

# CONTENTS

## NTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>APPLICATION HISTORY OF THE KEADBY II PROJECT</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>THIS APPLICATION</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>POLICY AND LEGISLATION OVERVIEW</b>	<b>1-4</b>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>REPORT CONTENT AND STRUCTURE</b>	<b>1-5</b>
<b>1.6</b>	<b>APPROACH TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>1-6</b>
<b>1.7</b>	<b>COMPARISON BETWEEN THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND THE CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>1-11</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>2-1</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>OVERVIEW</b>	<b>2-1</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION BOUNDARY</b>	<b>2-2</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>2-2</b>
<b>2.4</b>	<b>CONSTRUCTION PHASE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>2-14</b>
<b>2.5</b>	<b>OPERATION</b>	<b>2-21</b>
<b>2.6</b>	<b>DECOMMISSIONING</b>	<b>2-23</b>
<b>2.7</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVES</b>	<b>2-24</b>
<b>2.8</b>	<b>POSSIBLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>2-26</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>TECHNICAL SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>SPATIAL SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>TEMPORAL SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>3-2</b>
<b>3.5</b>	<b>CONSULTATION</b>	<b>3-3</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b>BASELINE</b>	<b>3-13</b>
<b>3.7</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>	<b>3-15</b>
<b>3.8</b>	<b>INDIRECT EFFECTS</b>	<b>3-15</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY</b>	<b>4-1</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4-1</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>4-8</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>BASELINE CONDITIONS AND RECEPTORS</b>	<b>4-17</b>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS AND EFFECTS</b>	<b>4-25</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>MITIGATION</b>	<b>4-35</b>
<b>4.6</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>4-35</b>
<b>4.7</b>	<b>COMPARISON BETWEEN THE LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>4-36</b>

<b>5</b>	<b>ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THIS CHAPTER</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>DESIGNATED ECOLOGY SITES ASSESSED</b>	<b>5-2</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS</b>	<b>5-7</b>
<b>5.5</b>	<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	<b>5-29</b>
<b>5.6</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>5-30</b>
<b>5.7</b>	<b>COMPARISON BETWEEN THE LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>5-30</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE AND INDIRECT EFFECTS</b>	<b>6-1</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6-1</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>	<b>6-3</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>INDIRECT EFFECTS</b>	<b>6-9</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>MITIGATION SUMMARY AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>MITIGATION SUMMARY</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>7.3</b>	<b>MITIGATION DELIVERY</b>	<b>7-2</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF COMPARISON BETWEEN THE LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>LAND AND WATER</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.3</b>	<b>ECOLOGY</b>	<b>8-2</b>
<b>8.4</b>	<b>NOISE</b>	<b>8-3</b>
<b>8.5</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY</b>	<b>8-3</b>
<b>8.6</b>	<b>CULTURAL HERITAGE</b>	<b>8-4</b>
<b>8.7</b>	<b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT</b>	<b>8-5</b>
<b>8.8</b>	<b>SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>8-6</b>
<b>8.9</b>	<b>LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>	<b>8-6</b>
<b>8.10</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>8-7</b>
	<b>ANNEXES</b>	
<b>ANNEX A</b>	<b>CONSULTATION RESPONSES</b>	
<b>ANNEX B</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY</b>	
<b>ANNEX C</b>	<b>INFORMATION TO INFORM THE HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>ANNEX D</b>	<b>CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT ES</b>	
<b>ANNEX E</b>	<b>CONSENTED DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION CORRESPONDENCE</b>	
<b>ANNEX F</b>	<b>CHP REPORT</b>	
<b>ANNEX G</b>	<b>CCR REPORT</b>	