



3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000
e-mail: EastAngliaOne@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk

Recipient name
Address line 1
Address line 2
Town
County
Postcode

Your Ref:

Our Ref: EN010025

Date: 4 July 2013

Dear Sir/Madam,

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 8

Application by East Anglia One Ltd for East Anglia ONE Offshore Wind Farm

Examination Timetable and Procedure

I am writing to inform you about the procedural decisions made by the Examining Authority (ExA) at and following the Preliminary Meeting held on Tuesday 25 June 2013 at the Town Hall, Ipswich, Suffolk IP1 1DH. This letter provides you with the timetable and the initial questions that the ExA is asking in the examination.

A link to the note of the Preliminary Meeting is [here](#). It is published on the project webpage on our website and made available for inspection at the venues listed in Annex A. An audio recording of the Preliminary Meeting has also been published on our website.

1. Procedural decision and timetable

The ExA is grateful to all those who attended and for all views expressed at the Preliminary Meeting. All matters have been carefully considered.

The ExA has now made its procedural decisions about the way in which the application is to be examined. The timetable setting this out is attached as Annex B. If the ExA considers it necessary to vary the timetable, full notification will be sent to all interested parties and invitees to the Preliminary Meeting¹. We will also do this if the date, time and place of any hearing are changed, except in the event of an adjournment.

¹ Rule 8(3) EPR

2. Statutory Parties² deadline

Statutory parties are now requested to submit notifications in writing to the ExA that they wish to become an interested party the deadline for this is **Tuesday 9 July 2013**.

3. Written questions

The ExA has decided to ask a number of questions and to receive further information about matters relevant to the application. These questions are set out in Annex D, and responses must be received on or before **Tuesday 30 July 2013**.

The ExA now also invites all interested parties to submit written representations and evidence on any matters concerning the application, and on relevant representations already submitted. All written representations must be received on or before **Tuesday 30 July 2013**.

Please send your representations to us using the email or postal address at the top of this letter quoting reference EN010025 and your unique reference number, if one is quoted on this letter. Representations can deal with any relevant matter. They are not restricted to the matters set out in the ExA's initial assessment of principal issues which was discussed at the Preliminary Meeting, nor restricted to the questions set out in Annex D. Please note if you are submitting a written representation, you should identify those parts of the application or specific matters with which you agree and those parts with which you do not agree. You must state the reasons for your agreement or disagreement.

In addition the ExA now requests notifications from interested parties regarding any wish to be heard at a Open Floor Hearing; or any wish to make oral representations at the Issue Specific Hearing; and of any wish to attend either day of the ExA's inspections of sites to be held on Tuesday 10 September and Wednesday 11 September, in the company of interested parties. These notifications must also be received on or before **Tuesday 30 July 2013**. It would be helpful if notifications could be sent separately from written representations and if each could be clearly titled with which form of notification it is.

4. Habitats and Marine Regulations³

Explanation was provided at the Preliminary Meeting regarding the process through which the examination will provide sufficient information to enable the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to meet his statutory duties as the competent authority under the Habitats and Marine Regulations. The applicant is now requested to populate the model matrices designed for the purposes of screening and assessing potential impacts upon European Sites and available to download from the National Infrastructure East Anglia ONE page of the Planning Portal website. The matrices completed by the applicant must also be received on or before **Tuesday 30 July 2013**.

² The list of statutory parties can be seen in the Schedule to The Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties) Regulations 2010.

³ Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) (the Habitats Regulations) and the Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Marine Regulations) (referred to jointly here as the Habitats and Marine Regulations).

5. Guidance for the submission of written representations

There is no prescribed form for written representations. In accordance with DCLG 'Planning Act 2008: guidance for the examination of applications for development consent for nationally significant infrastructure projects (February 2010)', participants should normally provide with their written statements, *"the data, methodology and assumptions used to support their submissions"*.

Any written representation that exceeds 1500 words should also be accompanied by a summary. This summary should not exceed 10% of the original text. The summary should set out the key facts of the written representation and must be representative of the submission made.

To assist in the timely processing of written representations to be submitted by the deadline of **Tuesday 30 July 2013** we request that interested parties send, where practicable, electronic copies of their submissions as email attachments, to EastAngliaOne@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk by 11:59 pm on **Tuesday 30 July 2013**. Electronic attachments should be clearly labelled with subject title and not exceed 12MB for each email. Should electronic submissions include documents of 300 pages or more, interested parties are advised to send to us, by post, an additional full paper copy of their submission⁴.

Timely submissions in advance of the deadlines set in the timetable are encouraged and welcomed.

6. Availability and inspection of representations and documents

Written representations, responses to relevant representations and to questions, local impact reports, comments or any other documents or information about the application sent to the Planning Inspectorate will be made available to all interested parties and to anyone who requests an opportunity to inspect and take copies of them.

This letter provides notification to all interested parties that at each stage of the examination set out in the timetable at Annex B and as soon as practicable, we will make these available by publishing them on the National Infrastructure, East Anglia ONE project pages on the Planning Portal website. We will also provide an opportunity for inspection and copying at a number of locations in the vicinity of the application site. The notification of the deposit locations is at Annex A.

7. Changes to the timetable

If the ExA need to vary the timetable set out in Annex B for any reason, the Planning Inspectorate will write to you and inform you of the changes. The ExA will also do this if the date, time or place of any hearing is changed, except in the event of an adjournment.

⁴ Subject to EPR Rule 10(6)(a), we request the applicant to supply 9 paper copies of their written representation(s) for the Examining Authority to use and make available for public inspection under Rule 21.

8. Deadlines for receipt of documents and requests for hearings

It is important to note that if written representations, responses to relevant representations and to written questions, local impact reports, further information or requests for hearings are not received by the dates specified in the timetable, the ExA may disregard them.

If no written requests are received by the identified deadline for Open Floor Hearings or Compulsory Acquisition Hearings the ExA is not required to hold any such hearings, although may choose to do so. The time, date and place of any confirmed hearing will be notified in writing to all registered interested parties, providing at least 21 days notice.

9. Award of costs

I also draw your attention to the possibility of the award of costs against Interested Parties who behave unreasonably. You should be aware of the relevant Costs Policy that applies to National Infrastructure Projects. The policy is available on the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal website.

10. Future notifications

If you are an interested party you will continue to receive notifications from the Planning Inspectorate about the examination throughout the process. If you have received this letter because you attended the Preliminary Meeting but you are not an interested party you will **not** receive any further communication from us relating to this application. You can, however, visit the dedicated project page on the Planning Inspectorate's website to stay informed of the progress of the examination of the application. If you are a statutory consultee who has not made a Relevant Representation but wishes to become an interested party, you should inform us as soon as possible. **Statutory consultees who have not made a Relevant Representation and do not notify us of their wish to become an interested party will not receive any further correspondence.**

Yours faithfully

Gideon Amos

**Gideon Amos OBE RIBA MRTPI
Lead Member of the Examining Authority – on behalf of the Panel**

Annexes:

- A. Availability of representations and application documents
- B. Timetable for Examination of the Application
- C. Acronyms
- D. First written questions and requests for information

Annex A

Availability of all documents and representations

On the National Infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal's website at:

<http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/projects/Eastern/East-Anglia-ONE-Offshore-Windfarm/>

For inspection and copying:

Suffolk County Council Offices, Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich IP1 2BX

Opening Times

Monday – Friday 9am – 5pm

Copying charges: 10p per black and white A4 sheet, 20p per black and white A3 sheet; other sizes at additional cost

Hadleigh Library, 29 High Street, Hadleigh IP7 5AG

Opening Times

Monday Closed
Tuesday 9:30am – 5pm
Wednesday 9:30am – 5pm
Thursday 9:30am – 5pm
Friday 9:30am – 7:30pm
Saturday 9:30am – 5pm
Sunday 10am – 4pm

Copying charges: 10p per black and white A4 sheet, 20p per black and white A3 sheet; no colour photocopying facility

Ipswich County Library, Northgate Street, Ipswich IP1 3DE

Opening Times

Monday 9am – 6pm
Tuesday 9am – 7pm
Wednesday 9am – 6pm
Thursday 9am – 6pm
Friday 9am – 7pm
Saturday 8:30am – 5pm
Sunday 10am – 4pm

Copying charges: 10p per black and white A4 sheet, 20p per black and white A3 sheet; £1 per colour A4 sheet

Woodbridge Library, New Street, Woodbridge IP12 1DT

Opening Times

Monday 10am – 4pm
Tuesday 9:30am – 7:30pm
Wednesday 9am – 5:30pm
Thursday 9am – 5:30pm
Friday 9am – 7:30pm
Saturday 9am – 5pm
Sunday 10am – 4pm

Copying charges: 10p per black and white A4 sheet, 20p per black and white A3 sheet; no colour photocopying facility

The Planning Inspectorate, Major Applications and Plans Directorate, Temple Quay House, Bristol BS1 6PN

Opening Times

Monday – Friday 10am – 4pm

Copying charges: 10p per A4 sheet (black and white) other sizes on request at additional cost

(Copying charges quoted are indicative costs as at November 2012)

Annex B

2013 Timetable for Examination of the Application

The Examining Authority (ExA) is under a duty to **complete** the examination of the application by the end of the period of 6 months beginning with the day after the start day (s98 PA 2008).

Item	Matters	Due Dates
1	Preliminary Meeting	Tuesday 25 June
2	Issue of: <input type="checkbox"/> Examination timetable ⁵ <input type="checkbox"/> Examining Authority's Questions ⁶ <input type="checkbox"/> Requests for Statements of Common Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of publication of Note of the Preliminary Meeting	Thursday 4 July
	<input type="checkbox"/> Deadline for Statutory Parties to inform the ExA of a wish to be considered an Interested Party <input type="checkbox"/> Submission by the applicant of any further information	Tuesday 9 July
3	<u>INTERESTED PARTIES DEADLINE I</u> for receipt of: <input type="checkbox"/> Local Impact Reports <input type="checkbox"/> Written representations ⁷ , <input type="checkbox"/> Responses to ExA's written questions ⁸ <input type="checkbox"/> Statements of Common Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Any summaries of Relevant Representations exceeding 1500 words ⁹	Tuesday 30 July

⁵ Rule 8(1) and (2) EPR

⁶ Rule 8(1)(b)(i) and (iii) EPR

⁷ Rule 8(1)(a) and Rule 10(1)&(2) EPR

⁸ Rule 8(1)(b) EPR

⁹ Rule 8(1)(i) EPR

	<input type="checkbox"/> Any summaries of WRs exceeding 1500 words ¹⁰ <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of wish to be heard at an open floor hearing by Interested Parties ¹¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of wish to make oral representations at the specific issue hearing ¹² <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of wish to attend the ExA's inspection of the sites to which the application/specific matters relate in the company of Interested Parties <input type="checkbox"/> Matrices prepared by the applicant to inform the Report on the Implications for European Sites	
4	<p>Issue of:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Details of date time and place of ExA's inspection of a site to which the application/specific matters relate in the company of Interested Parties ¹³ <input type="checkbox"/> Final notification by ExA of date, time and place for Open Floor and Issue Specific Hearings ¹⁴	Tuesday 6 August
5	<p><u>INTERESTED PARTIES DEADLINE II</u> for the receipt of:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Comments on Local Impact Reports <input type="checkbox"/> Comments on Relevant Representations <input type="checkbox"/> Comments on Written Representations <input type="checkbox"/> Comments on responses to ExA's Questions <input type="checkbox"/> Comments on Statements of Common Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Comments on applicant's matrices to inform the Report on the Implications for European Sites <input type="checkbox"/> Notification of wish to make oral representations at a Compulsory Acquisition hearing	Tuesday 27 August

¹⁰ Rule 8(1)(i) EPR

¹¹ s93(1) PA 2008 and Rule 8(1)(f) and Rule 13(1) EPR

¹² s91 PA 2008 and Rule 8(1)(k) EPR

¹³ Rule 16(3) EPR

¹⁴ Rule 13(3) EPR

6	<input type="checkbox"/> ExA's inspection of on shore site(s) to which the application/specific matters relate in the company of Interested Parties ¹⁵ <input type="checkbox"/> Time reserved for an Open Floor Hearing	Tuesday 10 and Wednesday 11 September Thursday 12 September
7	Time period reserved for Hearing on Specific Issues relating to the principle of the development and the Development Consent Order.	Tuesday 17, Wednesday 18 and Thursday 19 September And Tuesday 24, Wednesday 25, Thursday 26 and Friday 27 September
8	Time period reserved for Compulsory Acquisition Hearing	Tuesday 8, Wednesday 9¹⁶, Thursday 10 and Friday 11 October
9	<u>INTERESTED PARTIES DEADLINE III</u> for receipt of: Post-Hearing documents including any written summary of an oral case put at any Hearing and any documents/amendments requested by the ExA ¹⁷	Monday 21 October
10	Time period reserved for an Open Floor Hearing if required	Tuesday 22 October

¹⁵ Rule 16 EPR

¹⁶ It is envisaged that this day of the hearing will deal with matters relating to any applications under s127 (for a certificate from the SoS consenting to the acquisition of statutory undertakers' land), s138 (for a certificate from the SoS consenting to interference with statutory undertakers' apparatus) and under s132 (for a certificate from the SoS consenting to acquisition of common, open space, fuel or field garden allotment land).

¹⁷ Rule 8(1)(k) EPR

11	Time period reserved for further Issue Specific Hearing if required	Wednesday 23 October
12	Issue of: <input type="checkbox"/> ExA's draft Development Consent Order, if any, for consultation <input type="checkbox"/> Matrices prepared by the ExA to inform Report on the implications for European Sites, for consultation	Tuesday 5 November
13	<u>INTERESTED PARTIES DEADLINE IV</u> for receipt of: <input type="checkbox"/> Any written comments on the ExA's draft Development Consent Order. <input type="checkbox"/> Any written comments on the matrices to inform Report on the Implications for European Sites	Tuesday 26 November

Annex C

Acronyms used during the examination

AA	Appropriate Assessment
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
CCS	Continuous Circulation System
CRM	Collision Risk Model
dB(A)	Decibel Auditory Threshold
DC	District Council
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DCO	Development Consent Order
DECC	Department of Energy and Climate Change
DWR	Deep Water Route
EA	Environment Agency
EAONE	East Anglia One (The Project)
EAOL	East Anglia One Limited (The applicant)
EAQ's	Examining Authority Questions
EH	English Heritage
EMF	Electromagnetic Fields
EMP	Ecological Management Plan
EPR	Examination Procedure Rules
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
GWFL	Galloper Wind Farm Ltd
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HGC	Heavy Goods Vehicle
HPA	Health Protection Agency
ICNIRP	International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection
IDB	International Drainage Board
ISH	Issue Specific Hearings
IP's	Interested Parties
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
LAeq	Equivalent Continuous Sound Level (A-weighting setting)
LBBG's	Lesser Black-backed Gulls
LIR	Local Impact Report
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Agency
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MPS	Minerals Planning Statement
NE	Natural England
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NPS EN-1	National Planning Policy Statement for Energy
NRA	Navigation Risk Assessment

NRIL	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
OFH	Open Floor Hearing
OSPAR	Oslo/Paris convention (for the protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic)
PAM	Passive Acoustic Monitoring
PCH	Potential Collision Height
PVA	Population Viability Analysis
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEI	Supplementary Environment Information
SofS	Secretary of State
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPL	Sound Pressure Level
SSSI	Sites of Special Scientific Interest
UK BAP	UK Biodiversity Action Plan

Annex D

Examining Authority's Questions

Examining Authority's written questions (EAQs) and requests for information – responses to be received by the Examining Authority (ExA) on or before Tuesday 30 July 2013.

Questions are asked of the Interested and/or other parties identified against each question, in addition all Interested parties are welcome to address any Question wherever they have relevant information to offer.

It has been assumed by the Examining Authority that the applicant will have reviewed the section 55 acceptance checklist in relation to this application and will provide responses to all omissions and similar matters by the deadline set. Such responses, where incorporated in any form of written response/submission should be clearly identified.

Where questions below can be fully addressed within a SOCG then a reference to the relevant SOCG will be sufficient.

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
0.0		EXAMINATION MANAGEMENT
		<i>Site inspection in the company of Interested parties</i>
0.1	All interested parties	In addition to unaccompanied site inspections the ExA is considering a site inspection on 10 and 11 September 2013, in the company of any Interested parties who wish to attend, of the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Bawdsey (proposed landfall location)- The Bealings (on the proposed onshore cable corridor)- Proposed Greenhouse Development SITA- A12 Woodford (proposed primary construction consolidation site)- Bramford (proposed Onshore Converter Station location)

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		Do Parties have a view on which of these locations are the priorities for the ExA to inspect and/or do they suggest additional locations for this inspection in the company of Interested parties or for other unaccompanied site inspections by the ExA?
1.0		PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: ASSESSMENT APPROACH & POLICY BACKGROUND
		<i>General</i>
1.1	Applicant	The applicant is requested to provide a table fully itemising mitigation measures committed to in the Environmental Statement showing how they would be secured in the draft DCO (For example; Chapter 25 in sections 25.7 and 25.8 make a commitment to ensuring that any archaeological and other heritage assets discovered en route are protected in situ presumably by route diversion)?
1.2	Applicant	Figure 25.4 (in Volume 3 Chapter 25 Document 7.4.6a of the ES) is at 1:50,000 and thus the context of the Onshore Converter Station in terms of nearby buildings, heritage assets, other context, ES visual impact viewpoints and relationships are difficult to see. Figure 1 (in Volume 5.3.2 Appendix 25.5 of the ES) provides more detail but of a smaller area. According to table 29.13 in chapter 29 of the ES only viewpoints 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15 would experience major or moderate significant visual effects of the Onshore Converter Station. The most distant of these (viewpoint 9) is 2.13km from the site. The applicant is requested to provide an amended version of Figure 1 of Appendix 25.5 of the ES at a scale of 1:5000 extending over an AO sized sheet of paper with the site of the proposed Onshore Converter Station located centrally on the sheet which includes the information on Figure 1 but also which names and numbers any Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and other identified heritage assets and as many of the viewpoints 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15 as are encompassed by the plan. Please include the date of the Ordnance map used as the base.
1.3	Applicant	Section 25.3.3 of Chapter 25 of the ES states that installing the export cables for East Anglia One alongside additional infrastructure would ease cabling activities for future

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		phases of development. This implies that sequential installations of different cable route connections would be a worst case scenario, has this worst case scenario been assessed?
1.4	Applicant	Which projects have been included for cumulative assessment purposes and why are different projects included for different topics?
1.5	Applicant	What policy support, in the NPS, NPPF, MPS or Marine Plans, is provided for the provision of multiple cable connections for potential future wind farms?
1.6	Applicant	NPS EN-1 (para 5.9.9) asserts that where development consent is sought in AONB areas that the existence of exceptional circumstances should be demonstrated. How does the current proposal meet the three criteria set out in that paragraph?
1.7	Applicant and MMO	What are the implications of the Draft East Marine Plans and accompanying SEA for the proposal?
1.8	Applicant and LPAs	What policy support is provided in the development plans for Suffolk Coastal or Mid-Suffolk for the multi-cable connection approach?
1.9	Applicant and Suffolk CC	What are the implications for the project of the new Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB Management Plan?
1.10	Applicant and Suffolk Coastal DC	What account has been taken of the Shoreline Management Plan in the proposed scheme?
1.11	Applicant	Explain in detail how the site selection of the onshore converter station been undertaken and how it is justified by development plan policies? What weight has been attached to the possibility of a future substation and grid connection between Bramford and Twinstead?
1.12	Applicant	Does the publication by the Department for Communities and Local Government of new

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		"Planning Act 2013: Guidance for the Examination of Applications for Development Consent" raise any new important and relevant issues in the examination of the application?
1.13	Applicant	Does the publication by the Department for Communities and Local Government of new "Planning Act 2013: Guidance on Associated Development Applications for major Infrastructure Projects" raise any new important and relevant issues in the examination of the application?
1.14	Applicant and Suffolk Coastal District Council	Does the finding of Suffolk Coastal District Council's Core Strategy as sound raise any new important and relevant issues in the examination of the application?
1.15	Applicant	What are the implications for the application of the issuing of a generation licence to the applicant by Office of Gas and Electricity markets in April 2013?
1.16	Applicant, MMO, MCA	Does the making of the Galloper Wind Farm Order 2013 on 24 May 2013 (or of any other recent national infrastructure Order) raise any important and relevant issues for the examination of the application that are not otherwise covered by the questions on the DCO below?
2.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: BIODIVERSITY, BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT AND ECOLOGY	
	<i>General</i>	
2.1	Applicant	Within the ES there are categories of moderate significant impact and major significant impact, but no category of low significant impact. If a category of low significant impact had been included, would there have been occasions where, cumulatively with other low significant impacts, there would have been the need for some form of mitigation (See ES Volume, Section 5.5.2.4)?
2.2	Applicant	Has the ES included an assessment of the timing and duration of maintenance works

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		onshore and offshore over the period of the operation? If so, what were the conclusions?
		<i>Offshore</i>
2.3	Applicant, NE, RSPB	Could any direct evidence to verify the accuracy of the Collision Risk Model (CRM) be indicated and referenced, particularly with reference to individual bird species, locations or specific offshore wind farms?
2.4	Applicant, NE	Does the potential collision height (PCH) of birds with the blades vary according to the tip height of the blades? Could the variation in the PCH for bird species be explained?
2.5	Applicant	Which different potential turbine layouts were considered for the CRM: 325 x 150m to tip ht, 150 x 200m to tip ht, or other variation? The worst case scenario which was modelled was based on the construction of 325 turbines at 150m tip height which, it is claimed in the ES, would have a more adverse impact on ornithological interests than 150 turbines with 200m tip height. Explain whether there is a "best" formation of turbines of varying sizes and associated structures in order to mitigate identified adverse impacts on ornithological interests whereas still producing the power which is sought. Can the "best" formation be provided for in the DCO?
		<i>Alde Ore Estuary SPA</i>
		<i>Lesser Black-backed Gulls (LBBGs)</i>
2.6	NE	Does NE agree that there would be no adverse effect on LBBGs due to the project alone? If not, what further evidence should be supplied by the applicant to answer this question?
2.7	Applicant, NE	The ES states that the PCH is based on a minimum air draft clearance of 22m. What would be the effect on LBBG mortality if a PCH of 19.1% was used (as recommended by NE at Galloper)?
2.8	NE	Does NE agree the basis for the Population Viability Analysis (PVA) for LBBGs? If not,

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		explain how it should be done?
2.9	NE	How does NE suggest that the applicant should address the issue of the impact of the project in-combination collision mortality caused by other plans or projects?
2.10	NE	What is the justification for on site mitigation such as reducing the number of turbines or the area of blade sweep?
2.11	Applicant	If there is justification based on sound agreed evidence, can mitigation take the form of phased development, with monitoring to ascertain the extent of any adverse effects caused by an earlier phase?
2.12	NE, Applicant	NE accepts that an annual mortality of up to 20 LBBGs from the SPA population, caused by the project alone would not constitute a significantly adverse impact on the SPA. Nevertheless, if the applicant were to provide appropriate mitigation for that number, would there then be no adverse effect in combination with other projects? Consequently, what form of mitigation would be acceptable, either at the SPA or the site?
		<i>Herring Gull</i>
2.13	NE	What additional evidence is required in order to assess whether there would be an adverse impact from either the project alone or in combination with others on herring gulls due to collisions?
2.14	NE, Applicant	Explain which population figures should be used as the basis for the prediction of annual collision rates (1,400,000 or 64,172) and whether breeding season mortality should be estimated, together with the exclusion of juveniles.
2.15	Applicant, NE	Given that 13 of the 19 projects used in the in-combination assessment (Table 6.6 of the AA) do not have available data for mean estimated collision rates, the total of 556 might

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		be a substantial underestimate, which makes the contribution of EAONE even smaller than the 0.5 currently predicted. Confirmation would be helpful.
		<i>Flamborough and Bempton Cliffs SPA</i>
		<i>Gannet</i>
2.16	NE, Applicant	Does NE accept that the collision mortality of 16 birds during the breeding season and 23 birds during the winter due to the project alone would not constitute a likely significant adverse impact on the SPA? If not, what additional evidence or clarification is required from the applicant to give an answer to that question? In particular, how was the apportionment of birds to the SPA made? Why does 33.7% represent the likely population guide?
2.17	Applicant, NE	What is the in-combination mortality that can be attributed to the Flamborough Head colony? What is the most up to date evidence to reinforce any opinion? Would there be a significantly adverse effect on the SPA?
		<i>Kittiwakes</i>
2.18	NE	Does NE accept that the project alone would not be likely to cause any significant effect on the colony at Flamborough Head?
2.19	Applicant	Could the applicant clarify the evidence and reasoning to justify the claim that there would not be a significant adverse impact on the kittiwake population at Flamborough Head in-combination with other projects? The issue appears to be whether the resident Flamborough Head colony or the flyway population is used as the basis of apportionment.
2.20	NE	NE states that due to the fact that 12 out of 18 wind farms are not included in the in-combination assessment, the number of birds killed might be higher. In that event, would not the proportion attributed to the project be even smaller than the 0.9%?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		<i>Herring gull</i>
2.21	Applicant, NE	Would the use of the most recent herring gull North Sea flyway population data or the resident population alter the conclusion that there would be no significantly adverse impact due to collision for the project alone and in-combination with others?
		<i>Outer Thames SPA</i>
		<i>Red throated diver</i>
2.22	Applicant	Clarify and explain why cable laying activities would give rise to a reduction in commercial shipping movements to the extent that there would be no significant adverse effect on red throated divers.
2.23	NE	Does NE agree with the applicant that due to the small numbers forecast likely to be present within the site and the low flight height, the risk of collision with turbine blades is so low as to be insignificant? Furthermore, that the only risk of an adverse impact would be from cable laying? There appear to be no significantly adverse impacts which would be caused by cable laying in the Galloper proposal. What is the difference between the two schemes which has caused a different conclusion?
2.24	Applicant	Would cable laying only between April and October cause insurmountable operational difficulties for the project? Could such an arrangement be included in the DCO?
		<i>Deben Estuary SPA</i>
		<i>Brent geese and Avocet</i>
2.25	Applicant, NE	Would cable laying near the Deben Estuary SPA only during the months of March to September inclusive cause insurmountable operational difficulties for the project? Could such an arrangement be included in the DCO? Would NE then find that there would be no adverse impact on the Brent geese and Avocets in the SPA?
2.26	Applicant	What evidence is there to demonstrate the likely impact (or lack) of any disturbance on

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		wintering Brent geese and Avocets within the SPA, due to cable laying?
2.27	Applicant, NE	What is the chain of reasoning and where can the evidence be found to inform the in-combination assessment of the project on Brent Geese and Avocets? What are the conclusions from such evidence?
2.28	Applicant	What is the evidence to justify the contention that the construction work at the crossing point in the estuary would not disturb the feeding or roosting of Avocets 300m – 500m away, especially with 24/7 hours of operation?
2.29	Applicant, NE	There is an issue about whether the surveys of Brent Geese and Avocets have been adequate. Can the parties agree on what has been done and whether any conclusions based on the surveys are still justified or not?
		<i>East Coast and Northern Isles SPA</i>
		<i>Gannet and Great Skua</i>
2.30	Applicant, NE	What is the evidence to demonstrate there would be no adverse effect from collision mortalities on Gannet and Great Skua populations due either to the project alone or in combination with others? Is this agreed with NE?
		<i>Other</i>
2.31	Applicant	Is there a European Protected Site in the area of Brown Ridge near the Dutch coast and, if so, has the effect of the proposal on this site been taken into account? Have the effects of the EAONE on Auks from this area been taken into account in this application? Clarify the extent to which the effect of the project on European Protected Sites in other European Member States.
		<i>Great Black-backed Gull and Auk species</i>
2.32	Applicant	What is the evidence to demonstrate that the mortality of Great Blacked-back Gulls would

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		not be adversely affected by collisions throughout the year from the proposal and other projects in-combination?
2.33	NE	What evidence does NE have to dispute the claim by the applicants that Auks normally fly below 22m and so would avoid collision with the turbine rotors? If such flight heights are accepted, does NE agree that there would be no significant adverse effects on those species?
		<i>Schedule 1 species</i>
2.34	Applicant, NE	How could mitigation enable the breeding of Marsh Harriers and Cetti's Warblers (and other protected species) to continue in the area with relatively little disturbance?
2.35	Applicant, NE	Is there any evidence to suggest that Marsh Harriers and Cetti's Warblers return to the same nest site or in close proximity in successive breeding seasons? What is the extent of alternative similar habitats in the area which would offer nesting opportunities for those species?
		<i>Marine Mammals</i>
2.36	Applicant, NE	What would be the effect of the construction and operation of EAONE alone and other projects in combination on Harbour Porpoises? How could predicted adverse effects be mitigated? How would the effects be monitored?
		<i>Other wildlife</i>
2.37	Applicant	What are the monitoring arrangements for Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species such as hedgehogs; great crested newts (post translocation)? Should the arrangements be included in the DCO (or legal agreement or undertaking)? What details are known about the possible receptor sites for displaced reptiles?
2.38	Applicant	How is the cable corridor minimum working width of 35m achieved at woodlands (where

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		HDD not employed), hedgerows and watercourses?
2.39	Applicant	To what extent would otters at Kirton be affected by the proposal and what mitigation would be possible?
2.40	Applicant	How can the 24 hr lighting proposed at the HDD sites, the CCS and, for a limited period, the converter station, be modified in order to avoid adverse impacts on various protected species, especially in relation to bats and other nocturnal species (converter station) and also particularly near the Deben Estuary SPA? How can this be secured in the DCO?
2.41	Applicant	Four hedgerows are identified as important for bat foraging/commuting? Would they be retained or could any mitigation proposed enable adverse effects to be insignificant? Would any loss be permanent or temporary? If the latter, what would be the timescale for returning the restored hedgerows to the same functions as before?
2.42	Applicant	Can the loss of wildlife habitat connectivity, including that offered by hedgerows, be mitigated more comprehensively by, for example, off site planting?
2.43	NE	Does NE accept that the implementation of the Ecological Management Plan would satisfactorily mitigate any significant harm caused to species or habitats by the proposal? If not, what further steps should be taken?
		<i>Benthic Ecology</i>
2.44	Applicant	How has the possibility of the spread of non native species being taken into account due to the cumulative impact of EA One and other similar projects?
2.45	Applicant, MMO	Could the applicant address the issues raised by the MMO in paragraphs 2.2 – 2.4 of their relevant representation?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
2.46	Applicant	How would the construction of the turbines and the other infrastructure, including cable laying, avoid identified reefs and other dense aggregations of Ross Worm (<i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i>)? How could the micro-siting be secured in the DCO? Would the presence of the various proposed offshore structures detract from or enhance the opportunities for the development of further aggregations of <i>Sabellaria spinulosa</i> ?
3.0		PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: FISHERIES
3.1	Applicant	In the light of concerns expressed by members of Felixstowe Ferry Fisherman's Association and other Interested parties about the impact on inshore and offshore fishing, can the applicant reassure the ExA that proposed mitigation measures and monitoring are adequate?
3.2	Applicant	Concerns have been raised by Orford and District Inshore Fishermen that the offshore cable installation and burying measures will interfere with fishing in their traditional grounds. Does the applicant accept this and how will this effect be mitigated?
3.3	Applicant, Wightman Fishing Company Ltd, and other IPs	How will the proposed exclusion zones impact on the viability of fishing in the area of the wind farm and what measures of mitigation are necessary to overcome these effects?
3.4	Applicant	VisNed (Dutch Demersal Fisheries Organisation) have highlighted the distinction between inshore and offshore fishing impacts of the exclusion zones. How have these different impacts been assessed and mitigated?
3.5	Applicant	The environmental assessment is based on a construction period of two and a half years. How realistic is this and how is this limit imposed through the DCO?
3.6	Applicant, MMO, NE	How should post-construction monitoring of the recovery of fish stocks be undertaken?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
4.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: MARINE & COASTAL PHYSICAL PROCESSES: SEDIMENT DYNAMICS, WASTE AND DEBRIS	
	Applicant	The applicant is requested to assist the ExA to enable the Secretary of State to carry out Habitats and Marine Regulations Assessment by completing assessment matrices. Templates are available for download from the National infrastructure pages of the Planning Portal (appended to advice Note 10). These should be cross referenced where necessary to the evidence provided in the application documents. Impacts arising from the proposed development in combination with its future onshore elements should also be included where these are known and relevant. Other Interested parties who wish to draw the attention of the ExA to issues potentially bearing on Habitats and Offshore Regulations Assessment that are referred to in these matrices should do so, using the relevant part of the matrix to provide the information, wherever possible within one of the SoCG requested below.
4.1	MMO	Could the MMO confirm that they agree with the conclusions in the ES on Coastal Processes as outlined in paragraphs 6.1 – 6.7 of their relevant representation?
4.2	Applicant	How has the impact of the proposal on Orford Ness geomorphology been taken into account? In addition, has the possible presence of ordinance off Orford Ness been considered in the development of the scheme?
		<i>Bawdsey Cliff</i>
4.3	Applicant	What is the predicted natural rate of erosion of Bawdsey Cliffs in the area of the landfall over the life of the proposal? What is the depth profile of the long and the short HDD needed to traverse Bawdsey Cliffs? Which HDD technique is favoured, and for what reasons? In either case, does the scheme and the DCO provide for conservation or enhancement and post-construction monitoring of the geological features for which the SSSI is designated? How would the short HDD operate given the relative lack of space between the foot of the cliffs and the sea at high spring tides and how can the effects on

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		the SSSI be mitigated? Vol 5 Chapter 24: fig 24.3.2 shows that land on the foreshore adjoining the north eastern boundary of the landfall site would be required. What is the purpose and would the land only be required if short HDD were to be the means of conveying the cables? What is the evidence and reasoning to explain that there would be no significantly adverse effects caused by the project on coastal erosion north and south of the landfall site? The indication in paragraph 2.2.3 (7) that the general shingle profile would be reinstated, implies it would be removed in the first place. Would this be correct for landfall with long HDD?
4.4	NE	What harm would be caused to the geological interest of the SSSI by the proposal? Would the exposure of the Red Crag formation be maintained? Would the evidence of geological sedimentary processes still be present?
4.5	Suffolk Coastal DC	Is the authority satisfied that the final cable set back distance and the working arrangements at the cliff top and the beach would ensure no adverse effects on coastal processes and cliff stability with either long or short HDD?
4.6	Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONBB Partnership	Explain in what respect the applicant's proposed monitoring of Bawdsey Cliff before, during and after construction would be unsatisfactory.
5.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: NOISE, VIBRATION, ELECTRO-MAGNETIC FIELD AND HEALTH IMPACTS	
5.1	Applicant	The ES, at section 26.5, sets out the baseline information used to underpin the assessment of effects to onshore noise receptors. Explain in detail how the baseline traffic noise has been established.
5.2	Applicant	The ES, at section 26.3.1, explains how the study area has been defined for the assessment of noise in relation to construction activities and convertor stations. Explain in detail the overall approach and how the study area in relation to predicted changes in traffic flow has been identified?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
5.3	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26: What criteria were used to decide which would be 'sensitive receptors'? In addition, section 26.3.1 refers to key receptors: how are these defined? Are they sensitive ones that are in proximity to the noise source or is the number affected at any location also of relevance? Are the locations referred to in section 23.3.1, paragraph 16, also key receptors?
5.4	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, Table 26-1, refers to the BS5228 time period of 15 days. Can it be confirmed that this is a reference to E.4 of BS5228? If not, the precise reference is required to be provided.
5.5	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, section 26.3.2, Table 26-2: Embedded Mitigation, makes reference to mitigation in the form of an embankment. Where is the noise assessment for the embankment construction and removal to be found?
5.6	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, section 26.3.3, Table 26-3: Worst Case Assumptions, explains how the construction and reinstatement periods of non-continuous work over (up to) 44 weeks over 2 years on a linear route would work. For cable trenching, the worst case assumption is for Mon-Sat 12 hour days. If more restricted hours are agreed with the relevant LPA, explain how this would still allow for completion in up to 44 weeks?
5.7	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, section 26.3.3, Table 26-3: Worst Case Assumptions, in relation to onshore cable route construction traffic, states that the maximum number of personnel would be "79 per 500km cable route section per day". Is the 500 kilometres (approx 312 miles) a typographical error? If not, please explain.
5.8	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, section 26.3.3, Table 26-3: Worst Case Assumptions, refers to the construction of the convertor station. Explain how the 'up to 46 weeks' construction period, non-continuous over 2 years is anticipated to work in practice. Does this mean that the building would be left partly completed? If so, why? Could a reduced

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		construction period be accommodated?
5.9	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, section 26.3.3, Table 26-3: Worst Case Assumptions, in relation to the convertor station, indicates that hours of work would be 'agreed' with Local Planning Authority. Is this aspect of the works satisfactorily 'controlled' by the requirements of the Draft DCO?
5.10	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, section 26.4.3, paragraph 52, refers to the assumption of the use of a 35 tonne drill rig for predicting noise levels from the large HDD sites and a smaller crawler rig at the smaller HDD sites. Does the figure for the track-mounted drill rig option within the table at page 26 correspond with the 35 tonne drill rig option? The figure for the smaller crawler rig is also provided in the table at page 26. Please confirm that the source for this is not BS5228.
5.11	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, Tables 26-8, 26-9, 26-10, give the noise units for noise levels of construction equipment in terms of A-weighted SPL (dB(A)). In contrast, why do tables 26-15 to 26-19 not specify the noise units? If they are LAeq, what is the averaging time?
5.12	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 26, section 26.5.2, paragraph 74, states that the threshold level at R7 is 66dB(A) and at R8 it is 68 dB(A). The ES, Volume 5, Appendix 26.2 gives the daytime figures as 60.7 dB for R7 and 62 dB for R8. How do the two sets of figures relate to each other? Can it be confirmed that the threshold figures set out in paragraph 74 are correct?
5.13	Applicant	The ES, Table 26-3, summarises the worst case assumptions but does not explain how they relate to the overall assessment of worst case. Please confirm that the approach to the assessment of worst case has considered all possible permutations arising from the proposed flexibility within the draft DCO. If not, how can the assessment be regarded as accurately presenting the worst case?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
5.14	Applicant	The ES has considered cumulative effects resultant from other proposed development with the potential to interact with the application scheme at the various project phases. Have the projects identified been agreed with the local planning authority?
5.15	Applicant	The cumulative impact assessment concludes that due to the factor of proximity, it is not likely that significant cumulative effects would occur. What, if any, evidence can be provided to show specifically what an appropriate distance to proposals would be so as to avoid significant effects?
5.16	Applicant	The ES assessment relies upon a number of mitigation measures to ensure that the impacts of noise, particularly during construction, are reduced to below significant levels. Explain in detail why this mitigation should be regarded as adequate. Is it suitably secured through the draft DCO?
5.17	Applicant	The mitigation, as proposed, could lead to other potentially significant effects, for example, visual, if on-site screening of noise effects is required. To what extent has this been considered when proposing this and other mitigation methods?
5.18	Applicant	In the light of the potential noise disturbance that would be caused to residents living in proximity to the tunnelling work, is it agreed that it would be reasonable to control hours of working to avoid disturbance being caused by all such construction activity at unsociable hours, unless clear justification for proceeding otherwise can be shown?
5.19	Applicant	Explain, including details of any technical reasons, why construction works at proposed HDD sites need to operate on a 24 hour basis?
5.20	Applicant	It is proposed that, apart from HDD, all other works would occur between 0700 hours and 1900 hours Monday to Saturday, with no activity on Sundays or bank holidays unless agreed in advance with the local authority. Such hours would still have the potential to

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		adversely impact upon people living nearby at unsociable hours. What, if any, operational reasons would prevent more restrictive hours of working being adopted?
5.21	Applicant	The Draft DCO, requirement 30, relates to construction hours with exceptions (a) to (e) setting out circumstances where the specified hours of working may be exceeded. Why are these exceptions considered to be necessary and reasonable?
5.22	Applicant	The Draft DCO, Schedule A, Part 3 requirement 30 (a), seems unduly vague and open to various interpretations. Could a more precise form of words not be employed?
5.23	Applicant	The Supplementary Environment Information (SEI) (Chapter 6, section 6.4) estimates that, in relation to the open cut section in the vicinity of the Bealings, installation of cables and ducts could be completed and the site reinstated over a period of 4 to 6 weeks. How can the ExA be confident that this timescale for the works would not be exceeded? Can construction duration periods for this and/or other sections of the route be secured through provisions in the Draft DCO?
5.24	Applicant	The ES, Volume 26 'Noise and Vibration', paragraphs 96/97, advises that given the assumed construction programme for trenching for each 1000m length of cable, noise would only affect a receptor above threshold levels for 9 out of 15 days and 18 days in any six month period. Could the maximum duration during which a receptor may be affected in this way be secured by means of a requirement of the Draft DCO? Would it be reasonable for such a provision to be included?
5.25	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 6, section 6.2, paragraph 189, indicates that the crossing of Lodge Road could be readily achieved by open cut but a short HDD or other trenchless technique could be employed. Paragraph 208 indicates that a non-HDD trenchless technique will be used to cross Lodge Road. Further details are sought of the precise technique to be employed and the likely noise implications of this process.

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
5.26	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 6, section 6.10, paragraph 208, indicates that the construction of the Lodge Road crossing will take place during normal daytime working hours only. Could these hours of working be secured for this part of the development by way of a variation of requirement 30 of the Draft DCO?
5.27	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 6, section 6.11, paragraph 208, refers to the 'nearest receptor'. Please specifically identify the nearest receptor and its distance from the construction works?
5.28	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 6, section 6.11, paragraph 208, predicts that the nearest receptor would experience noise levels of 67 dB(A) for less than a month. BS 5228-1: 2009 Annex E.3.3 sets out a test for deeming noise levels generated by construction activities to be significant. To meet the test the duration of the offending noise levels must be for one month or more, unless works of a shorter duration are likely to result in significant impact. Explain precisely, with reference to specific paragraphs of Annex E, why the noise impact of the construction works at the nearest receptor is not regarded as being significant?
5.29	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 7, section 7.11, indicates that the trenchless technique operations at the Sandy Lane site are unlikely to require 24 hour working. How is limiting the construction work at this point to normal daytime working hours adequately secured by the Draft DCO in its present form?
5.30	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 4, section 4.1, paragraphs 158-163, confirms that additional roads have been used for the noise assessment, a number of corrections have been made and tables 4.1 and 4.2 conveniently include the additional information for the noise assessment in blue. The predicted LAeq 1 hour for the nearest residential receptor is 58 dB(A)(paragraph 169). Please comment on the typical argument that the averaging process in the use of LAeq over a period – in this case of 1 hour - disguises the intrusive effect of 5 additional HGVs passing a residential property.

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
5.31	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 7, section 7.11, paragraphs 238/239, refers to the use of a “quieter crawler rig” for trenchless technique operations during normal working hours, Monday to Saturday over a period of 2-3 weeks. The ES (Chapter 26, page 26) gave the figure for the smaller rig as 80 A-weighted SPL dB(A) at 5 metres, while the SEI gives it as 74 at 10 metres, with the figures in each case coming from A E Yates. Please can you explain the difference between the two sets of figures and how a consistent assessment can be made?
5.32	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 7, section 7.11, paragraph 240, indicates that the resulting noise level at Telegraph Cottage is predicted to be 62 dB(A). Explain in greater detail how this figure has been calculated and how the conclusion that there would be no significant noise impact upon this receptor during the construction works has been reached?
5.33	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 2, section 2.3, sets out the rationale for Construction Traffic routes. How would the routes of HGVs on the public highway be subject to control? To whom would the public make complaints and would details of any complaints be passed to the Council? Would any complaints procedure be publicised? What sanctions would apply against those who contravened the limitations on routes and their use?
5.34	Suffolk County Council	In the light of the additional information provided by the SEI, relating to traffic volumes and routes, what, if any, additional noise mitigation measures are sought and why?
<i>Noise impacts from offshore construction and decommissioning works</i>		
5.35	Applicant, MMO	The MMO, in its relevant representation, recommends that passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) be employed along with qualified marine mammal visual observers (MMOs) in addition to soft start procedures identified within the ES (Chapter 8 paragraph 8.2.3.3). Is it agreed that the piling activities should be monitored in this way?
5.36	Applicant	The MMO in its relevant representation refers to the ES (Volume 2 Chapter 10 paragraph 214) which states that: “The use of multiple vessels carrying out simultaneous piling can

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		actually decrease the overall noise footprint in terms of area affected over the wind farm construction period and also reduces the time taken to complete the operation." What, if any, scientific references, and/or evidence has been relied upon to support this statement?
5.37	Applicant, Wightman Fisheries Ltd, MMO	The ES Volume 2, Chapter 10, section 10.5.2.5.3, paragraph 47, identifies the EAONE and the offshore cable corridor as falling within, and in close proximity to, the spawning and nursery ground of a number of species, including cod. Section 10.5.2.9.2, paragraph 79, explains that cod are listed as a UK BAP priority species. In addition, they are listed in the OSPAR list of threatened and/or declining species. The ES, section 10.6.2.6.2, also recognises that there is potential for juvenile fish and spawning fish to be disturbed by noise during the construction phase. Explain in greater detail why the impact of construction noise on cod spawning is assessed to be not significant. How strong is the case for restricting the piling works to outside the spawning season? What, if any, difficulties would that entail for the construction process and timetable?
5.38	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 8, page 10, in the response to consultation makes reference to ranges being slightly less than those reported, although this is said to be expected given the propagation environment around Bligh Bank. Please provide a detailed explanation of this point.
5.39	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 8, pages 10, 11 and 22, makes reference to the definition of 'peak SPL'. Is the peak SPL described as zero-to-peak pressure level of the pulse used consistently in the ES?
5.40	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 8, pages 11 and 12, refers to measurement ranges less than 14,150m but Table 8-2 (page 13) refers to a measurement range of 14,250m. Is one of the numbers a typographical error?
5.41	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 8, pages 13, 23, 28, 29, makes reference to the 6.5m diameter monopile

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		construction operational meteorological mast. The 6.5m diameter monopile would need approximately twice the hammer energy indicated in Diagrams 8-3, 8-4 and 8-5 for a jacket foundation with 2.0 to 2.5m diameter pin piles. Explain further why a different form of construction should not be used for the meteorological mast?
5.42	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 8, page 19, paragraph 31, makes reference to information that already exists, which will be used to represent the baseline ambient noise level in the region. What differences are there between the marine location for East Anglia ONE and the other sites mentioned which have been used to give an indicative ambient noise level. How 'safe' is it to make comparisons against an "indicative" ambient noise level?
		<i>The impact of electro-magnetic fields</i>
5.43	Applicant	The Health Protection Agency (HPA), in its relevant representation, notes that the developer does not anticipate there will be any significant EMF impacts arising from the onshore cables and converter station. Please set out clearly the calculations and assumptions that led to this conclusion.
5.44	Applicant	The HPA, in its relevant representation, points out that paragraphs 90-92 begin with a discussion on static magnetic fields, whereas the ICNIRP guidelines referred to subsequently (paragraph 93) are for time varying (50 Hz) magnetic fields. Additional clarification is required to explain this discrepancy.
5.45	Applicant	The ES, Chapter 8, page 31, paragraphs 57, 58 and 62, refers to types of cables, examples of cable crossings, areas of hard ground at sea, cable protection measures and cable burial. It is proposed that the cables would be sheathed, armoured, buried and protected as necessary. What cable protection measures would be applied where burial would not be possible? What sources of potential damage to cables would exist, where buried and where not buried? What potential adverse impacts would there be and how likely would they be? How would the necessary protection be secured by the DCO?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		<i>Health related land contamination impacts</i>
5.46	Applicant	The HPA recommends that a more general consideration of the potential human health impacts arising from land contamination would be appropriate, rather than the ES consideration of only a small portion of the cable route. Explain why the current approach has been taken, whether this omission should be of concern to the ExA and, if so, how it is proposed to be rectified?
5.47	Applicant, HPA, Suffolk Coastal District Council, Mid-Suffolk District Council	The HPA draws attention to the absence of provisions within the Code of Construction Practice to address unexpected land contamination which may be encountered during the construction phase. Does requirement 24 of the draft DCO provide a sufficient safeguard or is it necessary to incorporate a suitable precautionary phrase into the draft DCO or Code of Construction Practice?
5.48	Applicant	The HPA seeks the inclusion of Air Quality and Land Contamination Management as a specific requirement in clause 27, Part 3 of Schedule A of the draft DCO. Is this agreed? If not, why not?
5.49	Applicant	The SEI, Chapter 6, sections 6.5 and 7.5, acknowledges that open trenching which is now proposed in the vicinity of the Bealings, and the trenchless technique to install cable ducts beneath Sandy Lane, have the potential to release unforeseen contamination. Provide further clarification as to how it is anticipated that appropriate construction management, as outlined in the Code of Construction Practice, would provide an adequate safeguard in this respect?
		<i>Radar</i>
5.50	Applicant	How would the effects of radar echoes and shadows be mitigated and how would this be secured by the draft DCO?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
6.0		PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: OPERATIONAL AND NAVIGATIONAL SAFETY
6.1	Applicant	The Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) refers to the Hazard Review Workshop (12.2). Did the attendees support the Conclusions of the NRA (Section 21, pp 173-4)? Were the attendees involved in formulating the planned risk mitigation measures outlined in Table 20.1 and to what extent were the measures supported? Were any other mitigation measures suggested by the workshop not acted on by the applicant and for what reasons? How can the measures and associated monitoring, including via Automatic Identification System (IAS), if accepted by the Examining Authority, be secured and enforced?
6.2	Applicant	Could the applicant explain the post construction monitoring of shipping traffic patterns in order to assess the validity of the NRA analysis with particular reference to the possible diversion of vessels to the west of EAONE and the possible consequent restriction on sea room. How has the cumulative impact with other offshore wind farm proposals been taken into account?
6.3	Applicant, MCA, Trinity House	Would the 1NM separation zone intrude unacceptably into the deep water route (DWR) via the DR1 Light Buoy? What would be the cumulative impact of this and other permitted and planned projects?
6.4	Applicant, MCA	Would a 50m operational safety zone around individual structures be a justified measure? Should the zone be wider? How could it be enforced?
6.5	Applicant	Explain how the cumulative impact of the project in combination with other offshore wind farms has been taken into account in assessing navigation and safety to shipping, particularly to the south and east of the site.
6.6	Applicant, Trinity House	Have the comments by Trinity House set out in their relevant representation been accepted in the DCO and if not, why not? Does TH accept that any additional Aids to Navigation (AtoN) could be agreed with TH if/when consent is granted and the exact

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		turbine layout is decided?
6.7	Applicant, Galloper Wind Farm Ltd (GWFL)	Has a cable crossing agreement been reached between the applicant and GWFL? If not, what are the obstacles to agreement?
6.8	MCA	At Galloper, the SofS supported the conclusions of the ExA in deciding that the need and extent of any safety zones should be matters that he should consider should any application be made. Should this procedure be adopted for the EAONE proposal?
7.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: OFFSHORE AND ONSHORE HERITAGE AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT	
	<i>Historic Environment</i>	
7.1	Applicant, English heritage and Suffolk County Council	English Heritage recommends more extensive trial trenching and suggests that this would significantly reduce risks for the promoter of time delays resulting from encounters with unknown archaeological finds. What is the applicant's rationale for adopting a potentially higher risk approach and how should the ExA weigh the risk that unknown archaeology may render the development incapable of implementation within the Order Land available?
7.2	Applicant	It is stated that the onshore cable route will avoid all discovered heritage assets by maintaining them in situ, would such an approach be possible in the face of a large archaeological find? (See related questions on authorised works in the DCO below).
7.3	Applicant	How for example would cropmarked field boundaries and the possible bronze age round barrow (RSK IDs 568 and 122 - referred to in Tables 25-11 and 25-12 of Chapter 25 of the ES), given that they are currently of unknown importance, be restored though the WSI, detailed design and development process?
7.4	Suffolk Coastal District Council, St Mary's Church	Are the measures in Article 15 regarding the removal of human remains sufficient? What measures would be taken for the proper care of human remains at St Mary's Churchyard, Martlesham?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
	Martlesham	
7.5	English Heritage	EH refers to "the precautionary approach" in relation to archaeological impacts in its relevant representation, what is the status of the precautionary approach referred to, how is it defined and/or required?
7.6	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm that the assessment of sea bed anomalies in the appendices to Chapter 17 of the ES included any non British warships, other vessels and aircraft?
7.7	Applicant, English Heritage	Clarification is requested as to whether the European Landscape Convention contains any international obligations within the meaning of s104(4) of the PA2008?
7.8	Applicant	What is the definition of the term "local seascapes" as used in Paragraph 160 of Chapter 17 of the ES and is it susceptible to subjective interpretations of what is important only to certain localities?
7.9	English Heritage	If the Early Medieval Period referred to in Chapter 25 of the ES, was re-categorised from "low potential" to a more sensitive category, would this alter the assessment and or the proposed works?
8.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: LANDSCAPE, SEASCAPE, VISUAL IMPACT & DESIGN	
8.1	Applicant and Interested parties	What good principles of design and of access is the Design and Access Statement intended to espouse for the design of the Wind Farm, the Onshore Converter Substation and for the restoration of public areas on the onshore cable corridor? How would disabled staff members or members of the public access the Onshore Converter Station building and/or traverse other elements of the scheme including public rights of way once the project was operational?
8.2	Applicant, Local Planning Authorities	Should there be independent professional design review of the design of the Offshore Wind Farm, the Onshore Converter Substation and/or other aspects of the development, in

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		accordance with NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.5.5?
8.3	Applicant	How will the design of above ground structures respond to the conclusions of the landscape character assessment?
8.4	Applicant	Why would planting above the cables not be possible? How would the impacts of a sequence of gaps in hedges and landscaping that would result along the cable route be mitigated and where is this secured?
8.5	Applicant	Potentially significant landscaping impacts at the Bealings are referred to in section 6.3 Post-submission Report 1 SEI. Why could such impacts not be mitigated through a combination of bunding and low level planting to restore the appearance of lost hedgerows etc. How would any mitigation be secured in the DCO?
8.6	Local authorities	Are there any landscaping approaches or measures justified for example by impacts set out in the ES that should form that should be specified and secured through the DCO or should all such matters be left to Requirements?
8.7	Applicant	With regard to the illustrative drawings of the proposed Onshore Converter Substation (document 3.1) no scale is given and the elevations appear to be at a different scale to the plans, what is the scale of each on the A3 sheet provided with the application?
8.8	Applicant	With regard to the Onshore Converter Substation the applicant is requested to provide all the illustrative elevations and plans shown on document 3.1 at a scale of 1:200 on AO or A1 sized sheets of paper, including on the elevations an illustrative human figure of 1.8metres in height.
8.9	Applicant	With regard to the Onshore Converter Substation the applicant is requested to provide a typical building south (or north) elevation and a typical building east (or west) elevation

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		and associated part plans at a scale of 1:100 on AO or A1 sized sheets of paper including on the elevations an illustrative human figure of 1.8metres in height.
9.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC	
9.1	Highway Authority	With the supplementary information provided in the Post-submission report 1 and SEI, is the data provided in the ES now considered adequate?
9.2	Highway Authority, LAs, Parish Councils and other IPs	Numerous concerns have been raised about the impact on traffic and pedestrian use of roads and footpaths. Are the mitigation measures now proposed for road and footpath users adequate? If not what mitigation measures would satisfy your concerns.
9.3	Highway Authority and other IPs	Are the mitigation measures included in the Outline Access Management Scheme, Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan adequate for the purposes of the construction period of both the infrastructure grid connection developments, the construction and delivery of wind farm equipment and the servicing of the wind farm during its operation and decommissioning? Should these Schemes and Plans be included in the DCO?
9.4	Highway Authority and other IPs	A series of diversions are proposed to rights of way during the cable-laying period. Are the proposals sufficient to compensate for the disruption during this period and will the management of these arrangements be adequate?
9.5	Applicant	Swilland and Witnesham, Grundisburgh and Culpho, Playford, Little Bealings and Great Bealings Parish Councils raise a number of concerns regarding the impact of the construction consolidation sites at Witnesham and Playford generating additional traffic throughout the cable construction period. How have these concerns been addressed?
9.6	Highway Authority and other IPs	Additional CCSs are proposed at Bawdsey and the East bank of the Deben. Are the access arrangements adequately considered and sufficient mitigation measures proposed?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
10.	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: DRAINAGE WATER SUPPLY	
10.1	Anglian Water	Are the provisions of the draft DCO sufficient for the protection of water and sewerage pipelines and are the works and diversions proposed adequate?
10.2	Applicant	The Environment Agency has proposed a revised Requirement 23 to address surface and foul water drainage issues at the converter station. Is this proposal acceptable?
10.3	Applicant	The HPA has proposed further consultation on potential risks to human health and that consideration be given to "a suitable precautionary phrase or condition should be incorporated in to the Draft DCO or Code of Construction Practice" (RR10016991). What is the applicant's response to this suggestion?
10.4	East Anglia Internal Drainage Board	Is there further information which the IDB requires to properly assess the impact of the proposed scheme? Is there further information which the IDB requires to properly assess the impact of the proposed scheme?
10.5	Applicant and EA	Concerns have been expressed about flooding/run-off from the proposed storage areas (e.g. Mr Herrington). Have these matters been adequately addressed?
10.6	Applicant and NFU	How have the impacts on farming irrigation systems been taken into account in the routing of the underground cables?
11.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS	
11.1	Applicant	The SEI identifies Great Yarmouth, Lowestoft and Felixstowe as candidates for the Base Port, but not Harwich as in the ES Chapter 28. Is there any further progress on identifying the preferred port(s) for construction and operation/servicing of the wind farm?
11.2	Applicant, Suffolk CC, Norfolk CC,	Given the criticism raised by Suffolk CC that the proposals set out in the ES do not adequately respond to the analysis (RR10016995 Appendix para5), is the assessment of

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
	Suffolk Coastal DC	socio-economic impacts in the region and at potential ports adequate for the purposes of issuing a DCO?
11.3	Applicant, Suffolk Coastal DC and Mid-Suffolk DC	Does the route of the onshore cable corridor affect any allocated sites in the development plan or for which planning permission has been granted?
11.4	Applicant	The potential cumulative socio-economic impacts of building of a series of offshore wind farm developments, Sizewell C and other significant developments in the region in a short period of time have been assessed from the point of view of traffic impact (SEI 3.7.3), but have other impacts such as employment and community facilities been assessed?
11.5	Applicant, Mid-Suffolk DC, Suffolk Coastal DC, Norfolk CC and Suffolk CC (also on behalf of New Anglia LEP)	The socio-economic analysis of the employment benefits has been undertaken in terms of direct and indirect employment, local skills training, etc. How will these benefits be achieved and retained in the local economy?
11.6	Applicant, Mid-Suffolk DC and Suffolk CC	The route of the onshore cable connection will impact on the site neighbouring the SITA energy from waste plant, earmarked for commercial green-housing. How is this conflict of interests being resolved?
11.7	Applicant, LAs, Suffolk CC, Norfolk CC	What socio-economic benefits will accrue to communities affected by the route of the connection and how will these be put into effect?
11.8	Applicant	Land and property other than commercial, agricultural and residential (such a graveyard extension) will be affected by the cable connection. How will such effects be mitigated?
11.9	Applicant	Some communities will experience considerable disruption and Great Bealings Parish Council has proposed that the developers establish an amenity fund. What is the

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		applicant's response to this proposal?
11.10	Applicant and LAs	Is a s106 agreement in draft to address any of the issues raised in relation to the socio-economic impacts of the development?
12.0	PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT: COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND / RIGHTS OVER LAND	
12.1	Applicant	In the light of the DCLG 'Guidance related to procedures for compulsory acquisition', paragraph 20, how can the ExA be assured that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition including modifications to the scheme) have been explored? In particular, what assessment/comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests therein in each case?
12.2	Applicant	In the light of s122(2) of the PA2008, what justification is there for seeking compulsory acquisition powers in respect of any additional land required to accommodate the East Anglia Three and East Anglia Four cable/duct corridor, as opposed to the extent of the land required to accommodate EAONE alone?
12.3	Applicant, Andrew Bond, Hayden Foster	The revised DCLG Guidance on Associated Development has recently been issued. What bearing, if any, does this have on the exercise of CA powers in respect of the wider corridor required to accommodate the East Anglia Three and Four ducts and compliance with s122 of the PA2008?
12.4	Applicant	No assessment has been made in the ES of the environmental impact that the project would have on the land needed for the EAONE scheme cable corridor only, as an alternative, compared to the impact of the full width cable/duct corridor sought to additionally accommodate East Anglia Three and East Anglia Four? Having regard to the legislative background, should this omission be of concern to the ExA?
12.5	Applicant	What is the present state of progress and intended timescales, including the scoping

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		reports, for East Anglia Three and Four?
12.6	Applicant	What evidence is there to support the conclusion that there is a reasonable prospect that East Anglia Three and Four will actually be taken forward and in what time periods?
	Applicant	To assist with the consideration of whether the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development to which the development consent will relate, please explain the following points:
12.7	Applicant	Notwithstanding the details shown on Diagram 2.5 within the ES Non-Technical summary, explain in detail why a standard working space for construction up to 55m in width required for the majority of the route?
12.8	Applicant	In relation to the revised route corridor in the vicinity of the Bealings (SEI Chapter 6, paragraph 6.2), it is noted that the standard working width of 55m for open trench technique is reduced to 25m and 15m over a short section of the turn. Why cannot similar reduced widths be adopted for the remainder of the route?
12.9	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.12, claims that an additional 20m is included in the cross-section of the land to be acquired or used (LLAU) to enable works to be carried out with the "minimum of inconvenience" to affected landowners. Explain how, in practice, this land would be used and why it is required?
12.10	Applicant	Provide a full and precise explanation as to how the anticipated permanent cable corridor width of 42m for most of its length has been calculated? Why is a permanent cable corridor of this width required to accommodate all 12 cable/ducts? What permanent corridor width would be reasonably required to accommodate the cables for EAONE only? Can this permanent corridor width for EAONE be identified by reference to the Land Plans?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
12.11	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.14, advises that it cannot yet be confirmed exactly where within the 75m corridor the cables and ducts will be laid or identify accurately where only temporary possession would be sufficient. Whilst it is noted that detailed surveys are proposed to be carried out under the powers in the Order, why cannot greater accuracy be provided at this stage?
12.12	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.15, indicates that the notices or vesting process for the acquisition of rights pursuant to Schedule F will reflect only the area over which acquisition of permanent rights is required. How can the ExA be confident that only the required area will be secured in that way?
12.13	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.17, refers to the potential for up to 33m of the 75m width of the LLAU being required only temporarily. How can the ExA be confident that no more than the required area will be permanently secured through the compulsory acquisition process?
12.14	Applicant	What, if any, discussions have taken place with the owner of the relevant Order land in respect of the land next to Waldringfield Golf Club (Plots 161, 163 and 164), with a view to minimising the impact on the camp site?
12.15	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.58, indicates that there are no other suitable alternatives to the selection of the landfall, onshore cable corridor and convertor station. Nonetheless, explain in greater detail what alternatives have been considered in the selection process and why they have been ruled out. How does this sit with any consideration of alternatives in the ES?
12.16	Applicant	The ES indicates, at Chapter 3 paragraph 89, that the routing of the Onshore Cable Route within the Preferred Onshore Cable corridor away from residences constitutes a key consideration. What regard has been had to this key consideration in the selection of the

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		route between Great Bealings and Little Bealings?
12.17	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.36, (Plots 271-291) refers to the drilling of cables under land, part of which forms the extended gardens to residential properties. Explain in detail why there is no suitable alternative area for the authorised project to access the converter station site without undertaking this part of the project along this particular route?
12.18	Applicant	Why does the cabling route need to pass through or close to the church yard extension (graveyard) of St Mary's Church? What alternatives (if any) were considered to this particular route?
12.19	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.41, indicates that Plots 416-422 comprise a wider area than would normally be the case in order to accommodate the owner's intention to develop commercial glasshouses in this area. Has a solution been agreed with the freehold owner that would accommodate this other proposed development? Given that it is acknowledged that land would appear to have been included mainly or exclusively to accommodate the greenhouses development, how does this aspect of the compulsory acquisition powers sought meet the s122 tests? What other reasonable alternatives have been considered rather than this approach?
12.20	Applicant	In the light of the likely depth of most tree roots, why is it regarded as being necessary to place a prohibition on the planting of trees within the corridor route after the cables/ducts are laid?
12.21	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.44, outlines the proposals for Plots 450-463 which comprise the areas of land required permanently for the converter station areas and associated landscaping. How, and with what degree of precision, has the extent of the land required for the onshore converter station and associated landscaping been

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		calculated?
12.22	Applicant	The ES, Volume 1, Chapter 3, paragraph 110, indicates that the Converter Station Site Boundary incorporated an area sufficient to site converter station compounds for East Anglia One and for East Anglia Three and Four. Please clarify, if necessary by reference to a plan(s), the extent of the land required permanently to accommodate the East Anglia One converter station, and distinguish that required to accommodate future projects within the East Anglia zone.
12.23	Applicant	In relation to the Statement of Reasons, paragraph 7.55, explain in further detail why it is necessary to include provisions allowing for overriding and/or extinguishing rights and covenants over the Order Land. What is the nature/extent of any delay to the Project that might otherwise result? What alternatives to this approach have been explored and what progress has been made in reaching agreement with the benefitting parties?
12.24	Applicant	What account has been taken of responses to pre-application consultation (both in relation to statutory and non-statutory consultation) in considering whether there are reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition? Where (if anywhere) are these referenced in the Statement of Reasons and/or Consultation Report?
		<i>Whether the purposes of the proposed compulsory acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</i>
12.25	Applicant	What regard has been had to the provisions of Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 to the European Convention on Human Rights?
12.26	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.49, confirms that negotiations are underway with each affected party, along the cable route and at the onshore converter station site. What is the present state of any negotiations to acquire the various land/rights in question?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
12.27	Applicant	What degree of importance can be attributed to the existing uses of the land proposed to be acquired?
12.28	Applicant	For the avoidance of doubt, what are all the factors that are regarded as constituting evidence of a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition powers sought and where (if anywhere), giving specific paragraph references, are these set out in the Statement of Reasons?
12.29	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 7.49, submits that the private interests of the relevant owners should not take precedence over the compelling public interest? What assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon those persons and their private loss that would result from the exercise of compulsory powers in each case?
12.30	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 9.5, indicates that the applicant has weighed the potential infringement of Convention rights against the potential public benefits if the Order is made. Explain more precisely the factors which have been placed in the balance (including references to any paragraphs of the relevant National Policy Statement), the weight attributed to them and how this exercise has actually been undertaken?
		<i>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</i>
12.31	Applicant	Can the ultimate holding company of Vattenfall be confirmed as Vattenfall AB?
12.32	Applicant	Explain in greater detail how, in terms of funding the costs of compulsory acquisition and compensation, the resource implications of this project have been assessed.
12.33	Applicant	The proposed cap on liability of £7,500,000 set out in the funding agreement is to be shared equally between the two companies Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd and Scottish Power UK plc. The Funding Statement, at paragraph 3.4, explains that this is based on advice received by EAOL on the likely level of compensation due to claimants for compulsory

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		acquisition of interests in the land. What is the source of that advice and what degree of reliability can be attributed to it?
12.34	Applicant	The funding agreement provides that each parent company is only liable to pay a maximum of 50% of the total estimated potential liability. Why should the parent companies not be made jointly and severally liable for the total amount thus reducing the risk to individuals that the funds will be available in the event of the failure of one of the companies concerned
12.35	Applicant	The funding agreement, clause 6.2.2(a) enables the assignment or novation of the deed by the Parent Companies to a group company of each of the parent companies. What would prevent the assignment or novation under this provision to a shell company, with no assets, provided that it was a group company of either of the Parent Companies?
12.36	Applicant	In the funding agreement, clause 6.2.2(b), provides for the assignment or novation of the deed to a person of "broadly equivalent" financial standing to the relevant Parent Company. Does "broadly equivalent" financial standing provide sufficient assurance as to the financial standing of the person, particularly given that the Parent Companies would determine what constitutes "broadly equivalent" financial standing?
12.37	Applicant	The funding agreement, clause 6.2.2(c), relies upon the consent of all the Specified Third Parties to the assignment or novation to a person who is not of broadly equivalent, or better, financial standing to the relevant Parent Company. Why is it considered that this provision is necessary and how is it envisaged that it would work in practice?
12.38	Applicant	Can the Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd and Scottish Power UK plc accounts for the year ended 31 December 2012 be provided? Where in those accounts for the year ending 31 December 2011 and (if provided) those for the year ending 31 December 2012, has provision been made for costs related to compulsory acquisition and compensation for this

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		project? If provision has not been made in those accounts has provision been made in the accounts for an earlier financial years(s), and, if so, which, or is it intended to make provision in a subsequent year(s), and, if so, which?
12.39	Applicant	Why should the loss of £3,509,000 for Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd for year ended 31 December 2010 not provide any cause for concern?
12.40	Applicant	The Directors' Report for the year ended 31 December 2011 identifies the principal financial risks for Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd as being cash flow and liquidity risk. Against that background, and the information provided by the submitted accounts, what level of confidence can there be in the financial soundness of that company?
12.41	Applicant	How is compulsory acquisition and compensation in relation to the East Anglia Three and Four schemes proposed to be funded and secured? How can the Panel be assured that those projects would be viable? Where in the provided accounts are the sums identified as necessary to meet compensations and/or blight notice claims?
		<i>The acquisition of statutory undertaker's land – s.127 of the PA2008</i>
12.42	Applicant, NRIL	The cable corridor from Bawdsey Cliffs to Bramford would cross Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd's (NRIL) East Suffolk Railway Line and Great Eastern Main Line. What is the present state of any negotiations with NRIL?
12.43	Applicant	In the light of s127 of the PA2008, explain how the HDD works can be undertaken, and the land secured and not replaced, without serious detriment to the Network Rail operation?
12.44	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 8.12, refers to operational equipment being within the order lands. Does this mean that s138, regarding statutory undertakers' rights and/or apparatus is likely to be engaged in relation to some of the plots of land included in

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		the Book of Reference? What is the present state of any discussions with statutory undertakers to resolve their concerns in this respect?
12.45	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraph 8.9, states that the cable route will be directionally drilled under the railway lines and will therefore cause "minimal" disruption to Network Rail's operations. What disruption is it anticipated will be caused? How has this been assessed giving any relevant references in the ES?
12.46	Applicant, NRIL	NRIL raises concerns as regards the protective provisions in the draft Order. Explain in more detail how these can be said to ensure that the interests of Network Rail are appropriately protected? Can they be said to be inadequate in their current form and how could they be changed to accommodate those concerns?
12.47	NRIL	What protective provisions do NRIL consider appropriate if the proposed Order were to be approved with CA powers? What protective provisions have been agreed?
12.48	Applicant, NRIL	There have been concerns expressed by NRIL as regards the detailed wording of Part 3 of Schedule K of the draft DCO. In particular: In relation to paragraph 4(1) of Part 3 of Schedule K of the draft DCO, NRIL makes the point that this paragraph traditionally addresses survey powers rather than compulsory powers in general. Why has paragraph 4(1) been drafted in this way and what, if any, objection is there to the proposed amendment of this section to refer to the powers of Article 14 (Authority to survey and investigate the land) and section 11(3) of the 1965 Act (powers of entry)?
12.49	Applicant	Should paragraph 4(4) of Part 3 of Schedule K of the draft DCO be amended to protect the position of NRIL in relation to third party land over which it has rights?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
12.50	Applicant	Does paragraph (b) of the definition of "railway property" not already cover such rights that NRIL have over third party land?
12.51	Applicant	Paragraph 4(5) of Part 3 of Schedule K of the draft DCO refers to a programme for the implementation of works to "the railway crossing". This term is not defined in paragraph 2 of Part 3 of Schedule K of the draft DCO. What problems, if any, is this clause likely to cause in practice? Should it be retained and, if so, in what form?
12.52	Applicant	Should paragraph 15(2) of Part 3 of Schedule K of the draft DCO be amended to provide that the undertaker's consent to the compromise of a claim or demand must not be unreasonable refused?
12.53	Applicant, NRIL	NRIL seeks a binding undertaking from the applicant that it will enter into appropriate ancillary agreements such as NRIL's basic asset protection agreement and property agreement including easements, rights of access and licences for temporary possession. Why is this necessary? What, if any implications, does the presence or absence of such an undertaking have for the application process?
12.54	Applicant, National Grid	National Grid Plc in its relevant representation objects to the overriding/extinguishment of their easement rights in relation to their existing equipment. It seeks various protective provisions within the draft DCO, in order to safeguard National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc and National Grid Gas Plc infrastructure and other equipment within the Draft DCO boundary and to ensure that any connections taken to their existing equipment are carried out in an approved manner. Has agreement been reached as regards the precise terms of those protective provisions? If not, what provisions are proposed and what objection is there to their incorporation within the draft DCO? What is the likelihood of s138 of the PA2008 being engaged?
12.55	National Grid	For the avoidance of doubt, what precise provisions in draft DCO does National Grid seek

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		to be excluded/included/amended and why?
12.56	Applicant, Anglian Water	It is noted that Anglian Water's assets are potentially affected by the onshore works. Has any agreement been reached on this issue and is s138 of the PA2008 likely to be engaged?
12.57	Anglian Water	What protective provisions do Anglian Water consider appropriate if the proposed Order were to be approved with CA powers? For the avoidance of doubt, what precise provisions in draft DCO does Anglian Water seek to be included or amended and why?
		<i>The acquisition of commons, open spaces etc – s.131/132 of the Act</i>
12.58	Applicant	The applicant's letter of 7 June 2013 identifies that the beach area at the landfall could be said to comprise open space land under s132 of the PA2008. The applicant envisages that s132 of the Act will apply, what evidence is there that the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government is likely to issue a certificate under s132(2)?
		<i>Crown land</i>
12.59	Applicant	The Statement of Reasons, at paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2, refer to what is being done to obtain the requisite consents of the appropriate Crown authorities in relation to Crown land. The Panel notes that discussions with the Highways Agency and/or Secretary of State for Transport are proposed and that a licence will be sought to install the cables and ducts by way of HDD under the A14. Have any such discussions commenced? In view of the provisions of s135(2) of the PA2008, could the applicant clarify when they anticipate both these consents being forthcoming and whether this is likely to be prior to the close of the examination of this application?
13.0	PRINCIPLE & FORM OF DEVELOPMENT: STATEMENTS OF COMMON GROUND	
	The applicant and relevant Interested parties below are requested to provide the following Statements of Common Ground on the topic below, wherever appropriate these may include the answers to Examining Authority's Questions above.	

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		<p>If it assists in preparation and agreement of SOCGs the ExA will accept a number of bilateral and/or separate documents, however it should be made clear to the ExA through such submissions where the same topic is treated differently between one SOCG and another, perhaps in a table.</p> <p>Where responses to questions or SOCGs require the involvement of a number of parties, submission of the information to meet required dates should not be held back because of lack of response from one or more parties. The information available at the time to meet the dates set in the Rule 8 timetable should be submitted, and work continue to seek confirmation of agreed information and areas of dispute.</p>
A.	The Applicant, Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Natural England (NE), Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB).	Habitats and Offshore Regulations Assessments , scoping, baseline information, methodology, impacts, mitigation and overall adequate information to inform any necessary Habitats and Marine Regulations Assessment:
B.	JNCC, MMO, NE, RSPB	Other Environmentally Protected Species: baseline information, methodology, impacts, mitigation and overall, adequate information to enable environmental assessment.
C.	Applicant, JNCC, MMO, NE	Inshore Fisheries: baseline information, methodology, impacts and mitigation and overall, adequate information to enable environmental assessment. Impact of each phase of the project, particularly the cable route, on inshore and offshore fishing.

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
D.	Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, Visned, Applicant, MMO, NE, JNCC	Offshore Fisheries: baseline information, methodology, impacts and mitigation and overall, adequate information to enable environmental assessment. Impact of each phase of the project, particularly the cable route, on inshore and offshore fishing.
E.	JNCC MMO NE The Environment Agency	Marine, Coastal and Physical Processes: Sediment Dynamics Waste and Debris including dredging and disposal of any consent requirements, disposal site location and definition in DCO and impacts on sea defences.
F.	The Applicant Relevant local planning authorities NE	Onshore Noise, Vibration, Electro-magnetic Field and Health Impacts: Agreement on assessment of noise impacts given representations from local authorities and noise impacts from construction and operation and their mitigation, including consideration of working hours. Health related land contamination impacts.
G.	The Applicant JNCC, MMO, NE Relevant electricity, gas and other undertakers	Offshore Noise, Vibration, Electro-magnetic Field and Health Impacts: Disturbance from construction and decommissioning vessels and equipment. Construction and decommissioning noise impacts, particularly on cod spawning. Effects on National Grid electricity and gas infrastructure. The impact of electro-magnetic fields including human receptors offshore. Health and safety of offshore construction and operational personnel.
H.	The Applicant Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA), Dutch Government, MMO, Relevant Port Authorities and Shipping Operators,	Operational and Navigational Safety: Agreement on adequacy of the Environmental Statement for assessing navigational risk. The location, extent and justification for safety zones during construction and operation; and the consequences for shipping lanes, in view of representations for example; from the Dutch Government. Obstruction and interference with shipping and marine navigation. Obstruction and interference with civil EAONE and other wind farms in the East Anglia zone, including the potential Galloper Wind farm. Cable route in relation to telecommunications cables and connections to the Greater Gabbard and potential Galloper windfarms. Navigation to and from East Anglian ports for recreational craft. Navigation risk associated with rock transshipment. Emergency plans and

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
	The Ministry of Defence	procedures; human health and safety. Lighting/aids to Navigation as provided for in the DCO.
I.	The Applicant, English Heritage, Relevant local planning, authorities, Owners of Bawdsey Manor (ICS Education) and relevant landowners	Offshore and Onshore Heritage and Built Environment: Agreement on the adequacy of the Heritage Impact Assessment including archaeological investigation given the representations made by English Heritage. The assessment of the Marine Historic Environment. The significant features of the onshore heritage assets potentially affected and the significance of marine heritage potentially affected. Impact of cable drilling on cliff stability. Effects of drilling, trenching and any land shrinkage on any heritage assets. Alternative assessment and consenting processes for crossing watercourses where HDD proves unsuccessful and trenched material requires stockpiling.
J.	The Applicant English Heritage Relevant local planning authorities Design Council Cabe ¹	Landscape, Seascape, Visual Impacts and Design: Impact of the scheme on the landscape, including within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Special Landscape Area and the proposed mitigation. Stability of soils along the cable route and impacts of HDD and trenching. Effects of drilling on protected and veteran trees and hedgerows. The effects of drilling beneath the Deben Estuary. Visual impact of the Bramford converter substation including building heights. The effects of onshore lighting during construction. The adequacy of DCO provisions for the design and the phasing of the construction of the wind farm. The need for design drawings for and the adequacy of assessment of the proposed above ground onshore works. The adequacy of consenting and appeal arrangements in the DCO for above ground onshore works. Including: i. whether there is agreement on the baseline information and methodology and relevant landscape related Development Plan policies that should be taken into account in the terms described in NPS EN-1.

¹ The Design Council Cabe are not currently an Interested Party however the Examining Authority has invited its representatives to the Preliminary Meeting.

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		<p>ii. agreement and/or disagreement on impacts and their mitigation.</p> <p>iii. the good design principles that should apply to the design of the: Onshore Converter Station and any other above ground structures (operational phase) Public land proposed to be restored following installation of the onshore cable corridor Offshore Wind Farm</p> <p>iv. Onshore Converter Station: the principal parameters for this development that should be stated in and secured by the DCO</p>
K.	The Applicant, Relevant local planning and highways and street authorities	Highways and Traffic: The adequacy of the traffic data in the Environmental Statement. Impacts on pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and other road users. Mitigation through the Access Management Scheme, Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan. The traffic management and working arrangements. The impact on other Public Rights of Way.
L.	The Applicant, Environment Agency, Relevant Drainage Boards, Relevant local planning and highways authorities, water undert'rs	Drainage and Water Supply: Protection of waste water and potable water pipelines. Risk of flooding (especially at the converter substation). Contaminated land (Tuddenham). Potential land shrinkage and Effect on field drainage including effects on land at Bawdsey Manor. Effect on private water supplies.
M.	The Applicant, Relevant local planning and highways	Socio-economic Effects: Identification of preferred port(s) for construction and operations work, supply chain and any associated infrastructure constraints. Adequacy of socio-economic impact assessment prior to identification of any port. Any sites allocated for development in the development plan, or for which planning permission has been

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
	authorities, Relevant port authorities, Relevant land owners	granted which may be affected. The cumulative impact with Sizewell. Extent of benefits through direct and indirect employment, local skills training and development. The impact on tourism and local recreational users. Direct and indirect effects on land and property including potential graveyard extension.
N.	The Applicant Relevant local authorities The Environment Agency	Compulsory Powers – Onshore Powers: Independently from any planning case relating to NPS policy, whether the full extent of the proposed 75m wide cable corridor (and the full extent of all other plots) is required for the proposed authorised works. Other compulsory powers on streets and to make temporary use of land.
O.	The Applicant Relevant statutory undertakers	Compulsory Powers – Statutory Undertakers’ Land/Apparatus: Whether any statutory undertakers land may be acquired/apparatus removed in view of the provisions of s127 and s138 of the Planning Act 2008.
P.	Relevant land owners	Compulsory Powers – Common Land or Open Space or Fuel or Field Garden: Whether any such land may be acquired in view of the provisions of s131 and s132 of the Planning Act 2008.
14.0	THE FORM OF DEVELOPMENT AS PROVIDED FOR IN THE DRAFT DCO & PLANS/DOCUMENTS <i>NB. Where appropriate Interested parties are requested to provide answers in the form of any proposed amendments to the DCO.</i>	
		The applicant is requested to provide its proposed revisions to the draft DCO (including any prompted by the questions below) in the form of a word tracked change form of the application version of the draft DCO.
		<i>Plans and drawings</i>
14.1		The applicant is requested to provide proposed plans and elevations of kiosks and of any other proposed above ground structures that would be authorised by the draft associated

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		works in the current DCO at a scale of 1:50 if under 10metres in height and at a scale of 1:100 if structures would exceed this height). These drawings should show materials appearance and colours. If their design cannot be finalised at this stage and thus such drawings are not proposed to become certified the applicant is requested to provide its suggested amendments to the DCO to secure the proper control and authorisation of the detailed design of such structures by the local planning authority.
14.2		The applicant is requested to suggest and the local planning authorities to comment upon whether layout, approximate locations of buildings, routes, open spaces, scale (i.e. upper and lower limits for height, width and length of buildings) and points of access should be determined as part of the current DCO application as they would normally be in an application for outline planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
		Article 2 Interpretation
14.3		Does the applicant wish to suggest an interpretation of “maintain” similar to that used in the Galloper Wind Farm Order 2013 made on 24 May 2013? If reconstruction and replacement of wind turbine generators and other structures during operation has been assessed where is this recorded in the ES?
14.4		What is meant by “stage” of the development for example in Requirement 25 given there is no interpretation in Article 2 of the term. Does the applicant wish to propose a definition of the word stage (see below question related to DML Condition 9(1)(b)).
		Article 13 Discharge of Water
14.5	Environment Agency and Water Undertakers	With regard to Article 13 in the draft DCO are the water undertakers and Environment Agency content with its provisions?
14.6	Applicant	Is the applicant confident that the works do not require the placing of structures or obstructions in any watercourse as controlled by the Water Resources and Land Drainage

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		Acts of 1991, respectively? If the applicant intends to rely on separate consents for these what is the likelihood of them being granted?
		Article 24(1)(b) Powers of Acquisition
14.7	Applicant	In relation to the power to remove any buildings and vegetation from the land - what building(s), if any, is it envisaged will be removed in connection with the carrying out of the project?
		Article 24(3) Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised project
14.8	Applicant	Why is it necessary to remain in possession for the period of one year beginning with the date of completion of the part of the authorised project specified in relation to that land? Could a lesser period be substituted?
		Part 1 of Schedule A Authorised Development
14.9	Applicant	Does the wording in relation to the further associated development (a) to (g) and the preceding paragraph in the draft DCO ensure that only such associated development as is authorised under Requirements may be carried out?
14.10	Applicant	How would the above ground kiosks proposed at jointing bays and fibre optic link boxes referred to in paragraph 183 of Chapter 29 of the ES and further associated development (c) in Part 1 of Schedule A of the draft DCO be authorised, and under which requirement (if any)? How would their size and design be controlled?
14.11	Applicant	Would all fencing and means of enclosure works as authorised by further associated development (f) be subject to Requirement 22 in the draft DCO?
14.12	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm that its proposed DCO would authorise works which would export electricity from the wind turbine generators to the high voltage alternating current collector stations and thence to high voltage direct current offshore converter stations

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		from which it would be transmitted to the onshore converter station at Bramford?
14.13	Applicant	Is it intended that the Order should be flexible enough to allow the transmission of electricity to Bramford in alternating current?
14.14	Applicant	If electricity was transmitted from the wind turbine generators to Bramford in alternating current what balancing stations and/or compounds would be required and where would they require to be located?
14.15	Applicant	Is it intended that any structures should be located in the offshore cable corridor between the site of the proposed wind farm and the shore?
14.16	Applicant	On the assumption that the ES has not assessed the impacts of erecting structures in the offshore cable corridor would the draft DCO nonetheless authorise such works given that the only requirement is that they be within the Order Limits? If not how would works such as wind turbine generators and/or stations be excluded from the offshore cable corridor?
		<i>Requirement 1 Interpretation</i>
14.17	Applicant	Does the applicant wish to suggest an interpretation of the words "sea leave" as used in Requirement 7? Is it necessary to set out interpretations so many times in the draft DCO, could not the contents of the Interpretation paragraph at the start of Part 3 of Schedule A (Requirements) be listed within Article 2?
		<i>Requirement 18 Detailed Design Approval Onshore</i>
14.18	Applicant and Mid-Suffolk District Council	Should the decisions of the local planning authority be constrained to accord with the Design and Access Statement, as referred to in Requirement 18(2) of the draft DCO and if so with which aspects of this document? Is it sufficiently clear and precise to refer to the "principles" of the design and access statement?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
14.19	Applicant	What drawings/plans are proposed to be covered by the term "authorised plans" in Requirement 18 in the draft DCO, given that the usual DCO term would be plans and documents certified under Article 33, and that this phrase does not appear to be defined anywhere in the draft DCO?
14.20	Local authorities and applicant	What parameters of the proposed Onshore Converter Station development is it considered should be authorised in the DCO and what parameters and matters should be determined by the local planning authority through Requirement 18?
14.21	Local Authorities, English Heritage, National Trust	Work Plan (Document 3.2) Sheet 30 provides no information on buildings to be erected at the Onshore Converter Station development/as part of proposed Work 39. Location Plan (Document 2.1) Sheet 30 provides only an "indicative" outline of the proposed buildings and does not identify nearby sensitive receptors. The parameters in draft Requirement 18 whilst limiting the proposed buildings at Work No. 39 to a footprint of 130x85m and a building height above floor level of up to 25m, does not specify how many buildings there would be or the layout of the buildings on the site. Given the significance of the Onshore Converter Station to the development what is the reason for excluding these parameters?
14.22	Local Authorities, Applicant	What is the existing ground level above ordnance datum on the site of the proposed onshore converter station (Work No 39) and where is this specified in order to give meaning to the parameter in draft Requirement 18(5)?
14.23	Applicant	Is the floor level referred to in draft Requirement 18(3) intended to be the level of a ground floor storey? Would there be any upper floors level and would the maximum height be measured from the upper or the lower floor levels?
14.24	Applicant	The applicant is therefore requested to provide a revised location plan or a site plan at a scale of 1:2500 (or similar) extending over an AO sized sheet of paper as necessary showing the proposed parameters to be authorised for the Onshore Converter Station.

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
14.25	Applicant	Were the draft DCO to be made does the applicant envisage that by virtue of Part 1 of Schedule A (proposed authorised works) and Requirement 18(1) that it would be empowered to construct the Onshore Converter Substation without recourse to the local planning authority? If not why does the draft requirement limit the information to be supplied to the local planning authority to details of the development <i>"so far as it does not accord with the authorised plans"</i> ? Should these words be deleted and does the applicant wish to propose this?
14.26	Applicant	How would a decision maker in relation to Requirement 18(2) (either Ipswich Borough Council or the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on appeal under s78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) determine whether works were in accordance with the Design and Access Statement? Which parts of the Design and Access Statement provide clear parameters for the development?
14.27	Applicant	Does requirement 18(8) need amendment in the light of the proposed change at the Bealings to a different non-HDD drilling technique?
		<i>Requirements 19 & 20 Landscaping</i>
14.28	Suffolk Coastal and Mid-Suffolk District Councils	Do the relevant local planning authorities believe that Requirements 19 and 20 meet the tests in circular 11/95 relating to conditions of planning permission, as required by NPS EN-1?
14.29	Suffolk Coastal and Mid-Suffolk District Councils	Are the provisions in Requirement 20 that the landscaping scheme and associated work programme shall accord with the landscape strategy (Application Document 9.5) sufficient to secure adequate landscaping of the proposed development?
14.30	Applicant	It would seem that the reference in requirement 20 should be to requirement 19, not 21. Is it agreed that requirement 20(1) should be amended in this respect?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		<i>Requirement 25 Archaeology</i>
14.31	Applicant and English Heritage	In view of the representation from English Heritage regarding involving archaeologists and agreeing objectives for monitoring, what amendments in what wording, are required to draft requirement 25 (or to other parts of the DCO)?
14.32	Suffolk County Council and English Heritage	Are there key features of the onshore written scheme of archaeological investigation, for example the extent of proposed field walking surveys, that are not referred to in draft Requirement 25 which need to be?
14.33	Suffolk County Council, Applicant and English Heritage	Given the significance of the choice between extensive pre-construction trial trenching in advance of construction and an archaeological controlled strip during the construction phase why should this matter not be secured in any recommended Order?
		<i>Requirement 22(4) Fencing and other means of enclosure</i>
14.34	Applicant	Should this also require the permanent fencing to be thereafter maintained?
		<i>Requirement 27 Code of Construction practice</i>
14.35	Applicant	The reference to " <i>any other matters the relevant planning authority reasonably requires</i> " seems unduly vague. Can this aspect of the requirement be drafted with greater precision?
		<i>Requirement 28 External lighting and control of artificial light emissions</i>
14.36	Applicant and local authorities	Requirement 28(2) relates to the mitigation of artificial light emission in respect of the onshore converter station. But what about the control of light emissions on other sections of the route that are of concern to local residents? Is the safeguard provided by requirement 28(1) considered to be sufficient in this respect even though it does not include reference to a scheme for the management and mitigation of artificial light emissions?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		<i>Requirement 30 Construction hours</i>
14.37	Applicant	Can these hours/days of working be regarded as reasonable in locations where residential properties are in proximity to the construction works? What are the operational implications of any reduction in the proposed hours/days of working? Why is it necessary to include the exceptions (a) to (e)? Is exception (a) unduly vague and unenforceable? Who is to decide whether continued periods of operation are required? Is the reference to " <i>unless otherwise agreed in writing with the relevant planning authority</i> " compliant with Circular 11/95 guidance? Does the case of <i>R (Warley) v Wealden DC [2011] EWHC 2083 (Admin)</i> concerning the validity of planning conditions that purport to allow a developer to apply informally under condition to the LPA in order to vary the restrictions of the condition have any implications for this aspect of the requirement?
		<i>Requirement 34 Restoration of land used temporarily for construction</i>
14.38	Applicant	This requirement refers to " <i>such condition as the relevant planning authority may approve</i> " – Is this aspect of the requirement unduly vague and unenforceable?
		<i>Schedule 1: DML Conditions</i>
14.39	MMO	Does draft licensed marine activity 2(2) need to be limited in terms of the quantity of cable armouring or other materials to be deposited and/or by reference to draft condition 9(1)(e) and/or the relevant paragraphs of the ES?
		<i>Draft Condition 9 (1)</i>
14.40	Applicant, English Heritage MMO	Would the buffer zones referred to in this draft condition give effect to the archaeological exclusions zones referred to in the ES? Should English Heritage be consulted by the MMO prior to the discharge of condition 9(1)(a)?
14.41		Is the applicant content to provide exclusion zones of 100m around historic wrecks and around A1 and A3 receptors referred to in paragraphs 28, 77 and 81 of Chapter 17 of the ES?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
14.42	English Heritage	Is EH content that the draft DCO would secure archaeological exclusion zones around all wrecks that merit them? Are non-metallic wrecks (eg. WA ID 70611) likely to be of more archaeological significance and should this be reflected in the levels of protection provided?
14.43	MMO, MCA, CABE and applicant	On the basis that the phasing of the development will be a significant aspect of its safe and functional design (in the terms described as good design in NPS EN-1) should the construction and monitoring programme to be provided to the MMO under Condition 9(1)(b) include the setting out of the main stages of the development? Should these stages be shown on the layout plan under DML Condition 9(12)(a)?
14.44	Applicant, Maritime and Coastguard Agency, MMO	Will the plan referred to in draft Condition 9(1)(a) once received and/or consented, be available for public inspection/will it be effective in keeping public and other bodies aware of the planned stages of the development of the wind farm, the locations of these in the sea and any changes to this programme?
14.45	English Heritage, MMO and Applicant	Should the MMO be required to consult English Heritage prior to the discharge of draft condition 9(1)(h) – the written scheme of archaeological investigation? Are there any key features of the scheme which need to be referred to which are not already referred to in draft condition 9(1)(h)? Is it intended that draft Condition 10(1) should refer to written schemes of archaeological investigation set out in draft Condition 9(h)?
14.46	Applicant, English Heritage?	Is it intended that the commitment that “industry staff will be offered guidance and advice” (in paragraph 36 of chapter 17 of the ES) should be secured in some way by draft condition 9(1)(h) or elsewhere in the DML/Order?
14.47	English Heritage, Applicant, Natural England	Are there key mitigation measures that any Environmental Management Plan should contain which should at this stage be specified in draft Condition 9(1)(d) (which are not already specified), if so what are they and what wording would be proposed for their

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		inclusion in any recommended Order? For example how would observation as appropriate, of the terms of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 be secured?
14.48	Applicant	The applicant is requested to provide a draft Environmental Management Plan as referred to in paragraph 33 of chapter 17 of the ES and in draft condition 9(1)(d).
14.49	Applicant	Are exclusion zones proposed beside the Explosives Dumping Ground, around the gas pipeline or in relation to areas 1610, 1630 and 1631 (all as shown on the Works Plan) or in relation to any other features or shipping areas and how will these be secured by the DCO and/or on the plan required by draft DML condition 9(1)(a)?
14.50	Applicant	In volume 3 Figure 17.3 the size of wrecks/exclusions zones is small and difficult to see. Can the applicant confirm that the wrecks are shown on this map surrounded by proposed archaeological exclusion zones, for example is wreck WA ID 73078 (HMS Arethusa lost in 1916 Volume 16 Chapter 17 of the ES) shown with an archaeological exclusion zone around it and how would the imposition of archaeological exclusion zones be secured by the DCO, does the applicant wish to suggest an amendment to DML draft condition 9(1)(a) such that the plan would show all archaeological and all and any other exclusions zones?
14.51	MMO	Is the MMO content that draft conditions 15, 16 and 17 cover the necessary matters and are sufficiently precise and enforceable?
14.52	Applicant, English Heritage	Are any amendments required to draft Requirement 17 to secure a reassessment of archaeological and historic baseline information prior to decommissioning?
15.0	OTHER CONSENTS	
15.1	Applicant	The applicant states in Section 24 of the Application Form that a Coast Station Radio Licence from the Radio Communications Agency will be required. What evidence can be provided that this licence can be expected to be obtained?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
15.2	Applicant	The applicant states in Section 24 of the Application Form and in Document 6.5 that an Energy Generation Licence will be required and has been applied for. What evidence can be provided that this licence can be expected to be obtained?
15.3	Applicant	The applicant states in Section 24 of the Application Form and in Document 6.5 that Building Regulations Consent may be required. For which buildings would Building Regulations Consent be required and if any proposed buildings would be exempt under which part of which Regulation of the Building Regulations would they be exempt? Are any relaxations likely to be necessary with regard to Building Regulations approval and if so what evidence can be provided that they would be granted?
15.4	Applicant	The applicant states in Section 24 of the Application Form and in Document 6.5 that an Environmental Permit for water discharge or waste operations may be necessary. Which of these would be necessary and for what operations? What evidence can be provided that such permits can be expected to be obtained?
15.5	Applicant	The applicant states in Section 24 of the Application Form and in Document 6.5 that a Flood Defence Consent will be required. For what operations will this be needed and what evidence can be provided that this can be expected to be obtained?
15.6	Applicant	The applicant states in Section 24 of the Application Form and in Document 6.5 that a Land Drainage Consent will be required. For what operations will this be needed and what evidence can be provided that this can be expected to be obtained?
15.7	Applicant	The applicant refers in Section 24 of the Application Form to permanent culverts over drains/watercourses. Why would the draft DCO not empower the undertaker to carry out such work?
15.8	Applicant	The applicant refers in Section 24 of the Application Form to the need for future consents

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
		for structures in, under or over a main river and for structures in watercourses. What evidence can be provided that this can be expected to be obtained?
15.9	Applicant	The applicant refers in Section 24 of the Application Form to the need for future Road Traffic Orders. Why would any necessary closure of a public highway not be possible under powers within the draft DCO? If such Orders became necessary what evidence can be provided that they could be made?
15.10	Applicant	The applicant refers in Section 24 of the Application Form to the need for consent for Waste Production. Why would this be separate from environmental Permits referred to above? What evidence can be provided that if required this can be expected to be obtained?
15.11	Applicant and all Fishing and Shipping Interested parties	<p>The applicant states in Section 24 of the Application Form and in the Safety Zone Statement (Document 1.2) that an application for a Safety Zone under the Energy Act 2006 will be required.</p> <p>The applicant is asked to provide any comments received from DECC and/or the Maritime and Coastguard Agency on the proposed Safety Zones showing how the applicant has these into account?</p>
15.12	Applicant and all Fishing and Shipping Interested parties	The applicant and all Interested parties concerned with fishing, shipping and navigation are asked whether the proposed extent for safety zones (50m during operation and 500m during construction and maintenance etc) are appropriate with regard to the need to consider safety in the context of the potential socio-economic impacts on shipping and fishing?

No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
15.13	Applicant and all Fishing and Shipping Interested parties	The applicant is asked to provide any comments received from DECC and/or the Maritime and Coastguard Agency on the proposed Safety Zones showing how the applicant has these into account?
15.14	Applicant	It is noted that application document 6.5 provides a list of other consents that would be required, separately from the list provided on the application form. Does the list in document 6.5 refer to any consents not listed on the application form and if so, what evidence can be provided that they are likely to be granted?

Advice may be given about applying for an order granting development consent or making representations about an application (or a proposed application). This communication does not however constitute legal advice upon which you can rely and you should obtain your own legal advice and professional advice as required.

A record of the advice which is provided will be recorded on the Planning Inspectorate website together with the name of the person or organisation who asked for the advice. The privacy of any other personal information will be protected in accordance with our Information Charter which you should view before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.