

Reference	Consultee	Consultee Response	Applicant Response/Action	Project significance/Document Reference
CR01	Parish councillors	<p>It was requested that Allostock be included in the consultation.</p> <p>One attendee enquired about the scope of the consultation zone and which parishes fell in the 3.5km Zone A.</p> <p>It was asked whether the red line boundary for the site meant that there would be no impacts outside of this area.</p> <p>One attendee asked whether there would be an impact on Lower Peover.</p> <p>Representatives were asked whether brine from the KGSP would eliminate the need to develop Hulme Hall.</p> <p>One attendee asked about the location of Hulme Hall.</p>	<p>Although the village of Allostock falls outside of the Consultation Zone A for the main site, Allostock Parish Council was included as a consultation body and was provided details of the Project for the benefit of parish councillors and local residents.</p> <p>It was noted that residents in neither Allostock or Lower Peover would be contacted directly, but reinforced that the consultation had been widely publicised, with the relevant documentation available to download online or view in local</p> <p>KGSL explained the relationship between the red line area and assessment areas, confirming that although the application area covers areas such as the pipeline and saturators, construction was not proposed in all locations. However, study areas for the ES are different to – and in some cases go beyond – the red line area, meaning potential impacts on the surrounding area have been considered</p> <p>The Applicant responded to parish councillors that it was unlikely Allostock and Lower Peover would be affected by the Project. It was explained that KGSL had drawn on lessons learned from the previous gas storage projects and that these had been taken into account when designing the KGSP and deciding operational practices, such as traffic routing</p> <p>It was explained that the KGSP will supply enough brine for between 6 and 10 years. INOVYN Enterprises cannot commit to the timing of development at Hulme Hall Brinefield, which will be dependent on customer demand for brine.</p> <p>Attendees responded verbally, explaining the location of the site.</p>	<p>The Applicant ensured that Allostock Parish Council were consulted and engaged during the consultation.</p> <p>No change. A variety of methods were agreed as part of the published SoCC with the intention of raising awareness amongst wider audiences and encouraging participation.</p> <p>No action required. The significance of the application boundary was communicated in response.</p> <p>No change. The likely areas of impact have been agreed and considered as part of the ES.</p> <p>The proposed KGSP is likely to reduce the scale of development at Hulme Hall within the timeframe.</p> <p>The response is not directly relevant to the proposed KGSP.</p>
		Attendees asked whether KGSP would be the only location where water was going into the ground during construction.	KGSL does not propose to go beyond the 19 proposed cavities as described in the Application documents.	No change. KGSL is applying for Development Consent to solution mine 19 cavities, to be subsequently used for gas storage provision.

		Attendees asked about the risk associated with storing gas underground and the risk of a leak.	It was explained that the Holford Brinefield has an extensive and predictable salt deposit and proven history of safe storage of natural gas. The location of each cavity has been chosen after careful consideration of geological constraints of the site. The Applicant responded that KGSP will be covered by COMAH regulations and that a Hazardous Substances Consent will be secured for the Project, in accordance with the Planning (Hazardous	No change. Details of the site selection is included in the DCO geological reports and summarised in the Project Overview. A HSC for the Project will be secured by KGSL.
		It was questioned why the COMAH report could not be made available to the public, and would this be available via Freedom of Information.	It was explained that COMAH licenses are not public documents for security reasons. It is down to HSE to respond to Freedom of Information Requests, however it is assumed that if released the documents would be redacted.	No action required. It would not be the responsibility of the Applicant to respond to Freedom of Information requests.
		One attendee asked how many gas storage cavities have already been consented. One attendee asked whether the rings of the hazardous substances consultation area correlated to potential accident impacts. Questions were asked about the timescales for the Application.	It was confirmed that there have been 37 cavities consented so far, with the KGSP seeking consent for a further 19. The Applicant explained that the 'rings' are consultation zones, and that these are defined by the HSE and not within the control of the Applicant. The HSE consider the Project and determine acceptability, taking into consideration the character of the surrounding area. The Applicant confirmed to attendees that DCO application would likely be submitted around spring 2015, with the determination period being around 12 – 18 months. It is anticipated that construction of the KGSP could start in 2017, with the potential for gas storage to begin in 2020 following solution mining.	No action required. KGSL is seeking Development Consent for 19 cavities. No action required. The (hazard) consultation zones are out of the control of the Applicant. No action required. Progression of the Application will depend on the timetable for consideration post-submission.
CR02	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	The response from the MMO explains the organisation's remit. The MMO raised comments regarding the potential need to acquire a Deemed Marine License (DML). The MMO notes it is unable to provide comments until it has been determined whether a DML is required, with advice on the suggested content of a draft license.	KGSL welcomes comments from the MMO and has had regard to the feedback expressed. As noted in ES Chapter 25: Marine Environment, KGSL has identified the Mean High Water Spring (MHWS) in line with its responsibility and can confirm that no construction is proposed to take place seaward of the MHWS, it is therefore considered that a DML would not be required for the KGSP. KGSL has come to this conclusion following careful consideration of the licensing requirements of the 2009 Act. More information on the Applicant's assessments and consideration can be found in ES Chapter 25: Marine Environment, in particular Figure 25.1 which identifies the MHWS.	KGSL contacted the MMO ahead of submission of the Application to confirm that a DML will not be required. No further action required.

CR03	Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	<p>The HSE noted the nearby hazardous installation and stated that, due to the small number of people associated with operation of the KGSP, it would not object to the development. It advised that each site should have emergency procedures in place for use in the event of an accident at the neighbouring COMAH site. The HSE advises that the Applicant will be applying for Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) and that it would provide advice to the local authority. The HSE notes that the Applicant has been engaging before the formal submission and that it will work with the Applicant to resolve any details going forward.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes the formal advice from the HSE and reiterates the intention to continue engagement as the KGSP progresses. A HSC will be secured for the Project, in accordance with the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992.</p>	<p>A final Application for HSC has been submitted to the Hazardous Substances Authority for consideration.</p>
CR04	Public Health England (PHE)	<p>The organisation does not comment on the gas pipeline or site safety but notes that the KGSP will fall under the remit of COMAH. PHE advises against exclusion of the assessment of potential Electric and Magnetic Forces (EMF) connected to the 33 kV power line. PHE adds that it will provide detailed comments on the submitted assessments once available.</p>	<p>KGSL notes the comments made by PHE, in particular that PHE will provide detailed comments on both the submitted assessments and proposed route corridor once available. Information has been submitted as part of the DCO application, including a CEMP.</p>	

CR05	Canal & River Trust	<p>Following engagement and informal discussion with the Canal & River Trust (The Trust), a formal response was received. The Trust notes ongoing engagement and that the Trust has accepted the likelihood that the outfall pipe will have to go over the Weaver Navigation due to the risks associated with local infrastructure and alternatives being ruled out. The Trust welcomes the proposed new access, which will allow for easier maintenance and inspection of the outfall pipe and Telford Wall and that the bridge will be high enough to allow commercial freight transport. The Trust expressed the opinion that the bridge will have substantial visual impact and asked for this to be fully considered as part of the assessments. The Trust notes that the use of lighter colour frame materials and simple detailing could help mitigate impact.</p>	<p>KGSL has welcomed ongoing engagement with the Trust. Views expressed during engagement with the Trust have helped inform the design process of the pipe bridge. A robust LVIA has been submitted for the Runcorn elements of the Project, which have been shaped by feedback from consultees such as the Trust. KGSL has identified a number of sensitive receptors in its assessment, however it is considered that there will be no significant effects on users of the canal, given they would be transient and taking into account the industrial context of the infrastructure's setting. The proposed pipe bridge is designed to fit with the architectural context of the area, however in order to ensure safe use of the waterway it must be visible to users. The Applicant can commit to continued engagement with the Trust over this matter, in particular through the detailed design development. Further information on KGSL's assessments and conclusions can be found in ES Chapter 24: Landscape and Visual at Runcorn.</p>	<p>Engagement with the trust has helped shape the proposed design of the pipe bridge. Following consultation, the bridge will include a walkway; a stair tower; and is proposed to be galvanised grey in colour.</p>
CR06	English Heritage	<p>English Heritage notes the cultural heritage assessment appears to be a thorough piece of work identifying effects on known and potentially unknown assets. The body expresses the opinion that more needs to be done to mitigate impacts on historic hedgerows, whilst noting that the impacts are not themselves great. It would consider limited recording to be appropriate. English Heritage suggests geophysical surveys and archaeological evaluation of areas that could potentially be home to unknown heritage assets. A buffer zone around the Drakelow Hall moated site is suggested.</p>	<p>KGSL notes the comments of English Heritage and welcomes the opinion that the prepared assessments are thorough. KGSL has had regard to comments made regarding historic hedgerows and is proposing additional mitigation measures, including the recording of these boundaries. A watching brief will be carried out when hedgerows are cut, which will include excavation and recording of a sample slot across each of the boundaries. The Applicant has also set out a method statement for evaluation of the areas noted by English Heritage, which includes the use of geophysical surveys and test trial trenches where anomalies are identified. KGSL has agreed a draft Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) with English Heritage and the local authority. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage.</p>	<p>The Applicant has included several mitigation measures as a result of consultation. These are set out in ES Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage and Chapter 26: Mitigation. Groundworks will be supervised by a qualified archaeologist and in accordance with the agreed WSI, which will be secured via the DCO.</p>

CR07	Natural England	<p>NE made a suggestion for further information on the impact on bird species at Runcorn to be considered. The potential for air quality impacts during construction of the Runcorn pipe bridge are also recommended for consideration.</p> <p>NE shows support for the mitigation measures in the form of a Soil Management Plan and asks questions regarding the classification of agricultural land to be lost.</p> <p>Further information is requested on wintering bird surveys carried out and conclusions of the surveys, advising that further survey work may be necessary. The authority welcomes interim survey results on Great Crested Newts and anticipates a draft licence application for consideration. It also notes potential impact on certain species, such as badgers, bats and barn owls, and commits to review under NSIP and licensing guidance.</p> <p>NE voices disagreement that noise can be scoped out at Runcorn and references comments made during the Scoping period regarding visual impact and support for the production of a CEMP.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the comments made by NE and has carefully considered the content of the letter. How KGSL has had regard to the comments is included in the submitted ES, mainly Chapter 8: Ecology. As a direct result of the comments made by NE, KGSL carried out further wintering bird surveys in November and December. The results of all surveys assessing the presence and likelihood of any impacts are detailed and appended to ES Chapter 8: Ecology. The Applicant has had regard to NSIP and Licensing Guidance regarding GCNs and produced a full draft licence application, which was submitted to NE for consideration following completion of surveys.</p> <p>Details of potential impacts on ecology have been considered in both Chapter 10: Air Quality and Chapter 8: Ecology. Chapter 10 details proposed mitigation measures during site planning and construction. ES Chapter 8: Ecology details the surveys undertaken with regard the species noted in the response. A suite of mitigation measures are detailed in ES Chapter 26: Mitigation, including removing hedgerows outside of the bird breeding season; night-time crossings of trenches for badgers; reduction of hedgerow gaps for bats amongst others. KGSL has assessed the land classification and land to be considered Grade 3. Since the category was subdivided into 3A and 3B, only a small number of sites have since been surveyed, none of which fall with the DCO boundary. As such, the Applicant has assumed in its assessment that all grade 3 land is grade 3A (classed as best and most versatile).</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a robust response to the matters raised by NE and the submission has directly impacted the Project and undertaking of environmental assessments. This included the carrying out of further wintering bird surveys and the preparation of GCN licence application.</p> <p>A robust set of mitigation measures have been proposed, which will in the main be secured via the DCO.</p>
CR08	Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	<p>The CAA noted that it is unlikely there would be any significant aerodrome safeguarding issues or the need for an aviation warning light. The CAA also noted that there could be potential for high pressure venting or flaring of gases in the case of abnormal operation or emergencies and that the site operator/developer should assess if these have any potential to cause danger to overflying aircraft.</p>	<p>KGSL expects that it is unlikely there will be any aerodrome safeguarding issues or requirements for a warning light. It is not expected that there should be any issues with respect to venting or flaring of gasses, although the Applicant understands the issues and will review them further as work on the facility progresses.</p>	<p>KGSL will continue to take full account of the points raised by the CAA during the development of the facility.</p>

CR09	Environment Agency (EA)	<p>The general themes and comments provided by the EA are summarised as follows:</p> <p>Flood risk: Prior written consent from the EA would be required should the proposals be deemed to have an effect on Puddinglake Brook.</p> <p>Ecology: Further information sought on impact on the Ship Brook watercourse including the level of impact on habitats.</p> <p>Water: Reinforcing the need to comply with the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>Protected species: The response notes the presence of the Lesser Silver Water Beetle, with a request made for further information regarding the survey methods used.</p> <p>Pollution control: Advice on pollution control requirements. COMAH: Notes the need for COMAH licensing.</p> <p>Environmental Permit: Offers discussion regarding whether an Environmental Permit is necessary.</p>	<p>KGSL has considered Puddinglake Brook (or Ship Brook as referred to) as part of its submitted ES Chapter 8: Ecology. It is not expected that the watercourse will be damaged as a result of the works. The Applicant understands the requirements for appropriate land drainage consents, which will be sought prior to construction. The impacts of the KGSP on water quality have been assessed, further details of which can be found in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality. The technical information details how, with the exception of 12 crossing points over Puddinglake Brook for access roads and pipework, there is no permanent interaction with the watercourse. No detrimental effect on WFD status is expected as these roads will be constructed in accordance with the CEMP and will be carried out under separate licence from the EA. The Applicant has surveyed the presence of and potential for impact on the Lesser Silver Water Beetle, the results of which are now available and have been submitted as an annex to ES Chapter 8: Ecology. No impacts on the beetle are expected as a result of KGSP and habitat availability and suitability will be enhanced by proposed pond rehabilitation. A HSC application will be made, in accordance with the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992. Storage of potentially contaminating materials will be in accordance with the EA Pollution Prevention Guidelines and will be in bunded areas with an impermeable base. It is not anticipated that secondary storage will be required given the nature of the KGSP and quantities of potential contaminants.</p>	<p>The Applicant has been given consent for crossings by the EA and no additional watercourse creation is considered necessary. A draft HSC licence application has been prepared and submitted to the HSE.</p>
CR10	National Grid	<p>NG's response outlined the company's overground and underground transmission assets in the area, the need for full access and safe statutory clearance areas. The response also identifies gas transmission and distribution pipelines in close proximity to the Application area. Several advice points are noted in relation to crossings of pipelines, such as construction traffic only crossing at agreed locations; for pipelines to be protected by rafts to be agreed with NG; and other protective measures to be agreed with NG.</p>	<p>KGSL notes the points raised by NG and the advice given regarding protecting existing infrastructure and assets during construction and operation. INOVYN Enterprises has extensive experience in solution mining at the Holford Brinefield and a detailed knowledge of the constraints of bringing forward gas storage facilities in the area. KGSL is aware of the locations of grid infrastructure and will ensure that, prior to construction commencing, NG is fully consulted on the approach and that proposed protective measures are agreed. KGSL has also agreed a connection location to the National Transmission System with NG.</p>	<p>The Applicant has issued the proposed protective measures to NG.</p>

CR11	E.ON	<p>Prior to the statutory consultation, KGSL engaged with E.ON regarding matters including lease of the land, HSC, KGSP construction roads, brine and water connections and COMAH licenses, following which, engagement modifications were made to the proposed pipeline and connection locations. E.ON also responded to the statutory consultation in relation to the nearby Holford Gas Storage Project (HGSP), providing an overview of the operational assets in the area. E.ON requests construction and operation is carried out so that it does not pose a risk to employees, does not impact on the business or damage E.ON's property. Additional points include the request for the Applicant to agree in advance work to be carried out on land leased to E.ON and vehicular access to be controlled at all times.</p>	<p>The Applicant thanks E.ON for its continued engagement regarding the Application and KGSL intends to continue discussion over this matter as the Application progresses. The Applicant notes that measures will need to be agreed for the maintenance of existing roads, new roads and pipelines on HGSP leased area. KGSL is in ongoing liaison with E.ON regarding these matters. The Applicant agreed the proposed road layout with E.ON ahead of statutory consultation.</p>	<p>The proposed development and associated infrastructure has been shaped as a result of liaison with E.On. This includes changes to the proposed road layouts. KGSL will continue to engage with E.ON to agree maintenance of roads and pipelines on the HGSP area.</p>
CR12	Storengy	<p>Prior to and during formal consultation, KGSL was also in discussion with Storengy, the operators of the nearby Stublach Gas Storage Project (SGSP). KGSL provided details of the brine, water and gas pipelines proposed to enter on to land leased by Storengy. The design and location of such pipelines was important given the provision being made as part of the DCO application to link the two facilities in the future. The Consultee provided several points of feedback on the proposed design, advising on the optimum locations for the proposed pipelines to ensure that the KGSP did not disrupt their existing operations.</p>	<p>The Applicant thanks Storengy for its response during the evolution of the Project. As a result, Storengy has been incorporated as part of the design of the Project. KGSL has continued liaison with Storengy following the updates to proposed infrastructure.</p>	<p>As a result of feedback provided, KGSL made modifications to the proposed pipeline locations and connections and provided updated drawings for Storengy to review and agree.</p>
CR13	Scottish Power Energy Network	<p>KGSL also received a consultation response from Scottish Power Energy Networks (SPEN). SPEN highlighted the presence of a new section of overhead cable linking the proposed infrastructure to an existing 33kV power cable. As this was referenced in the PEIR as being the responsibility of SPEN, the Consultee</p>	<p>KGSL responded directly to the request from SPEN to confirm the points raised in the submission, communicating that KGSL intended to secure consent for the proposed works as part of the DCO application and acknowledging that there is no formal agreement in place to date between KGSL and SPEN. In addition KGSL had further conversations and attended a meeting with the Consultee to discuss</p>	<p>Following discussion and as a result of opinions and advice given by SPEN, KGSL altered the design so that the proposed new section of the 33kV cable to the GPP is in part overhead line and in part buried. This proposition was then redrawn and</p>

CR14	Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board	In its response, the Cheshire Brine Subsidence Compensation Board raised no objection to the proposals. The Board however confirmed that, upon the description of the proposals, proposed solution mining activity would require registration with the Board as a brine pumper and the payment of a levy in accordance with the Cheshire Brine Pumping Act 1952.	Members of the Project team spoke directly with a representative of the Board to discuss the proposed KGSP and answer questions. As INOVYN Enterprises currently solution mines at the Holford Brinefield, the company is aware of and fulfils the requirements of the Board. Should the KGSP be granted Development Consent, the Applicant will comply with the requirements set out in the Cheshire Brine Pumping Act.	INOVYN Enterprises has an existing relationship with the Board and already engages regarding ongoing activity. The Applicant can commit to continued engagement and compliance.
CR15	Stakeholder Workshop attendees	Attendees discussed the issue of noise from existing gas compressors as well as explaining that those living close to drilling rigs had experienced issues with lights on construction sites which are sometimes susceptible to facing the wrong direction.	It was clarified that noise disruption is understood to be due mainly to tonal noise. ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration considers the impact of noise on sensitive receptors during both construction and operation of the proposed KGSP. The Chapter details mitigation measures and operational practices to reduce noise impacts, including the use of well-maintained efficient machinery; perimeter fencing; and the use of mobile screens.	ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration
		A question was asked about the Cheshire irrigation system and the issue over the loss of ponds as well as disruption caused to local farmers when gates had been left open during past projects resulting in a mix up of cattle.	Directional lighting will also be used to limit unwanted light spill, which will be positioned and angled away from sensitive receptors, such as nearby properties.	ES Chapter 26: Mitigation
		The issue of soil and water contamination was also raised by attendees.	The Draft DCO will contain a requirement to obtain the relevant planning authority's written approval of a scheme for external lighting and construction noise requirement prior to the commencement of each stage of development.	Draft CEMP
			The impact of the proposed development on geology, land and water quality has been considered in depth as part of environmental assessments, including a Flood Risk Assessment. Details of the work done can be found in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality. It concludes that there will be limited scope for significant effects on surface water quality. Several mitigation measures are proposed, including the use of construction bunds and temporary site drainage to prevent uncontrolled run-off of wastes and liquids. These will be secured via the CEMP.	ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality

	<p>With regards to gates being left open in the past, the Applicant has been in discussion with tenants regarding access routes and these will be designed with such previous incidents in mind.</p>	Draft CEMP
	<p>As noted above, extensive work has been done to assess the likely impact of the proposed development on soil quality and risk of contamination. Assessments detailed in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality conclude that there will be no significant effect on the surface water regime, as well as limited scope for significant effects on surface water quality. The assessments do however note that known impacts to soils and surface water will occur, whilst there is the potential for unknown contaminated soils, for example from farming activities of in-filling of</p>	ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality
	<p>A series of mitigation measures, detailed in ES Chapter 26: Mitigation, are proposed. These include the avoidance of contaminated land being identified and avoided; handling and storage of potentially contaminated soils; and the use of construction bunds and temporary site drainage. Each of these measures will be secured by the CEMP.</p>	Draft CEMP
<p>Attendees asked if there were any issues with the heritage sites.</p>	<p>Drakelow Hall and listed buildings have been identified on the map, showing that provisions are in place to ensure that no form of development could take place in certain areas including at Drakelow Hall and RAF Cranage.</p> <p>Heritage assets have been considered in ES Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage, including the potential disturbance of currently unknown assets. It is proposed that an archaeological watching brief will record historic boundaries where these are cut by the proposals and that groundworks will be supervised by a qualified archaeologist in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation.</p>	ES Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage
<p>Some attendees added that they had no further environmental concerns in need of clarification and that they were much more confident having listened to the discussions.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes such responses, as the Stakeholder Workshop was intended to act as a forum to discuss the application and environmental assessments and increase knowledge of the preparation of the Application.</p>	

<p>Attendees asked if sound proofing was possible at the gas compressor station and a suggestion was made to have cladding on drilling rigs and to ensure reputable drilling companies were used</p>	<p>The Applicant informed participants that it is possible to mitigate noise impacts throughout the design process. This is apparent in ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration and the proposed measures to lessen the impact of noise at sensitive receptors. For example, the GPP will be designed to be non-tonal, whilst lower noise fans have been selected. Measures also include the locating of some equipment within buildings and enclosures.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration · DCO noise limit requirement</p>
	<p>KGSL's parent company INEOS Enterprise Group Ltd upholds high standards in procurement and, as such, KGSL will have strict criteria for companies to meet to ensure they are reputable and able to carry out the work whilst keeping disruption to a minimum.</p>	
<p>Attendees were concerned that planted trees and hedges around wellheads must be maintained through their lifetime.</p>	<p>KGSL notes that it is important to ensure that trees and hedges planted as part of the Project are maintained to ensure they achieve the desired effect, both to provide habitats and screening. The Applicant will commit to a five- year maintenance programme, to be delivered by a DCO requirement.</p>	
<p>Project Team members were asked about the consideration for existing land drains and how this will be addressed if they are located on the Project footprint.</p>	<p>Appropriate land drainage consents will be sought prior to construction from the appropriate authority for work near any watercourse. Construction will not begin until this has been granted by CWCC.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality</p>
<p>Attendees showed an interest in the technical aspects of brine and drilling into salt, in particular what percentage of brine would need to be purged.</p>	<p>It was explained that the aim of the KGSP is to use as much brine as possible to meet customer demand but that a guaranteed minimum rate of cavity creation would be required in order to underpin and achieve significant investment in gas storage. It was explained that the ability to discharge would be solely to achieve a minimum rate of cavity creation. The need for brine is market driven and dependent on customer demands.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>Attendees were interested to discuss whether HS2 would affect the Project and if there would be some disturbance to the strata. The point was also raised whether the KGSP would have an impact on the subsidence and impact on the HS2.</p>	<p>Attendees were reassured that the HS2 would not affect the development and subsidence monitoring was explained. KGSL is aware of the proposals and has submitted a response to consultation on the proposals. The timescale for development of the HS2 rail line has not been confirmed, however it will fall after the peak period of construction of the Project, and is likely to be when the Project is in its operational phase of gas storage. Therefore, the Project will form part of the baseline for the HS2 scheme and will need to be taken into consideration as part of the HS2 consenting process. As currently proposed, it does not appear that the HS2 route would directly affect, or be directly affected by the Project.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Scope of Environmental Assessments.</p>
<p>The group discussed the main gas pipeline location and asked whether there would be any more pipelines installed.</p>	<p>The proposed KGSP will link to existing infrastructure in the vicinity of the proposed site to connect to the NTS. Beyond those shown in the documentation, no further pipelines are being planned as part of this Project.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The locations of cavities were discussed, along with the movement and proximity of cavities to residential properties following surveys.</p>	<p>An overview of the seismic survey and explanation of the cavity distances was given.</p>	<p>DCO Project Overview, Document 8.1, Chapter 4.</p>
	<p>It was explained that a seismic survey has been undertaken to establish salt depth (below grade) and the thickness of the salt layer, as well as ensuring no fault lines are present within a proposed location.</p>	
	<p>The HSE will require established calculations to be produced and agreed in respect to how close cavities/wellheads can be located in respect to existing properties. The location of the gas storage cavities has been chosen after careful consideration of geological constraints of the site, whilst above-ground infrastructure has been designed to have as little disruption as possible for features, such as hedgerows.</p>	

<p>The economic benefits of the Project were discussed such as employment opportunities and apprenticeships.</p>	<p>The economic contribution of the Project to the local and regional economy is evidenced by the number of jobs that will be created, particularly during the construction process. It is anticipated that up to 300 jobs during construction and 30 during operation would be created by the KGSP. KGSL is keen to ensure that individuals and companies within the locality benefit from the proposals and is willing to work with the relevant local authorities and job centres in order to publicise opportunities to a local audience.</p>	<p>DCO Project Overview, Document 8.1</p>
<p>Group members asked whether there was the possibility of gas supply in Byley.</p>	<p>KGSL confirmed that they are not a utility supplier and thus would be unable to provide a gas supply to Byley, this matter should be addressed to the NG.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>A suggestion was made that local suppliers and/or local farmers could be used for moving hedges/trees as well as a suggestion that semi-mature trees should be planted on soil mounds.</p>	<p>KGSL welcomes any commercial interest in the Project and has kept a log of those with potential interest in contracts or other opportunities during construction. KGSL intends to continue liaison with local landowners, farmers and elected representative as the Application progresses. Any such opportunities could be discussed following consideration of the Application</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Attendees were interested to learn about the motivation for the Project and whether it was brine or gas storage.</p>	<p>In response to discussions surrounding the depth of the cavities and the distance from properties it was explained that the sizes of the salt cavities would be mined specifically to allow for gas storage. It was mentioned that cavities stored gas at 30 – 130 barg, with NTS running at typically up to 70 barg.</p>	<p>DCO Project Overview, Document 8.1</p>
<p>Discussions were had around the depth of the cavities and the distance from properties, with other questions including how much of the national shortage of gas storage this Project would fulfill and whether there would be any extension of existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>The salt beds dip generally from the north east to the south west in this part of the Brinefield so the top of the cavities will vary from approximately 500 to 700 metres below surface.</p>	

	<p>Appropriate separation distances have been included as part of the project design; the wellheads and gas processing plant are at least 240 m from residential properties.</p> <p>The Project will increase the UK's existing and planned gas storage deliverability by 18.5% and the gas storage inventory by 10%, a significant contribution towards meeting an acknowledged need. The proposed location for the Project is close to the locations of two previous gas storage projects and in an area where there is an ongoing requirement for solution mining to produce brine for customers. As such there are opportunities to re-use existing assets and new infrastructure can be added to the existing operating site, minimising both cost to industry and the environmental impact of providing additional gas storage.</p>	
<u>Transport</u>	<p>The transport assessment, carried out as part of the environmental assessments and featuring as ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, is based on worst case scenario traffic movements. It was stated that there would be on average 30 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) in and out per day (resulting in 60 HGV movements). During limited occasions there may be a requirement for an additional 10, two-way vehicle movements, for example during periods of continual concrete pour.</p>	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport
Traffic management was discussed with the suggestion of implementing a temporary speed restriction.		
Attendees highlighted the issue of tight bends on the roads and the need to let road users know that development and project work is taking place, in order to avoid any potential collisions	<p>A HGV Routing Plan will be prepared and supported by the CEMP and secured via a Section 106 Agreement. This will be prepared in consultation with the local highways authority and will agree measures such as appropriate routes for HGV vehicles and wheel washing facilities. KGSL advised attendees during the workshop that compliance measures, such as a 'three strikes and out' rule could be put in place during construction to ensure that contractors stick to designated routes</p>	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport

CR16

Cheshire West and Chester Council

<p>Concern about the measures in place to prevent construction traffic from using restricted roads was also raised.</p>		
<p>Attendees asked the question whether the HSE had responded to the Project.</p>	<p>It was confirmed that the HSE had been consulted on the Project. KGSL has worked with the HSE and responded to enquiries regarding pipework associated with the KGSP. Following minor changes, the HSE has confirmed that the KGSP would meet the HSE's 'do not advise against' criteria. Following this response, KGSL intends to submit a HSC</p>	<p>KGSL has engaged and worked with the HSE to ensure that the Project meets strict criteria.</p>
<p>Use of salt/brine: Referring to legislation in the NPPF and policies included in the CWCC Local Plan, the authority will make the provision for a sustainable supply of brine and prudent use of natural resources. Proposed discharge of brine is raised by the authority, which asks whether the driver for new solution mining would be demand for brine or gas storage. The authority asks for this point to be clarified. It is made clear that the council does not necessarily object to the proposal on these grounds, but that further information is required.</p>	<p>KGSL responded directly to the local authority with regards to sustainable use of Cheshire's salt reserve. It was explained that the aim of the KGSP is to use as much brine as possible to meet customer demand but that a guaranteed minimum rate of cavity creation would be required in order to underpin and achieve significant investment in gas storage. It was explained that the ability to discharge would be solely to achieve a minimum rate of cavity creation. The need for brine is market driven and dependent on customer demands.</p>	<p>No change. Since the inception of the Project it has been the intention to use as much brine as possible to meet customer demand, and the Project has been designed on this basis.</p>
<p>Landscape: The authority asked for further clarification and information with regards to viewpoints of Project. It was added that whilst the drawings provided demonstrated visual impact would not be significant, further montages would help confirm this. The general approach to mitigation was considered appropriate subject to further detail and further details of the cumulative impact of the development during construction and operation were sought.</p>	<p>Views expressed regarding the assessment of visual impact have been accommodated and ES Chapter 14: Landscape and Visual Impact contains further detail. It provides information regarding the locations of viewpoints; the assessment of impact in relation to other gas storage projects and additional diagrams showing predicted views during construction.</p>	<p>Further explanatory detail has been added to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and additional artist's impression have been prepared for the construction period.</p>

<p>Ecology: The authority expresses that the methodologies appear to be appropriate, however reserves judgement on ecology aspects pending the completion of surveys of species including overwintering birds and bats amongst others. Further advice was given regarding surveys of Great Crested Newt populations, with the assessment to be updated to demonstrate further work.</p>	<p>The Applicant has since updated all ecological surveys and further information on the methodologies and outcomes of assessments can be found in ES Chapter 8: Ecology. The Applicant has subsequently submitted a GCN licence to NE, as well as a draft Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). Each concluded that there will be no significant effects experienced.</p>	<p>Several mitigation measures have been proposed, detailed in ES Chapter 26: Mitigation. For GCN specifically, this will include reinstatement of habitats post-development; the provision of refuges; and the restoration of 36 ponds to improve suitability as breeding sites. The GNC Licence application and mitigation will be agreed with NE, whilst some measures will be secured via the CEMP.</p>
<p>Highways: Broadly raised no concerns regarding the highways network and supported the use of the existing exit in principle. Opinion is expressed that HGV routing is important and details should be included in the submitted CEMP. It is suggested that HGV access should be restricted during peak hours.</p>	<p>Impacts on the roads are unlikely to be significant, even at peak hours. Use of the highway network during peak hours will be avoided where possible and a CEMP and routing agreement will be produced to manage traffic movements.</p> <p>A draft Routing Plan has been prepared and is attached as an Annex to ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport. The Applicant has issued a draft routing obligation, which has been agreed in principle with CWCC, CE and HBC.</p>	<p>A HGV Routing Plan 13-03-01/HOL/24/405-B1(Doc Ref: 2.7.34)-will identify appropriate routes for use by HGVs and facilities for wheel-washing. The Routing Plan will be secure via a Section 106 agreement.</p>
<p>Public rights of way: More information is requested on the diversion of a restricted byway 'Rudheath No.7' including the diversion route, timescales of alerting the council and the proposed surfacing.</p>	<p>Following the request, a drawing demonstrating a proposed temporary diversion of the RB7 public right of way was submitted to CWCC for consideration. It is anticipated the bridleway will require temporary diversion during the construction period for a period of approximately 48 hours.</p>	<p>The diversion will ensure that the right of way remains accessible throughout the construction of the Project. The public right of way will be subject to a requirement as part of the DCO application.</p>

<p>Noise: Mitigation measures are broadly considered adequate. Consideration of construction hours will be important, with a request made to restrict activity to standard weekly hours and 8am – 1pm on Saturdays. The council raises concerns about noise impacts from 24-hour drilling during construction, however reserves judgement until further assessments have been carried out. The authority calls for more information to also be made available on operational noise impacts in order to make a judgement.</p>	<p>Following the response, the ES Chapter on Noise and Vibration has been completed. The hours of construction will be agreed with CWCC in advance of work commencing. If, in exceptional circumstances, it is required to carry out work outside of these hours, the manner of the works will be agreed with the authority and limited to activities that do not result in significant noise impacts</p>	<p>ES Chapter 26: Mitigation details the proposed measures including the use of quieter rigs, acoustic screening at the source or noise insulation at the nearest properties. Details will be identified through the detailed design process, whilst mitigation will be secured via the CEMP.</p>
	<p>The Applicant has included further details of the noise baseline and predicted effects in ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration. This provides detail of mitigation measures to be delivered where necessary. It is noted that drilling will temporary in nature, taking approximately a month per wellhead.</p>	
	<p>Other measures will include the use of low noise equipment, mobile screens and careful scheduling of work to reduce construction noise.</p>	
<p>Contaminated land: It is stated that the use of the term ‘farming practices’ should be clarified to provide insight into the potential contamination risk, calling for further liaison regarding the presence of animal burial sites to influence practices. The authority adds that potential for contamination during construction and operation should be addressed and how the Applicant intends to address this via land restoration.</p>	<p>With regard to contamination risks, the use of the term ‘farming practices’ is explained in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality. The Applicant explains that whilst there is no evidence of pond infill with potentially contaminating materials, there is a lack of records to refer to. Should this be encountered, construction would cease until mitigation measures were identified and agreed.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 26: Mitigation notes that contaminated land will be identified and avoided during excavation, with the inclusion of bunds, temporary site drainage and sediment traps installed as required. Such measures will be secured through the CEMP.</p>

		<p>Archaeology: It was considered that the proposed mitigation is sufficient but called for further attention to be paid to historic hedgerows, with a record to be made. It also called for high-visibility sheet fencing to be erected during construction at the moat at Drakelow Hall Farm.</p>	<p>KGSL has had regard to comments made regarding historic hedgerows and is proposing further mitigation measures, documented in ES Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage. KGSL is proposing additional mitigation measures. These additional measures include reinstating lost hedgerow and carrying out an archaeological watching brief during the work. High-visibility sheet fencing will also be erected during the construction period at the boundary of the moat at Drakelow Farm, whilst monitoring and recording of historic hedgerow boundaries will take place. A Written Scheme of Investigation will be agreed with EH prior to commencing work in areas of archaeological importance.</p>	<p>As a result of submission and assessments, KGSL is proposing additional mitigation measures. Such measures will be secured via the CEMP.</p>
		<p>Geology: The authority declined to comment and deferred opinion to the HSE and British Geological Society.</p>	<p>KGSL has consulted with the HSE.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
CR17	Cheshire East Council	<p>Nature Conservation: The authority noted that the distance to CE's boundary limited potential impacts. The authority noted that NE's opinion should be sought on the potential impacts on specially designated sites and that opportunities for biodiversity enhancement should be maximised as part of the design, resulting in habitat net gain.</p>	<p>The Applicant consulted with and has had full regard to comments made by NE during the consultation. ES Chapter 8: Ecology details the assessments undertaken and a range of proposed mitigation measures to maximise biodiversity enhancement and limit impacts. Compiled in ES Chapter 26: Mitigation, measures include minimising the loss of habitats; full restoring habitats disturbed during construction, including hedgerows; and new planting resulting in net gain of hedgerow and broad leaved woodland.</p>	<p>Full details of the proposed mitigation measures, including operational practices proposed, can be found in ES Chapter 26: Mitigation. These measures will be delivered mainly via the CEMP, with some covered by the DCO permission.</p>

<p>Environmental protection: The submission stated that noise impacts would not be significant provided mitigation measures are in place. The opinion is expressed that there was little information relating to noise mitigation and that further detail on the types of noise would be necessary. In addition, it was stated that no further mitigation measures would be necessary regarding the impact of construction traffic on CE's air quality.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered comments made in relation to the types of noise. Whilst it is not envisaged that noise from the GPP will be tonal, it is difficult to prove due to the equipment data available at this stage. Mitigation measures will be agreed prior to construction with CWCC and CEC.</p> <p>The plant will be designed either to be non-tonal or to ensure that equipment noise levels are reduced to appropriate levels. ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration features details of how the mitigation of noise impacts has been an inherent part of the design process, for example locating the loudest noise sources in buildings.</p>	<p>A detailed noise assessment has been submitted, with resulting mitigation measures proposed and compiled in ES Chapter 26: Mitigation. For construction, this includes the use of low noise equipment, mobile screens and careful scheduling. Such measures will be secured via the CEMP and/or construction noise requirement.</p>
<p>Highways: The submission makes several observations in relation to traffic and notes that the submission has been informed by liaison with CWCC. It considers that given the period of greatest traffic impact, during construction, will be finite, there are no significant concerns. It suggests liaison with groups such as Middlewich Town Council and requests construction traffic be carefully managed.</p>	<p>Comments regarding traffic impacts have been noted. It is proposed that routing of HGV construction traffic is carefully controlled by a routing agreement, to be agreed with local authorities such as CEC. A HGV routing obligation has been prepared as part of draft Section 106 agreement, and will be agreed with both CWCC and CEC.</p>	<p>ES Chapter details proposed mitigation, which consists of a HGV Routing Plan, to be secured through a Section 106 agreement, which will identify routes appropriate for HGVs and wheel-washing facilities.</p>
<p>Flood risk: Notes the Flood Risk Assessment appears to consider the relevant factors and should consider water management risks from all sources.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered in detail any water management risks. These, and proposed mitigation measures to manage risk such as the use of construction bunds and temporary drainage, are set out in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality. A Flood Risk Assessment has been completed, whilst an application to the EA has been made and subsequently granted to cross Puddinglake Brook</p>	<p>A package of mitigation measures are proposed as a result of completed assessments and consultation responses, the majority of which will be delivered via the CEMP.</p>

		<p>General: The authority acknowledges that views expressed at Scoping with regard to geological assessments and cumulative impact had been taken on board and that views of the Brine Compensation Board should be sought. It also provides an update on the progress of the CE Local Plan and asks that its policies are regarded during the Project.</p>	<p>KGSL has noted the comments made and had regards to these.</p>	<p>KGSL has consulted with the Brine Compensation Board, the outcome of which can be viewed in this section.</p>
CR18	Tenant Farmers Meeting attendees	<p>Interest was shown in the location of the wellheads, given some had been changed since the non-statutory consultation. It was questioned whether the KGSP was linked to proposals to extract crude oil locally. Attendees also asked about the INEOS Enterprises structure and asked whether INEOS would operate the facility on completion.</p> <p>Participants questioned why a discharge pipe at Runcorn featured as part of the development. It was asked whether the brine discharge limit of a third applied to KGSP.</p> <p>One attendee asked if fracking went ahead in the UK if this would have an effect on gas storage.</p> <p>One tenant enquired whether cavities on his farm would ever be used for gas storage.</p> <p>An attendee asked specifically about a cavity proposed for their farm, saying it was proposed for a wet area of land.</p> <p>Questions were asked about how the new roads would be built and whether they would be one way.</p> <p>One attendee asked about the proposed surface of the roads.</p> <p>It was asked whether it was possible for the solution mining compound to be shared with Storengy.</p> <p>An attendee asked about proposed shift changes during the night. A tenant asked whether there would be security on the drive.</p> <p>An attendee asked about the status of a local property within the main assessment area, in particular whether it had been sold.</p>	<p>The Applicant explained that the KGSP was not linked to plans by the Oil and Pipelines Agency (OPA) to remove crude oil from a former local storage site at Plumley.</p> <p>Whilst INOVYN Enterprises may operate the KSGP, it is too early to confirm whether the KGSP operation would involve a third party.</p> <p>The Applicant explained the provision being made for brine discharge and the context, in particular that as much brine as possible would be supplied to brine customers for use. It is anticipated that brine discharge would be much less than a third.</p> <p>With regards to shale gas, the Applicant responded that it would be difficult to assess the impact on the need for gas storage, given the industry has yet to establish in the UK.</p> <p>The Applicant is only applying to store gas in newly created cavities and is not seeking to use existing cavities. With regard to specific locations of cavities, assessments have been carried out as part of the ES into the need for construction drains. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality.</p> <p>The construction roads are proposed to be tarmac and a one-way routing system is being proposed, this has been developed taking account of feedback to previous gas storage schemes.</p> <p>Responding to the point regarding the solution mining compound, the Applicant expressed that whilst possible in theory, however it was not suitable in this case due to the distance between the projects, the overlap in solution mining programmes and the need for new pipes, therefore a new compound is being proposed.</p> <p>Changes to shift patterns at INOVYN Enterprises' Brine and Water operations at Holford are not related to KGSP.</p>	<p>KGSL has worked with landowners and been in liaison with tenants throughout development of the KGSP DCO application regarding the locations of the gas storage cavities and associated infrastructure.</p>

			<p>Procedures will be in place to ensure the site is safe and secure during construction and operation; however the detail of the measures will be determined at a later date.</p> <p>KGSL was unaware of the sale of a local property.</p>	
CR19	Representative of landowners	<p>An awareness of the need for mitigation against visual impact was made however opinions were expressed about lack of detail provided on this matter.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the proposed crossing point at Yatehouse Lane due to poor visibility, noting that vehicles will not use Yatehouse Lane in connection with the scheme.</p> <p>Concerns were also expressed regarding the amount of land proposed for use during and post construction and the potential impact on farming practices, with the lack of similar available land locally.</p> <p>Views were expressed about limited information provided on environmental impacts.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed about lack of forthcoming information prior to statutory consultation.</p>	<p>KGSL has subsequently updated its LVIA and submitted a robust assessment of the likely visual impacts of the KGSP as part of the ES. This includes further artist's impressions of the likely views during construction and details a range of proposed mitigation measures that have been factored into the assessment. Measures include the creation of bunding, hedgerow planting and the use of appropriate materials during construction of buildings amongst others. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 14: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>KGSL has carefully considered the impact on farming practices as part of the submitted ES. Details of the consideration given to these matters can be found in ES Chapter 13: Socio-Economic Characteristics. Whilst it is unlikely that the presence of access roads and construction activity will exclude livestock, for example, from large areas of land for long periods, it is recognised that there will be periods of inconvenience during construction. KGSL is currently engaging in compensation negotiations with affected parties.</p>	<p>The Applicant has taken an inclusive and proactive approach to consultation and has been in direct contact with the landowners since the launch of the KGSP. Whilst it notes concerns about the lack of environmental information, KGSL sought to provide as much information as possible as it emerged. The assessments, surveys and amount of pre-application work undertaken were extensive and communicated to consultees where possible throughout non-statutory and statutory consultation periods, as well as during the interim.</p>

CR20	Landowner	<p>It was stated that it was difficult to firmly grasp the potential environmental impacts due to uncertainty regarding phasing and delivery of infrastructure. Lack of information regarding impacts of proposed cavities on farming practices were expressed along with concerns over impact of construction on grazing livestock, such as noise.</p> <p>The landowner expressed views on disruption to access during the construction of the access road and potential impact on health and productivity of livestock.</p> <p>Requests for further information regarding noise assessments were made and conclusions related to predicted noise levels made in the PEIR, as well as a note regarding the potential for intrusion on the farm property due to wellhead lights during construction. It was stated that further information on the use of construction roads is required to provide a full assessment of environmental impacts.</p> <p>Disagreement was expressed regarding conclusions relating to socio-economic impacts on the agricultural business.</p>	<p>KGSL has selected the proposed wellhead and cavity locations on the basis of detailed seismic surveys, details of which can be found in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality. The Applicant has also consulted with landowners regarding the micro-siting of wellhead compounds and in some instances made modifications to the proposed orientation of the compounds.</p> <p>In addition, the location of construction roads was further discussed with the Consultee, with alternative proposals put forward and drawings provided. Whilst it is unlikely that construction activity will exclude livestock from large areas for long periods, it is recognised that during construction there will be periods of inconvenience, which are being considered through compensation negotiations between KGSL and affected parties.</p> <p>ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration considers any effects due to noise and vibration from construction operation and decommissioning of the KGSP. It considers a range of potential sources including noise from plant during construction, drilling, traffic and 24-hour operation of the facility once operational. The potential for noise is assessed on a worst case scenario basis. Detailed responses to consultation enquiries regarding noise can be found in ES Chapter 9, including responses on hours of construction being agreed with CWCC, outline mitigation measures and outcomes of assessment conclusions. Mitigation measures, to be agreed with CWCC, include use of low noise equipment and consideration of noise screening have been identified by the Noise Assessment.</p> <p>As detailed in ES Chapter 13: Socio-economic Characteristics, the assessment considers potential environmental effects which could arise from both construction and operation of</p>	<p>KGSL has taken on board views expressed regarding routing and has proposed modifications to the road layout that would be in the vicinity of the Consultee's property. Further details of use of the construction roads can be found in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and a draft HGV Routing Plan, which is Annex 12A to the ES.</p>
------	-----------	--	--	---

			<p>the proposed KGSP. Direct impacts on crops and livestock within development areas will be mitigated through compensation arrangements agreed with the relevant affected parties. Cumulative effects have also been considered and it is concluded that there will not be significant effects as a result of cumulative schemes.</p> <p>With regard to comments expressed about traffic and transport, full details of the proposed arrangements, predicted vehicle movements, access arrangements and routes can be found in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport. ES Chapter 10: Air Quality also considers potential effects on of the KGSP due to additional traffic generated during construction and operation.</p>	
CR21	Tenant Farmer	<p>Feedback provided by one tenant farmer included: dissatisfaction over non-payment of compensation; the way in which soil is stripped from the land; less-intrusive ways of digging trenches; the notice given in advance of pressure testing; the installation of drains. The stakeholder highlighted that they were not objecting to KGSP but that they wanted lessons to be learned from previous projects.</p>	<p>A KGSL representative responded directly to each of the points raised during the face-to-face meeting with the existing tenant, who wanted to raise points about operational practices in order to reduce impact on the local area. KGSL confirmed that it had learnt from experience with regards to compensation payments and a new agent had been appointed for the KGSP. With regards to stripping of land and soil movement, KGSL agrees that land should be sprayed to suppress weeds. To support the Application, a Soil Management Plan will be created and agreed, the objective of which will be to preserve and re-use the soils during decommissioning to return the land to agricultural use of equivalent quality.</p>	<p>KGSL has taken on board the feedback from the tenant farmer, with operational practices identified in the CEMP and impact on the land and soil considered in ES Chapter 7. KGSL will continue to liaise with tenant farmers and landowners through exiting community channels. This will provide a forum for such construction and operational practices to be discussed and addressed where necessary.</p>
CR22	Business owner	<p>KGSL also received an enquiry from a nearby business also required to hold a COMAH license, asking for an update on the KGSP and the progress of the COMAH license.</p>	<p>Other operational points were responded to, with KGSL noting that points for farmers to cross construction roads would be agreed with contractors prior to work starting. A CEMP, a draft of which has been prepared as part of the DCO application, will also be created outlining best operational practices to limit impact on the surrounding area. Information of how KGSL has considered impact on flooding and drainage can be found in ES Chapter 7: Geology Land and Water, which considers the risk of impact on surface water quality and levels.</p>	

CR23	Landowner	<p>The Applicant was also approached at one of the Information Days by a person whose land was within the application boundary, but was not the proposed location for a gas cavity or construction road. The Consultee enquired about depressions in fields near their property and close to an existing gas storage cavity.</p>	<p>KGSL addressed the point regarding depressions on land at the Holford Brinefield. The Applicant explained the background to solution mining and gas storage in the area, providing information on the measures in place to monitor and survey ground movement. KGSL made it clear that, whilst the depressions were not connected to the proposed KGSP, surveyors associated with the development had surveyed the land and identified the depressions. KGSL stated that the nature of subsidence noted was not in line with solution mining, but that the Project team had reviewed historical maps that showed a wet marshy area and pond where the subsidence had occurred and that this was likely to be the cause.</p> <p>The proposed gas storage facility will have to meet safety standards that are amongst some of the most stringent in the world and the site will be required to meet standards governed by the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) Regulations 1999.</p>	<p>No change to the KGSP. KGSL responded on the matter directly to the consultee.</p>
CR24	The Crown Estate	<p>Carter Jonas LLP responded on behalf of the Crown Estate. The consultee sought to establish whether there existing any Crown Estate-owned properties within the KGSP Order Limits.</p>	<p>Following an initial telephone conversation, KGSL, further details were issued to the consultee, in particular the title references that demonstrated the Crown Estate may have a potential interest in the land. It was also explained that a safeguarding provision for the Crown had been included in the draft DCO.</p>	<p>Following the response, Carter Jonas confirmed that there is no Crown Estate owned property within the Order Limits.</p>
CR25	Mexichem Fluor	<p>Mexichem Fluor responded to confirm that the company had an interested in the Project, in particular the development and usage at Runcorn. The consultee noted the existence of other effluent outfall discharge at the Weston Canal. It was asked whether brine discharge would have any impact on the flows along the Weston Canal towards the estuary, and whether this would materially affect any future discharge limits for other users.</p>	<p>KGSL is not intending to make any changes to discharges from the Runcorn site to the Weston Canal as part of the KGSP. As such, there will be no impact on the flows along the canal to the River Weaver as a result. Proposed infrastructure at Runcorn features a new brine outfall into the Manchester Ship Canal, via a new pipebridge.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not intend to impact on discharges into the Weston Canal, with proposed brine discharge into the Manchester Ship Canal.</p>

CR26	Akzo Nobel UK	The consultee confirmed the company as an interested party and asked to be kept informed about the Application. KGSL was asked to provide guidance on the locations of existing boreholes/cavities in relation to the proposed new cavities associated with the KGSP. The consultee raised the point that, historically, some cavities were used to store residues and that this should be taken into account when preparing details plans.	KGSL notes the comments and will ensure that the consultee is kept updated as an interested party. In response, KGSL provided a diagram (Annex 42) demonstrating the location of the proposed new KGSP cavities in relation to existing gas storage cavities and boreholes across the Holford Brinefield. The Applicant explained that the closest cavities to the KGSP development area are those currently used for gas cavities. The response referenced the enclosed diagram to demonstrate that the proposed cavities are not in close proximity to the existing residue boreholes, to the north of the Holford Brinefield.	KGSL produced a diagram showing proposed cavities in relation to existing boreholes at the Holford Brinefield, providing further illustrative information.
CR27	E.ON	E.ON also responded a similar consultation response to that submitted during the previous statutory consultation period, in particular in relation nearby HGSP. The response provided an overview of the operational assets in the area, the necessity for COMAH notification and operational requests such as the timing of security arrangements.	KGSL thanks E.ON for its continued engagement regarding the Application and KGSL intends to continue discussion over this matter as the Application progresses. The Applicant notes that measures will need to be agreed for the maintenance of existing roads, new roads and pipelines on the HGSP leased area. KGSL is in ongoing liaison with E.ON regarding these matters.	The Project and associated infrastructure was shaped as a result of liaison with E.ON. This includes changes to the proposed road layouts. KGSL will continue to engage with E.ON to agree maintenance of roads and pipelines on the HGSP area.
CR28	National Grid	The consultee submitted a response that it noted was largely based on the previous consultation submission. The response outlined the company's overground and underground transmission assets in the area, the need for full access and safe statutory clearance areas. Several advice points are noted in relation to crossings of pipelines, such as construction traffic only crossing at agreed locations; for pipelines to be protected by rafts to be agreed with NG; and other protective measures to be agreed with NG.	KGSL notes the points raised by NG and the advice given regarding protecting existing infrastructure and assets during construction and operation. As stated in the previous response to NG, KGSL is aware of the locations of grid infrastructure and will ensure that, prior to construction commencing, NG is fully consulted on the approach and that proposed protective measures are agreed.	KGSL welcomes NG's acknowledgment of receipt of details regarding protective provisions and that NG intends to progress this. The Applicant has agreed a connection location to the National Transmission System with NG and will ensure to work with the consultee as the Application progresses.
CR29	Landowner	Pinsent Masons responded on behalf of a landowner. The consultee responded to state that previous consultation responses had been submitted, setting out objections to the Project. It was expressed that the responses received were not deemed satisfactory and that the concerns raised still stood.	KGSL notes the points raised in the consultation responses submitted to date. KGSL issued the detailed response provide to the consultees original comments on the Application. The detailed response is summarised in the landowner section of this chapter.	In addition to a detailed consultation response, KGSL also provided Draft Land Plans; extracts from the Draft Book of Reference and; Draft Works Plans to aid understanding of the Project.

CR30	Landowner	The consultee responded to the consultation to clarify whether Information Days were being held as part of the additional statutory consultation.	KGSL responded to confirm that the Information Days publicised in the KGSP newsletter were those held in 2014 and that events were not being held as part of the additional limited statutory consultation. It was explained that the newsletter had been enclosed to ensure that those with a potential interest in the land were in receipt of original consultation material, which outlines the Project in a more accessible format.	No change required.
CR31	Mineral Owner	Wright Marshall Chartered Surveyors responded on behalf a mineral owner at the Main Development Area. The response states that such development should not take place without the owner's consent, and that formal agreement has yet to be reached.	KGSL acknowledges the response and that no development shall take place without an agreement being reached with the mineral owner.	Negotiations are ongoing and will be finalised prior to any development taking place.

CR32	Feedback Forms - Transport	<p>Consideration should be given to wildlife species when removing hedges to increase visibility on roads surrounding the site.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about HS2 construction closures diverting traffic to the B502 Penny Lane, which is described as experiencing an increase in traffic as a result of other diversions.</p> <p>Some respondents expressed that they did not have concerns about the proposed traffic arrangements, as a long traffic was not routed via Byley village.</p> <p>Minor concerns were raised regarding Marsh Lane, Whitley, due to the narrow nature of the lane and use by motorcyclists, including the speed of vehicles using the route.</p> <p>Desires were expressed that there should not be an increase in traffic on non-A roads in the Lach Dennis and Lostock Green areas.</p> <p>Expression of opinion that a 'well designed' traffic management plan will prove to be 'acceptable to all parties'.</p> <p>Several comments from participants who said they did not have concerns about the level of the traffic and that the proposed routes could cope with the increase (based on precedents set by previous gas storage projects) and the desire for operational practices to be adhered to.</p>	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered the effects on species associated with the removal of hedgerows, including bats and birds. ES Chapter 8: Ecology details the species surveyed as part of the assessment and proposed mitigation measures to ensure there are no adverse effects. Whilst there will be hedgerow loss associated with the KGSP, planting associated with new infrastructure and as mitigation for hedgerow loss will result in a net increase in hedgerow.</p> <p>The Applicant will draw up a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), in consultation with CWCC and NE, and restoration of habitat will be carried out in accordance with this plan.</p> <p>The Applicant gained much feedback during both non-statutory and statutory consultation with regard to traffic routing, associated with the KGSP and previous gas storage projects in the area. As communicated during the consultation, no minor roads will be used by construction traffic to gain entry or exit to the KGSP. All access is proposed via the existing priority junction to the A530 King Street, avoiding traffic through the village of Byley. This will be controlled via a HGV Routing Plan in consultation with the local authority.</p> <p>KGSL has considered the nature of Marsh Lane and traffic associated with the proposed KGSP and refurbishment of the Whitley Pumping Station. On a small number of occasions there will be a requirement for HGV deliveries, with traffic likely to vary between zero and 1 to 2 two way movements.</p> <p>In order to gain an accurate reflection of the likely traffic impacts, KGSL assessed the predicted vehicle movements against existing baseline traffic movements.</p>	<p>KGSL has incorporated a robust set of mitigation measures and operational practices following a detailed assessment of transport associate with the proposed development.</p> <p>Feedback regarding routing of vehicles expressed during previous gas projects as well as the KGSP consultation has influenced the proposed traffic routes, which will form part of the Local Travel Plan, to be agreed with the local authorities.</p>
			<p>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport details how worst-case scenario figures have been used to demonstrate the potential traffic impacts, however the impacts of the highway network will be negligible. Any future development proposals would be required to take account of baseline vehicle</p>	

CR33	Feedback Forms - Visual impact	<p>Several submissions made reference to the consultation materials provided and artist's impressions produced. The majority of views submitted by Section 47 consultees were that visual impact would be low and that appropriate measures would be mitigated. One respondent drew comparisons to the Storengy gas storage project, stating that if a similar approach is taken the result should be acceptable.</p> <p>Numerous points were raised regarding the design of the pipe bridge proposed at Runcorn, with concerns expressed that the infrastructure could 'damage the appeal' of the area for proposed tourism projects such as re-opening the canal ring for leisure craft. The submission suggested a more sympathetic crossing, suggesting trenching, tunnelling or other means. Further submissions from this community consultee requested a more creative design for the pipe bridge to be explored.</p>	<p>KGSL notes positive feedback on predicted visual impact of the KGSP and proposed mitigation. ES Chapter 14: Landscape and Visual Impact details the assessments carried out and a series of proposed mitigation measures to reduce visual impact. These include limiting land clearance, angling lights away from local properties, installing fencing, planting of trees and hedgerows and introducing bunding around infrastructure such as the Gas Processing Plant. Further mitigation measures proposed for construction and operation can be found in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant has fully considered the visual impact of the proposed pipe bridge at Runcorn and notes the comments made regarding design and visual impact. The visual assessment undertaken has considered views of the bridge from likely locations, such as the view from water users of the Weston Canal. Given water users would be temporary – or transient – and that the pipe bridge will set against an existing industrial context, it is not considered that the bridge will have significant impact.</p> <p>As part of the design process, the Applicant considered numerous alternatives to the pipe bridge, however options such as tunnelling present significant environmental, safety and economic challenges. This has been noted as a result of consultation with the Canal and River Trust.</p> <p>The KGSP will have an operational life of up to 50 years. However, the Runcorn Outfall for brine discharge will only be required during the period of solution mining, which will be completed in around year 10 of the Project life.</p> <p>Such decommissioning details will be considered at the appropriate time. Further information about the assessments can be found in ES Chapter 24: Landscape and Visual Impact at Runcorn.</p>	<p>KGSL has had regard to the feedback expressed regarding visual impact. The Applicant was keen to provide as accurate representation as possible of views of the Project and welcomed feedback on the subject. ES Chapter 14 sets out a series of mitigation measures that will reduce visual impact.</p> <p>The Applicant, in response to feedback on the pipebridge design, had further discussions with the Canal and River Trust to seek opinion on the preferred design and treatment.</p>
------	--------------------------------	--	---	---

CR34	Feedback Forms - Socio economic	<p>One submission said it was positive that the brine removed during the creation of cavities would be used. Other submissions said that it was 'good to see money being spent locally', welcoming investment into the area, suggesting that the use of local labour and contractors would contribute to the 'local spend'. Some responses expressed doubt that local people would benefit from the job opportunities, suggesting that a small number of operating jobs would be positive.</p> <p>One submission suggested a donation to the 'village' each year.</p> <p>Others expressed that the Project would be good for the region and encourage other entities to consider future investment in the region.</p> <p>A submission referenced plans to connect the Bridgewater Canal and Manchester Ship Canal, resulting in a 'canal ring' for leisure craft. Concern was expressed that the Runcorn pipe bridge could be of detriment to such plans due to a further industrialisation of the area.</p> <p>The Applicant had numerous conversations with those interested in the supply chain opportunities to be created by the KGSP. Multiple expressions of interest were also received from companies regarding supplying materials and services to KGSL.</p> <p>Four submissions requested information about employment opportunities to be created by the KGSP, following which CVs were also submitted to the Applicant.</p> <p>One response noted that the KGSP will help keep jobs</p>	<p>KGSL welcomes the positive interest in the supply chain and employment opportunities associated with the KGSP. The KGSP would create an estimated 30 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) new jobs during operation and around 300 at the peak of construction. Assessments undertaken by the Applicant conclude that, whilst there will be a small impact due to the diversion of public rights of way during the construction phase if necessary, overall, the construction of the Project is expected to have a negligible impact on tourism or leisure, amenity and leisure related businesses.</p> <p>KGSL responded to those who expressed an interest in jobs created by the KGSP advising that, although it was too early to advertise positions, the Applicant welcomed interest. As a result of consultation, KGSL has established an Expression of Interest Register for those interested in employment opportunities.</p> <p>A Construction Method Statement and /or Sustainable Procurement Policy will be developed and agreed with the contractor, which will incorporate local procurement procedures. A register will be created so that companies and individuals can express their interest in tendering for work. The lead contractor will be expected to appoint subcontractors through the register.</p> <p>KGSL notes and encourages interest in the supply chain opportunities during construction and operation and, as a result, has set up an Expression of Interest Register for those who have been early to enquire about the Project.</p> <p>This register will be kept on file and considered at the appropriate time. Further details of how KGSL has considered the socio-economic impacts of the KGSP can be found in ES Chapter 13: Socio-Economic Characteristics.</p>	<p>KGSL has welcomed all interest in potential socio economic benefits that could be reaped from the Project. In response, the Project team has compiled an internal log of those who have expressed an interest in potential employment or supply chain opportunities.</p> <p>The Community Benefit Fund has also been raised from £20,000 to £30,000, during the years of construction, following feedback.</p> <p>KGSL also presented to the Halton Chamber of Commerce to introduce the Project and encourage interest from the regional business community.</p>
			<p>Following feedback during statutory consultation, KGSL has increased the amount it intends to make available to local community projects during construction. The proposed payment has been raised from £20,000 to £30,000 per year of construction.</p>	

CR35	Feedback Forms - Noise	<p>Some respondents to the feedback forms said they did not have comments to make about noise, with others stating appropriate management controls should minimise impacts to acceptable levels.</p> <p>One submission stated that the noise 'must be controlled within reason', whilst another stated that noise would likely be a concern to residents</p>	<p>ES Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration considers any effects due to noise and vibration from construction operation and decommissioning of the KGSP. It considers a range of potential sources including noise from plant during construction, drilling, traffic and 24-hour operation of the facility once operational. The potential for noise is assessed on a worst case scenario basis. Detailed responses to consultation enquiries regarding noise can be found in ES Chapter 9, including responses on hours of construction being agreed with CWCC, outline mitigation measures and outcomes of assessment conclusions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures, to be agreed with CWCC, include use of low noise equipment and consideration of noise screening have been identified by the Noise Assessment.</p>	
CR36	Feedback Forms - Geology and Water	<p>An update was requested on the issue of a permissive path at the Holford Brinefield.</p> <p>A question was raised relating to the proposed HS2 high speed rail project, with the Consultee asking whether this would increase the risk to the stability and safety of existing and proposed gas storage.</p> <p>Concern was expressed about the potential threat to local water quality of streams and rivers during construction.</p>	<p>Although the issue of a permissive path at the Holford Brinefield was not related to the KGSP, the Applicant provided a written update on the issue which was subsequently published in the Gossip on the Green (recently renamed Village Links) local community magazine.</p> <p>The proposed HS2 project is not anticipated to have an effect on either existing or proposed gas storage in the area. INEOS, prior to formation of the joint venture INOVYN, submitted a consultation response to HS2 Limited.</p> <p>The potential for effects on water quality and watercourses have been fully considered as part of the environmental assessments. Use of construction bunds, temporary site drainage and sediment traps, as required will manage risk of impact on water quality. Detailed information on findings and mitigation can be found in ES Chapter 7: Geology, Land and Water Quality.</p> <p>INOVYN Enterprises has considerable experience in solution mining at the Holford Brinefield and has constructed and operated cavities using the proposed technique for many years. The location of the proposed KGSP cavities has been decided based on detailed knowledge of the area's geology following the undertaking of new seismic surveys. Further information on INOVYN Enterprises' experience in the area can be found in ES Chapter 5: Project Description for the Main Assessment Area. More detail has also been submitted in the Geological Information Report, Document 9.2 of the DCO application.</p>	<p>KGSL has communicated and demonstrated its detailed understanding of the geology of the area and demonstrable experience of operating within the Holford Brinefield.</p>

CR37	Feedback Forms - Ecology	<p>It was recommended that wildlife habituating in hedgerows should be carefully considered where it is proposed to remove hedges for increased visibility for road users.</p> <p>It was advised that 'proper' mitigation measures should be taken to reduce all environmental impacts, in addition to newts.</p>	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered the effects on species associated with the removal of hedgerows, including bats and birds. ES Chapter 8: Ecology details the species surveyed as part of the assessment and proposed mitigation measures to ensure there are no adverse effects. Whilst there will be hedgerow loss associated with the KGSP, planting associated with new infrastructure and as mitigation for hedgerow loss will result in a net increase in hedgerow. The Applicant will draw up a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), in consultation with CWCC and NE, and restoration of habitat will be carried out in accordance with this plan. KGSL has had regard to feedback given regarding potential impacts of the KGSP on local species. ES Chapter 8: Ecology details how the Applicant has surveyed and considered the impacts on a wide variety of species in addition to newts, such as bats, birds, otters and badgers amongst others. Mitigation measures are identified in this ES Chapter, which includes limited habitat loss as part of the design process; reinstates hedgerows; additional planting and landscaping; and newt refuges.</p>	<p>KGSL undertook detailed assessments of ecology as part of the ES and is therefore able to respond with a detailed knowledge of the impact of the Project and identify mitigation measures that will reduce such impacts.</p>
CR38	Feedback Forms - Other Areas of Interest	<p>Support for the Project</p> <p>Several respondents wished the Applicant luck in delivering the project and expressed a desire for the KGSP to go ahead. Others said they supported the proposal, with one individual stating that the integrity of regional gas supplies would be strengthened by the proposal which in their opinion has 'significant merit'.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes all feedback on the Application and was pleased to receive comments highlighting the importance of gas storage and demonstrating support for the KGSP.</p>	<p>KGSL welcomed support for the Project and will continue to engage with those who have an interest in any benefits associated with the KGSP.</p>

		<p>The consultation One submission asked why Lostock Green was not included in the direct mailing, with a request to be kept updated about the application to ensure the local community could be informed of developments.</p>	<p>Whilst comments specifically regarding the consultation approach were noticeably less than during the non- statutory stage, the Applicant responded to the Lostock Green consultation enquiry explaining the phased approach to consultation, with direct contact with those in Consultation Zone A supported by a wider community consultation for those in Consultation Zone B featuring posters and newspaper advertisement. As a result of the feedback, KGSL has since provided two updates on the progress of the KGSP for Gossip on the Green, the community magazine for Lostock Green and (more recently) Lach Dennis and is now known as Village Links.</p>	<p>KGSL sought to address any comments about the detail or scope of the consultation when raised, this included contacting consultees where advised or providing further updates via community news publications.</p>
CR39	Member of the public	<p>Requests Several requests were made throughout the consultation period, such as requests for site maps, consultation meetings and clarification on the Project.</p> <p>One member of the public that responded to the Section 48 publicity asked questions about the solution mining process during the creation of cavities and the subsequent use of the brine. The respondent asked specifically about the wastage of brine during the process and the environmental impacts of chlorine production, as well as stating their opinion that underground gas storage “is a far better option than above ground LNG tanks”.</p>	<p>When received, KGSL responded to enquiries providing the information requested or directing stakeholders to the KGSP documentation available to download from the ‘Library’ page of the project website.</p> <p>Full replies were issued to the two respondents in question providing information on how their points had or would be considered as part of the application. INOVYN Enterprises has been solution mining the Holford Brinefield for over 80 years for production of brine. As part of the Project, once brine is solution mined it will be transported by an existing pipeline to INOVYN’s operations in Runcorn. Brine is used by INOVYN and other customers in the chemical industry to make chlorine and everyday essentials such as washing powder, toothpaste and salt. Details of the infrastructure to support brine transportation can be found in ES Chapters 1-6: Project Description.</p>	<p>KGSL is able to demonstrate, via the ES and other DCO documentation, that it has robustly considered and responded to the points raised by Section 48 respondents.</p>

CR40	Member of the public	<p>Another member of the public responded asking a series of questions relating to a number of aspects of the proposed KGSP. These related to liability for the cavities during and once operation ceases; future use of the cavities; clarification of what pressure would be put on the 'towns water supply'; and the proportion of brine anticipated to be wasted. The submission also raised questions about the potential to re-saturate brine as part of the process and the methods to be employed for monitoring cavity integrity.</p>	<p>With regard to use and stability of the cavities, at the end of the Project life for gas storage, the cavities can be filled with water or brine, either to continue to be used for solution mining or to provide stability. Only uses for the cavities stated in the DCO application will be permitted, meaning the cavities will not be used to store waste. The cavities shape and size will be monitored during and upon completion of solution mining by sonar survey. Aspects and impacts associated with decommissioning of the gas storage facility have been considered extensively as part of the ES.</p> <p>It is the intention that the majority of the brine produced by the Project will be used to meet the needs of INOVYN and its customers. The Application includes the options for brine to be discharged – for which INOVYN already holds an Environmental Permit - to provide certainty with regard to delivery of the Project. The Applicant is in a more favourable position in that there is an ongoing demand and use for the brine, compared to some gas storage projects where all the brine has been discharged. Although possible, retrofitting infrastructure for brine re-saturation brings significant technical, economic and environmental challenges, in addition re-saturation would reduce the rate of gas cavity creation. The Applicant has fully considered the impacts of brine discharge as part of the DCO application, with further information available to view in ES Chapter 25: Marine Environment.</p> <p>With regard to use of towns water supply, ES Chapters 1-6: Project Description details that the towns water connection will only be used to provide amenity water to the office and maintenance buildings and that existing abstraction systems, detailed in the Project Description, will be used to supply water to the solution mining process.</p>
------	----------------------	--	---

			<p>The use of towns' water for the office facilities is not expected to be a burden on the existing supply network. As part of statutory consultation on the Application, KGSL has consulted with United Utilities.</p> <p>United Utilities did not raise any comments or concerns in relation to the PEIR, however has asked that KGSL continued to engage throughout the Project to ensure that any impacts on the UU's infrastructure and services are minimised. In response, the Applicant has agreed to continued engagement throughout the planning process and, should development consent be granted, during delivery of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant's full response can be found in the Response Chart (Annex 01). Supporting information about the Project can be found in the Project Description. Supporting information about the environmental impacts associated with brine discharge and the relevant studies carried out can be found in ES Chapter 25: Marine Environment (Runcorn).</p>	
CR41	Property Owner	One property owner enquired about depressions in fields local to an existing gas storage cavity. The consultees questioned the project team during one of the statutory Information Days, whether the depressions could be connected to gas storage.	Following the enquiry, members of the KGSP team made diligent inquiries into the matter and issued a full response in writing to the consultee. The response detailed the 'level point' networks in place around gas storage cavities to measure any settlement that may occur. The response noted that the survey results from the cavity in question had shown no drop in ground level. Following inspections of historical maps of the area, it appears that the area where depressions had been witnessed were once the location of a marsh and pond, indicating that the depressions could be the result of historic infilled ponds.	The Applicant issued a detailed response and no further action required.
CR42	Member of the public	Several consultees contacted the KGSP team about potential employment opportunities associated with the Project.	The Applicant welcomes such interest in the KGSP and the employment opportunities it could create. Responses were issued to such enquirers which explained the DCO application process and the likely timescales of the Project. It was noted that recruitment would not begin until after the KGSP received planning consent.	The Applicant has logged all interest in employment and will keep enquirers updated as opportunities become available.

CR43	Member of the public	One consultees contacted the KGSP team to ask what works would be taking place at the Lostock Gramam works as part of the KGSP.	The Applicant responded and detailed where proposed gas storage activity was proposed to take place as part of the KGSP. The response explained that, as part of the Project, there are other, smaller areas of development, including the proposal to develop two new tanks at the Lostock Works site. The Applicant provided a link to an artist's impression, featured on the KGSP website.	No change required.
CR44	Property Owner	A property owner contacted the KGSP team to raise concerns about the KGSP, mainly in relation to effects on the residents' health - with concerns expressed regarding dust and air quality - and the effects of construction, including visual impact, noise and traffic. The consultee added that GPP would likely adversely affect their quality of life and health. The respondent raised concerns about a reduced property value,	The Applicant responded in detail to the property owner, addressing each of the points raised and demonstrated a considered approach by referencing environmental assessments carried out. The response details the findings of the relevant assessments, namely that the effects of such works associated with the KGSP can be reduced with mitigation measures. Mitigation measures proposed include angling lights away from properties; screen planting; the use of low noise equipment; and mobile noise screens.	The Applicant met the consultee for an individual meeting to address concerns and highlighted the mitigation measures proposed,