Based Assessment Addendum Part 6 [APP-081] and the outline CEMP [REP1-022] on these matters. However, at deadline 2, the Environment Agency [REP2-009] considered that not all documents had been updated appropriately and requires the applicant to do so, and as such matters are not agreed. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfill to be specifically mentioned in the Water Environment Regulations Assessment [APP-074]. • The mechanism for monitoring and recording results of ground investigations and demonstration that the assumptions made in the initial conceptual site model will be validated. • Information on how the applicant intends to capture and dispose of wash water within the outline CEMP. • Clarification in the outline CEMP that all fuel and chemical storage should be covered to prevent the accumulation of rainwater and to prevent accidental damage. <p><u>For the applicant:</u></p>

ExQ1: Wednesday 11 March 2026

Responses due by deadline 3: Wednesday 1 April 2026

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		<p>Confirm whether the Water Framework Directive Assessment and outline CEMP will be updated accordingly. If not, explain why.</p> <p><u>For the Environment Agency:</u></p> <p>If the applicant stands by its response at deadline 1 [REP1-028], advise the Secretary of State whether he should withhold consent on this matter or, if applicable, what amendments to the draft DCO they should consider.</p>
Q1.0.10	<p><i>Water Quality Monitoring</i> The applicant</p>	<p>Notwithstanding the response at deadline 1 [REP1-028] and the acknowledgement that the application seeks no works in the River Trent, the Environment Agency maintains its request that monitoring is required owing to “...<i>potential risks from vehicles and plant machinery on site, a high risk of sediments, and fuels, oils, chemicals on site, all of which could impact water quality during construction. These risks are associated with the construction phase and would not be covered by the permit that will control operational discharge into the River Trent.</i>”</p> <p>The ExA considers the request to be reasonable and requests the applicant commit to this undertaking either by amendment to the outline CEMP [REP1-022] or draft DCO [REP1-003]. If the applicant disagrees, explain how the application could be amended accordingly should the Secretary of State accept the Environment Agency’s position on this matter.</p>
Q1.0.11	<p><i>American Mink Control</i> The applicant</p>	<p>The Environment Agency [REP2-009] recommends that mink control is added to table 5 of the outline CEMP [REP1-022] to protect biodiversity both with regards to mitigation measures for water vole and also specified in the Invasive Species Management Plan.</p> <p>Consider doing so and if necessary, update the outline CEMP. If not, provide an explanation.</p>
Q1.0.12	<p><i>Outline Wharf Management Plan</i> The applicant</p>	<p>In its relevant representations [RR-002] and written representations [REP1-055], the Canal and River Trust expressed concern over the content of a wharf management plan, which the applicant has committed to providing through requirement 22 of the draft DCO [REP1-003]. The Canal and River Trust, alongside the Maritime and Coastguard Agency [RR-022] consider such a document is critical to the management and access of Keadby Lock. The ExA considers that the submission of an outline Wharf Management Plan into the examination would assist in the alleviation of the said concerns. The applicant</p>

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		<p>acknowledges in its deadline 2 response [REP2-006] that one will be provided into the examination.</p> <p>The ExA requests an outline Wharf Management Plan is submitted into the examination as quickly as possible to allow proper examination of it. Amend requirement 22 accordingly to ensure the Wharf Management plan accords with its outline version, or separate it so it forms its own requirement.</p>
Q1.0.13	<p><i>Replacement Tree Planting alongside the Stainforth and Keadby Canal</i></p> <p>The applicant</p>	<p>The ExA notes the applicant's response regarding the replanting of trees at the water abstraction point (Work No.5) that such matters are, in its view, adequately controlled by requirement 6 of the draft DCO [REP1-003]. The ExA equally notes and understands the concerns of the Canal and River Trust [REP1-055] [REP2-008] in respect to the value and importance the existing trees alongside the canal.</p> <p>The ExA recommends that requirement 6 is amended to make specific reference to the need to consult the Canal and River Trust on proposals for the replanting of trees at the water abstraction point. Consider and amend.</p>
Q1.0.14	<p>Update on Green Hydrogen Production Facility</p> <p>North Lincolnshire Council</p>	<p>In the LIR [REP1-034], it is stated that a planning application reference PA/2025/1146 for a green hydrogen production facility in the vicinity of North Killingholme was currently being considered by the Council. The ExA would like to be kept informed during the examination as to the outcome of the decision taken.</p> <p>NLC Response:</p> <p>Planning application PA/2025/1146 for <i>the construction and operation of a low carbon (green) hydrogen production facility with an installed electrolyser capacity of 120 MW, including electrolyser units and power supplies, a water treatment plant, cooling equipment, hydrogen purification equipment, a hydrogen storage facility, a control building/stores and maintenance and laydown areas</i> was granted planning permission subject to conditions on 20 March 2026. Details can be found on the councils website at: PA/2025/1146 North Lincolnshire Planning Portal</p>

ExQ1: Wednesday 11 March 2026

Responses due by deadline 3: Wednesday 1 April 2026

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
Q1.0.15	<p><i>Draft DCO</i> <i>Schedule 2, Various Requirements</i> The applicant</p>	<p>The ExA has noted the term “<i>general accordance</i>” has been used for requirements 6(2)(g) and (4), 7(3), 11(1) and (4), 12(1), 13(3), 14(2), 15(1), 16(2) and (2)(n), 22(2) and 23(2). In the case of requirement 6(2)(g), Natural England [RR-013] considered this term needs strengthening. The ExA is minded to agree and considers the term is not sufficiently precise. The applicant stated at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [EV3-001] that it would update the Requirement but has not done so.</p> <p>Amend the above by removing the word “<i>general</i>” so it reads as “<i>must be in accordance with...</i>”</p>
Q1.0.16	<p><i>Draft DCO</i> <i>Schedule 2, Requirement 6(3)</i> The applicant</p>	<p>Requirement 6(3) as currently drafted [REP1-003] sets a monitoring and replanting period of five years after planting. While the ExA acknowledges this is standard, for this scheme and for the quantity of replanting proposed both within the Order limits and on the Keadby Ash Tip, the ExA is concerned that this period is not sufficient and should, in this case, be extended to ten years. Provide a response and amend the draft DCO accordingly.</p>
Q1.0.17	<p><i>Draft DCO</i> <i>Schedule 9, Protected Provisions</i> Canal and River Trust</p>	<p>Comment on the changes made by the applicant to paragraph 32 of Schedule 9 Protective Provisions of the draft DCO [REP1-003] which, as the applicant explains, ensures any works into the canal require the consent of the Canal and River Trust to ensure navigation of the canal suffices.</p>
Q1.0.18	<p><i>Draft DCO</i> <i>Schedule 9, Protected Provisions</i> Canal and River Trust National Grid Transmission Network Rail</p>	<p>Provide a response on the current draft of the Protective Provisions contained in Schedule 9 of the draft DCO [REP1-003]. Provide a tracked changed version of changes or amendments that is required so the ExA has a clear idea of the differences between the applicant’s and the IP’s versions.</p>
Q1.0.19	<p><i>Draft DCO</i> The applicant PD Ports</p>	<p>In its relevant representation [RR-019] and written representation [REP1-056], PD Ports has stated that a commercial service request is required to use the Port. The applicant stated [REP1-028] that it intends to appoint PD Ports as the Ships Agent and Traffic Marshall responsible managing the mooring and unloading of deliveries from the River Trent and traffic movements thereafter to Plot 3-188 as shown on the Land plans [APP-014]. Update the ExA on the progress of these negotiations. Explain the consequences</p>

ExQ1: Wednesday 11 March 2026

Responses due by deadline 3: Wednesday 1 April 2026

ExQ1	Topic and Responder:	Question:
		and changes required to the draft DCO should an agreement not be forthcoming at the point the Secretary of State determines the application, should they be minded to do make the Order.
Q1.0.20	<i>Draft DCO</i> All Interested Parties	Notwithstanding the Protective Provisions matters, set out, should it exist, any other outstanding concerns or suggested changes to the draft DCO [REP1-003] .
Q1.0.21	<i>Compulsory Acquisition and the Land Rights Tracker</i> The applicant	The ExA notes the progress being made by the applicant towards reaching voluntary agreements with Affected Persons and for updating of the Land Rights Tracker. The ExA requests a statement from the applicant on which parties, if any, it considers unlikely that heads of terms will have been reached when this examination closes.