

East Anglia THREE

Appendix 40

Phase III Formal Consultee Responses

Consultation Report

Document Reference – 5.2 (40)

Author – Royal HaskoningDHV
East Anglia THREE Limited
Date – November 2015
Revision History – Revision A



This Page Is Intentionally Blank

Table of Contents

40	Phase III Phase III Formal Consultee Responses	1
40.1	Introduction	1
40.2	Table 40.1 Statutory consultee responses	2
40.3	Table 40.2 Non Statutory consultee responses	41
40.4	Table 40.3 Public responses	51

40 PHASE III PHASE III FORMAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES

40.1 Introduction

1. This appendix contains individual written responses to consultation undertaken during statutory Section 42 consultation period Phase III: 19th June 2015 to 23rd July 2015. Each response has been divided into separate points so that EATL can demonstrate how each point has been addressed within the application, or will be addressed post application.
2. It should be noted that all comments that directly relate to the topics discussed in chapters 7 to 29 of the East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement have been included within each of the relevant chapters and detailed responses on how the comments have been addressed are also provided. A table near the front of each chapter either provides a response or refers the reader to where in the application documents the comment has been addressed.
3. It should also be noted that all names of individuals have been removed from this appendix and replaced with a unique identification number which is consistent throughout the Consultation Report and its appendices. In order to achieve this, some of the detail in *Table 40.3* has been removed.

40.2 Table 40.1 Statutory consultee responses

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Environment and Planning	16/06/15	Letter	General	Reference: Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008, Further Consultation on the East Anglia THREE Offshore Windfarm Project. I refer to your letter relating to the above consultation received on 15 June 2015. I can confirm that we have No Comment to make regarding the above.	No action required
Equality and Human Rights Commission	20/06/15	Email	General	The Commission receives many notices and requests to comment on planning issues. We do not have the resources to respond to all, and it is not our practice to respond to consultations on major infrastructure projects. Therefore, we would request you do not send us further information on this project, unless there is a clear and specific equality and human rights concern you wish to raise (for example, impact on minority communities such as BME groups, or on accessibility for disabled people) where we may be able to add value. If you do send anything further in relation to this matter, please do so via email, rather than in hard copy, to: correspondence@equalityhumanrights.com	No further consultation with the Equality and Human Rights Commission unless relevant.
Anglian Water	24/06/15	Email	Water Resource and Flood Risk and DCO	Having considered the Phase III Report(Consultation), it is noted that cable ducts being installed during the construction of East Anglia ONE removes the need for HDD or open trenching and substantially limits the amount of construction work'. 'The DCO for the East Anglia ONE project includes cable ducts for further projects planned to connect to the grid at Bramford in Suffolk. Therefore, there is now a commitment from EAOL that the ducts from the proposed East Anglia THREE project will be installed at the same time as the cables are laid for East Anglia ONE' With this in mind, AW would require the same protection measures as stipulated in the DCO for the East Anglia ONE	Potential impacts to utilities are addressed within Chapter 22 Land Use.

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				project unless you advise of any additional potential impact project THREE may have on Anglian Water.	
JNCC	24/06/15	Email	NA	I have been advised by our communications team that we did receive your consultation pack, however this consultation is out of JNCC's remit and I have been notified that Natural England will be responding accordingly.	No action required
Department for Energy and Climate Change	29/06/15	Email	NA	Please note that the Department for Energy and Climate Change will be the decision-taker for the proposed East Anglia THREE project. It is not appropriate, therefore, for the Department to provide comments on the proposal during the consultation phase of the Planning Act process (nor any subsequent phases of that process). I should be grateful, therefore, if you would remove Giles Scott's name from the list of consultees for the project. Thanks.	No further Consultation with DECC.
Associated British Ports	29/06/15	Email	NA	Can you send me the navigational co-ordinates (Lat & Long) of the boundaries for the EA Three project.	Coordinates are provided in the final application documents.
GTC Pipelines Limited	30/06/15	Email	Land Use	With reference to above I can confirm that the following have no comments to make at this moment in time: Independent Power Networks Limited, Independent Pipelines Limited, GTC Pipelines Limited, The Electricity Network Company Limited, Quadrant Pipelines PLC.	None
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	06/07/15	Letter	NA	Thank you for your letter on the 12th June 2015 regarding the proposed East Anglia THREE Offshore Windfarm Project. We note that a number of changes have been made to the project proposals since the earlier round of consultation in May 2014 but these do not change our earlier advice, which is repeated below.	None
HSE	06/07/15	Letter	NA	HSE's land use planning advice. Will the proposed project fall within any of HSE's consultation distances? The East Anglia THREE converter station does not fall within the consultation	EATL have consulted with National Grid Under Section 42 and impacts to National Grid assets are assessed in East Anglia THREE Environmental

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				zones (CZs) of hazardous installations or major accident hazard pipelines (MAHPs). The proposed onshore electrical transmission works and access could fall within the CZs of the following MAHPs. The OS National Grid references given are an approximation of where this may occur: The inner, middle and outer Czs of the Bramford/langham MAHP operated by National Grid Gas PLC (HSE Ref: 7424 / TRANSCO Ref: 1683) at Grid Ref: TM 10932 47295; The inner, middle and outer CZs of the Bredfield/ Bramford MAHP operated by National Grid Gas PLC (HSE Ref: 7423 / TRANSCO Ref: 1682) at Grid Refs: TM 15275 48446, TM 17751 48944 and TM 18857 49280; The inner, middle and outer CZs of the Great Bealings/Playford road MAHP operated by National Grid Gas PLC (HSE Ref:7431 / TRANSCO Ref: 1690) at Grid Ref: TM 22794 48427; The inner, middle and outer CZs of the Martlesham/Trimley MAHP operated by National Grid Gas PLC (HSE Ref: 7433 / TRANSCO Ref: 1692) at Grid refs: TM 25456 47752, TM 27445 44092 and TM 27962 41018.	Statement Volume I Chapter 22 Land Use.
HSE	06/07/15	Letter	Land Use	HSE recommends that the applicants contacts National Grid to discuss the proposed location and scope of works and how MAHPs may be affected. National Grid will also be able to provide up to date information on pipeline location.	EATL and EAOW have engaged with National Grid throughout the application period, both through the formal Section 42 process and informally and will continue to do so post submission.
HSE	06/07/15	Letter	Shipping and Navigation	The proposed East Anglia THREE Offshore Windfarm development does not impinge on the separation distances of any licensed site in the vicinity of the application. However, Felixstowe Port might object to this development if the wind farm interferes with the shipping route.	None required
HSE	06/07/15	Letter	Land Use	Electrical Safety. The project involves connections to electrical power distribution systems and has an impact on the existing generation, transmission and distribution assets on the UK	The East Anglia THREE Health Impact Review discusses the potential impacts of the project on

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				mainland. In the light of that, HSE offers the following comments: As well as satisfying general health and safety legislation (ie the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 and supporting regulations), the proposed design and future operations must comply with the Electricity at Work Regulations 1989 and the Electricity, Safety, Continuity and Quality Regulations 2002 as amended. Generators, distributors, their contractors and others have defined duties in order to protect members of the public from the dangers posed by the electrical equipment used. HSE enforces the safety aspects of these regulations. If you have any doubts about the particular application of these regulations in terms of either the operation or construction of generators, substations, overhead lines or underground cables please contact Mr J C Steed, Principle Specialist Electrical Inspector, either at john.steed@hse.gsi.gov.uk or Rose Court GSW, 2 Southwark Bridge Road, London, SE1 9HS.	health and Safety.
The Danish Nature Agency	08/07/15	Email	NA	The Danish Nature Agency (Sections Nature Planning and Forest and Water Management Plans and the Marine Environment) has no comments.	None
Civil Aviation Authority	08/07/15	Email	Aviation and MoD	Thank you for your letter dated 12 June 15 concerning the East Anglia Three Phase 3 Report (Consultation) which was also included with your letter. Having read the report, the CAA note that page 25 of the Phase 3 Report indicates that your potential changes should not impact Aviation. Accordingly, the CAA have no additional comments at this time.	No action required.
Civil Aviation Authority	08/07/15	Email	Aviation and MoD	I also note your prospective DCO submission date of November 2015 - the CAA will therefore comment formally on the ES when requested by the Planning Authority in due course.	Noted.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	Land Use	National Grid Electricity Transmission has a number of high voltage electricity overhead transmission lines which lie within	Noted and impacts to National Grid assets are assessed in the East Anglia THREE Environmental

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				or in close proximity to the proposed order limits. These lines form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales and include the following: 4ZW 400kV Bramford-Sizewell 1, Bramford-Sizewell 4, 4ZX 400kV Bramford-Sizewell 3, Bramford-Sizewell 2, 4YM 400kV Bramford-Norwich1, Bramford-Norwich 2. 4YL 400KV Bramford- Pelham, Braintree-Bramford-Rayleigh.	Statement Volume I Chapter 22 Land Use.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	There are no underground electricity transmission cables located within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits.	No action required
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	I enclose plans showing the routes of our overhead lines and the location of our substation within the area shown in the consultation. The following points should be taken into consideration: National Grid's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset.	Noted and included within the in East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement Volume I Chapter 22 Land Use.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for “overhead line clearances Issue 3 (2004) available at: http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/LandandDevelopment/DDC/devnearohl_final/appendixIII/applIII-part2	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances. Further guidance on development near electricity transmission overhead lines is	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project.

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				available here: http://www.nationalgrid.com/NR/rdonlyres/1E990EE5-D068-4DD6-8C9A-4D0B06A1BA79/31436/Developmentnearoverheadlines1.pdf	
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum "sag" and "swing" and overhead line profile (maximum "sag" and "swing") drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of support") drawings can be obtained using the contact details above	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	There are no National Grid Gas Transmission assets located within the proposed order limits.	No Action Required
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	In addition, National Grid has the following gas distribution	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				assets located within or in close proximity to the proposed order limits: High or Intermediate pressure (above 2 bar) Gas Pipelines and associated equipment, Medium pressure, Low pressure. I enclose plans showing our Gas Distribution assets within the area shown in the consultation documents.	the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Specific Comments- Gas Infrastructure. The Following points should be taken into consideration:National Grid has a Deed of Grant of Easement for each pipeline, which prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures, change to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings: Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at previously agreed locations.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings:The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings: The type of raft shall be agreed with National Grid prior to installation	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings:No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the National Grid pipeline without the prior permission of National Grid.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings: National Grid will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings:The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to National Grid.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings:Please be aware that written permission is required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings: A National Grid representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with National Grid specification T/SP/SSW22	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Pipeline Crossings:A Deed of Consent is required for any crossing of the easement	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Cable Crossing:Cables may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Cable Crossing:A National Grid representative shall supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Cable Crossing:Clearance must be at least 600mm above or below the pipeline.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Cable Crossing:Impact protection slab should be laid between the cable and pipeline if cable crossing is above the pipeline.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Cable Crossing:A Deed of Consent is required for any cable crossing the easement	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Cable Crossing:Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	General Notes on Pipeline Safety:You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and National Grid's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Grid High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties T/SP/SSW22.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	General Notes on Pipeline Safety:National Grid will also need	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				to ensure that our pipelines access is maintained during and after construction.	the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	General Notes on Pipeline Safety:Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a National Grid representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	General Notes on Pipeline Safety:If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of National Grid High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a National Grid representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	General Notes on Pipeline Safety:Excavation works may take place unsupervised no closer than 3 metres from the pipeline once the actual depth and position has been confirmed on site under the supervision of a National Grid representative. Similarly, excavation with hand held power tools is not permitted within 1.5 metres from our apparatus and the work is undertaken with NG supervision and guidance.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	We would request that the potential impact of the proposed scheme on National Grid's existing assets as set out above and including any proposed diversions is considered in any subsequent reports, including in the Environmental Statement, and as part of any subsequent application.	Impacts to National Grid assets are assessed in the East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement Volume I Chapter 22 Land Use.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Where any diversion of apparatus may be required to facilitate	EATL have produced an Outline Traffic Management

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				a scheme, National Grid is unable to give any certainty with the regard to the feasibility of any proposed diversions until such time as adequate conceptual design studies have been undertaken by National Grid. It is essential that such conceptual design studies are completed in advance of the DCO application being submitted. The powers and land interest/rights for the diversion of National Grid's apparatus must be included within the DCO application. Further information relating to this can be obtained by contacting the email address below.	Plan which sets out the standards and procedures for managing the impact of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic during the construction period, including localised road improvements necessary to facilitate the safe use of the existing road network.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	Where the promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of National Grid apparatus, whether resulting in extinguishment or diversion and/or within public highway or third party land, protective provisions will be required in a form acceptable to it to be included within the DCO.	The draft DCO doc ref 3.1 (submitted as part of this application) includes such provisions
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	National Grid requests to be consulted at the earliest stages to ensure that the most appropriate protective provisions are included within the DCO application to safeguard the integrity or re-provision of our apparatus and to remove the requirement for objection. All consultations should be sent to the following: box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com as well as by post (address was provided)	EATL and EAOW have consulted with National Grid throughout the application process and will continue to do so post application.
National Grid	13/07/15	Letter	NA	In order to respond at the earliest opportunity National Grid will require the following: Draft DCO including the Book of Reference and relevant Land Plans, Shape Files or CAD Files for the order limits	These will be provided at the submission stage.
The Environment Agency	14/07/15	Email	Water Resource and Flood Risk	Thank you for consulting us on the proposed changes to this project. We note the removal of the open trenching scenario for installation of the scheme's onshore export cables, due to the commitment to install ducting for this project during the	No action required

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				construction of East Anglia ONE. This will mostly remove the need for intrusive works to facilitate watercourse crossings, which was previously a key area of concern for us.	
The Environment Agency	14/07/15	Email	Water Resource and Flood Risk	In our response to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), dated 8 July 2014, we highlighted the Flood Defence Consent (FDC) requirements associated with the works. Crossing watercourses by pulling cables through pre-installed ducts under the bed is unlikely to specifically require FDC, providing there are no physical impacts on the waterbody. However, any works to facilitate this operation (or for any other purpose) which take place within the bye-law distance for Main Rivers (currently 9m from the top of the bank or toe of any defence), will require formal FDC. Please also be aware that proposals to amend the bye-law distance to 8m or 16m for tidally influenced watercourses are currently being considered, and may be in place by the time the scheme is due to be constructed.	The requirement for FDC is discussed in East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement Volume I Chapter 21 Water Resource and Flood Risk and the accompanying appendices.
The Environment Agency	14/07/15	Email	Water Resource and Flood Risk	We also note the relative increase in spoil to be removed from the site as a result of the phasing option. We welcome the recognition that this may require changes to the flood risk assessment. Our previous response (8 July 2014), discussed some of the implications of storing spoil in the floodplain. Regard should be given to those comments.	The difference in flood risk between a Single Phase and a Two Phased approach is discussed in East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement Volume I Chapter 21 Water Resource and Flood Risk and the accompanying appendices.
The Environment Agency	14/07/15	Email	Soils, geology and ground conditions	Consideration should also be give to the disposal or re-use of any spoil. This is to ensure that the requirements of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 are complied with.	EATL will where ever possible re-use any spoil. The volume provided for disposal offsite is a worst case scenario and may be considerably less than this.
The Coal Authority	15/07/15	Email	General	I have reviewed the proposals and can confirm that this proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project would be located outside of the defined coalfield. Accordingly, I can confirm that The Coal Authority has no comments or	No Action required

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				observations to make on this proposal.	
The Coal Authority	15/07/15	Email	General	As this proposal lies outside of the defined coalfield, in accordance with Regulation 3 and Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 it will not be necessary for any further consultations to be undertaken with The Coal Authority on this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. This letter can be used by the applicant as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.	No further consultation with the Coal Authority
Transition Ipswich Energy Group	18/07/15	Letter	General	As previously stated in our earlier response to the previous E.A.O.W Consultation, we are pleased to support the ongoing of this very promising project and happy about the undergrounding of cables in the manner generally explained in your June 2015 E.A III, Phase III consultation Brochure, and were interested to read of the options taken to bore the route substantially in sections and to achieve this for more than the one 'tranche' at once.	No action required
Transition Ipswich Energy Group	18/07/15	Letter	General	May I say that I was personally involved in proposing an extensive driven tunnel as an objection to surface routes for the Ipswich Southern, Western and Eastern By-passes of the Department of transport in 1977, for many reasons, as I am very interested in seeing such methods being used on much smaller diameter applications, as for the cabling relevant for these E.A.O.W projects.	No action required
Transition Ipswich Energy Group	18/07/15	Letter	General	Would it be possible to have a simple (or more technical?!) 'breakdown' of costing for the whole project including the aerogenerators themselves as well as cabling and other infrastructure to the W.E.Cs and connection to the Bramford Substation?	Such information could not be provided until the detailed design phase of the project and may be subject to commercial confidentiality.
Transition Ipswich	18/07/15	Letter	General	I visited the exhibition at Sheringham a few years ago re the Sheringham Shoal Wind Farm which showed the diameters and	No action required

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Energy Group				make-up of different stages of cables involved, as well as some other details and data. It was fascinating to see the different amounts of the 'bases' one could see for their different distances out from the shore, through binoculars provided.	
Transition Ipswich Energy Group	18/07/15	Letter	General	I'd also like to add that I have always been interested in renewable energy, research and supply since a boy, and have a copy of perhaps the best 'Bible' on Generation of Energy by Windpower by Golding! I am too, an inventor in the wide field.	No action required
MMO	21/07/15	Email	Offshore	The MMO has reviewed the Phase III Report with regards to the offshore elements of the proposal and has no further comments to make.	No action required
MMO	21/07/15	Email	Offshore	Our advice of 07 July 2014, (EA3 Section 42 Planning Act 2008 Consultation response) remains unchanged and relevant to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report of May 2014.	No action required
Historic England	21/07/15	Letter	Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	We can confirm that we have received a letter from you with regards to this matter (dated 12th June 2015), which included a copy of your supporting material (dated June 2015). This is entitled Phase III Report (Consultation), Authored by Royal HaskoningDHV	No action required
Historic England	21/07/15	Letter	Description of the development	Historic England Advice: From the original Phase III report we recognise the following changes that have been proposed to the design of the East Anglia Three project as described in Table 2.1. and 2.2 of the Phase III report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Changes to the access points for the onshore cable (see table 2.1). •An increase in the maximum offshore cable corridor length from 155km to 166km. •A reduction in the maximum offshore cable corridor area from 838km² to 454km². •The addition of a maximum interconnector cable corridor area of 238km². •The addition of a maximum interconnector cable corridor 	No action required

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				<p>length of 380km (4x95). An increase in the maximum number of offshore electrical platforms from 5 to 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An increase in the maximum height of meteorological masts from 150.5m above mean sea level to 160.5m above mean sea level. •Changes to the specification for the onshore landfall and export cables. •Increase in the size of the compound for the converter station. •Increase in the size of and changes to the specification for the equipment to be housed in the converter station. 	
Historic England	21/07/15	Letter	Archaeology and Cultural heritage	<p>As a result of the changes to the project design outlined in the Phase III Report, we have concluded that the limited changes to the infrastructure planned would cause an increase in the area of disturbance. This is due to the increase in cable corridor and the additional electric platform. However, we recognise that this increase in area is slight in comparison to the scale of the area to be developed and therefore would only require minimal changes to the impact assessment. The applicant will however need to ensure that full archaeological assessments of suitable geophysical and geotechnical data are conducted of these areas to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment. These changes will need to be included in the Environmental Statement that is submitted in relation to the application for a Development Consent Order.</p>	<p>The Changes to project design have been incorporated into the impact assessment with the East Anglia THREE ES, Volume I, Chapter 25 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage. Furthermore, the changes have been incorporated into the draft DCO which forms part of this application.</p>
Historic England	21/07/15	Letter	Archaeology and Cultural heritage	<p>We also recognise that there are minimal changes to the proposed onshore landfall site, export cables and the converter station. We recognise that impacts upon the historic environment will have been assessed and mitigated through the East Anglian ONE development, however, if there are changes that take the project outside of the pre-existing WSI</p>	<p>EATL have produced Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for both the onshore and the offshore environments (dof ref 8.4 and 8.5) within the East Anglia THREE redline boundary, these build on the WSIs for East Anglia ONE and incorporate the</p>

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				and the agreed working corridor, then the impact upon designated and non-designated assets will need to be re-examined within the ES. The impact on the setting of heritage assets from the converter station has also been assessed through the previous ES for EA ONE and therefore we would not anticipate any further work will be necessary, unless the scope of the changes takes this project outside of the pre-agreed design parameters.	differences in RLB.
Historic England	21/07/15	Letter	Archaeology and Cultural heritage	Furthermore, we wish to reiterate our previous comments which were provided in our letter dated 8th July 2014. In particular, we would like to re-iterate our position about the need to produce a draft WSI and the inclusion of archaeological input into the design of surveys.	The outline WSIs which are being submitted as part of the DCO application and these recognise the need to survey some of which has already been undertaken.
Historic England	21/07/15	Letter	Archaeology and Cultural heritage	Based on the information provided to us in the Phase III Report, we acknowledge and accept the changes proposed to the project design. We also accept that minimal change to the impact assessment in regards to the marine historic environment will result. Any changes that are made will however need to be included in an updated Environment Statement. We have no further comments to add at this stage, and look forward to reviewing future documentation regarding this application.	The Changes to project design have been incorporated into the impact assessment with the East Anglia THREE ES, Volume I, Chapter 25 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.
Trinity House Lighthouse Service	22/07/15	Email	Description of the development	We note that this project may now be built in two phases and should this be the case we would welcome early consultation on the project build programmes, in order to agree suitable Aids to Navigation Management Plans for each phase.	Further consultation with Trinity House Lighthouse board was undertaken in 2015 (see 9.4.4 and 9.8.1 of the consultation report) note that by the time the email had been received, further consultation had already happened.
Trinity House Lighthouse Service	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	To assist in your DCO submission, I attach the standard conditions (Aids to Navigation Management Plan) which should be used as a starting point in your deemed marine licence and encompass all requirements within our remit.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Trinity House Lighthouse Service	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	Having reviewed Appendix 15.15 – DR1 Light Buoy Deep Water Route Technical Note and carried out further traffic analysis in the area, we are now content with the 1nm “buffer” between the western boundary and the DWR via the DR1 Lighted Buoy.	No action required
Trinity House Lighthouse Service	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	We also note in Appendix 15.15 on page 3 – Section 2.2 – Realistic Worst Case Layouts, the layouts include structures such as converter stations and accommodation platforms positioned out with rows of turbines and therefore not maintaining the two clear lines of orientation expected. You should note that this is not acceptable and all structures should be located in such a way as to ensure the two clear lines of orientation are maintained throughout this project.	Noted and addressed in East Anglia THREE ES Volume 1 Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation; MGN 371 guidance currently indicated 1 row of alignment for SAR. However current design does include 2 lines of orientation for the East Anglia THREE site.
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	A completed MGN Checklist should be provided to MCA which forms part of the NRA assessment and ensures that all aspects have been adequately addressed.	This is addressed in the East Anglia THREE ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	Two Deep Water Routes exist in close proximity to the eastern and western boundaries of the development. We have been supplied with the DR1 Light Buoy Deep Water Route Technical Note which concludes that “a separation distance of at least 1.0nm between passing traffic and the nearest East Anglia THREE turbine (in both 100% and partial fill cases) could safely be maintained in the vast majority of cases”. In order for the risks to be considered As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP), as per MGN 371 Annex 3, appropriate mitigation measures should be proposed and agreed with relevant stakeholders.	This is addressed in the East Anglia THREE ES Volume 3 Appendix 15.1
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Description of the development	It is noted that two construction scenarios are proposed either as a single phased approach or two-phased approach. MCA does not have a particular preference, however we would like to see continuous construction which is progressive across the wind farm with no opportunity for two separate areas to be	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				constructed with a gap in the middle	
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Description of the development	Export cable routes, cable burial protection index and cable protection are issues that are yet to be fully developed. However due cognisance needs to address cable burial or protection and any consented cable protection works must ensure existing and future safe navigation is not compromised. The MCA would accept a maximum of 5% reduction in surrounding depth referenced to Chart Datum.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	MGN 371 Annex 2 Paragraph 6 iii requires that hydrographic surveys should fulfil the requirements of the International Hydrographic Organisation (IHO) Order 1a standard, with the final data supplied as a digital full density data set, and survey report to the MCA Hydrography Manager. This information is yet to be submitted and failure to report the survey or conduct it to Order 1a might invalidate the Navigational Risk Assessment if it was deemed not fit for purpose.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	The turbine layout design will require MCA approval prior to construction to minimise the risks to surface vessels, including rescue boats, operating within the site. As such, MCA will seeks to ensure the devices are aligned in straight rows and columns with ideally, two lines of orientation. Early consultation with MCA is encouraged.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	An approved ERCOP will need to be in place prior to construction being undertaken, this will be included as a formal condition of the Development Consent Order (DCO).	Addressed in East Anglia THREE ES Volume 1 Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation section 15.6.6 which assesses the impact on emergency response provision.
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Description of the development; Shipping and Navigation	The requirement and use of safety zones during construction, maintenance and decommissioning is noted and supported. An application to DECC will be required for operational and pre-commissioning phase safety zones.	Noted. Details addressed in the East Anglia THREE ES Volume 1 Chapters 5 Description of the Development and Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	The minimum air clearance of turbine blades should be 22m. Layout design - the latest MCA guidance is for at least two lines of orientation. ID Marking - this should follow a spreadsheet design that aligns with the layout and ideally with the SAR Lanes. Early consultation with MCA is encouraged.	Both of these issues are addressed in the East Anglia THREE ES Volume 1 Chapters 5 Description of the Development and Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation. Consultation with the MCA has continued throughout the application period and would continue post application (see section 9.4.2 and 9.82 of the Consultation Report).
Maritime and Coastguard Agency	22/07/15	Email	Shipping and Navigation	It is noted that the NRA does not draw any formal conclusions from its assessment; it has been used as a tool to outline impacts on traffic, its purpose purely to highlight risks, and consider any mitigation that may be appropriate in ensuring shipping will not be adversely impacted from the safety of navigation perspective. The data provides a comprehensive overview of the risk, the comments detailed above are not considered to be blocks to development, but provided to highlight concerns that remain, the development is to be established in an area of significant traffic activity hence risks to shipping will always be present.	The Conclusions of the assessment are provided in the East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 1, Chapter 15 Shipping and Navigation.
Natural England	23/07/15	Email	General	We do not have any detailed comment to make at this time but look forward to receiving the revised environmental assessment and the detail contained therein of how the changes to the project may affect the outcome of the receptor specific assessments.	No specific action required
Natural England	23/07/15	Email	Description of the development	We would recommend any changes to piling timings or increase in the duration of piling activities during construction from to the Two Phased approach is particularly considered in the cumulative impact assessment (CIA).	The different time scales have been taken into account, throughout the ES including: Volume 1 Chapter 12 Marine Mammals and Chapter 11 Fish and Shellfish Ecology.
Natural England	23/07/15	Email		Natural England welcomes the information contained within the Phase III report, which includes the revised project description, the changes to the project parameters and the Impact Assessment Screening exercise.	No action required

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Galloper Offshore Wind	Undated	Email	Infrastructure and Other Users	GWFL was previously in correspondence with EA3 with regard a cable crossing agreement however this was put on hold last year during the GWF hiatus. Given construction of GWF will commence in mid 2016 these discussions could now usefully be restarted. Please contact me in the first instance to discuss this.	East Anglia THREE intend to meet with Galloper once the DCO application has been submitted. These meetings will be used to work towards a cable crossing agreement.
Galloper Offshore Wind	Undated	Email	Infrastructure and Other Users	Please ensure my name and contact details are included in any further consultation that is to take place on EA3 or other wind farms in the East Anglia zone that may impact on GWF.	East Anglia THREE contact data base has been updated.
Eastern IFCA	20/07/15	Letter	Description of the development	It would have been beneficial to include in the report, a figure clearly showing the relationship between the East Anglia Three export cable and interconnector cable corridor, and East Anglia One project. It may useful for the same figure to be included in the forthcoming ES for reference.	Figure 5.3 the East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 2 Description of the Development Figures. Clearly illustrates these relationships.
Eastern IFCA	20/07/15	Letter	Description of the development	For a range of EIA topics in Table 3.1, the worst case change in project parameters is given as one additional offshore platform and additional cable within the wind farm, as well as a longer period of piling with a phased approach to construction. The report is unclear as how much additional cabling is needed, how this relates to the placement of an interconnector cable between the EA One and EA Three cable corridors, and how these changes in the project parameters relate to the project worst case scenario. These points should be fully addressed within the EIA and results presented in the Environment Statement (ES).	Section 5.5.13 in the East Anglia THREE ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 Description of the Development, clearly defines the differences in required cable between the two approaches, and the assessment takes account of these differences.
Eastern IFCA	20/07/15	Letter	Benthic Ecology; Fish and shellfish	Table 3.1 refers to an increase in magnitude of effects such as increased disturbance to benthic ecology receptors and to commercial fisheries due to the proposed project parameter changes. However, there is not considered to be a change to the significance of the impacts given the "limited changes compared to the scale of the proposed project". A phased construction approach coupled with the laying of more	The percentage increases are small for example the maximum total length of cable which could be installed would be 2.5% greater in a phase approach than it would be in a single phase approach. Therefore the impact significance for the vast majority of impacts is no different. Furthermore, in the inshore areas where the Eastern IFCA have

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				offshore cable is likely to increase the potential for the exclusion and displacement of inshore fishing, and thus, the significance of construction and operation impacts to inshore fishing fleets. Likewise, increased disturbance to benthos and fish and shellfish could in/directly have wide ranging impacts that may be significant during the construction and operational phases of development.	responsibility the same maximum amount of cable could be laid regardless of which approach to construction is taken.
Eastern IFCA	20/07/15	Letter	Benthic Ecology; Fish and shellfish	To address these points, the ES should clearly present the relationships between assessments of magnitude and significance for all offshore receptors, with clear justification for ratings of significance and evidence of appropriate mitigation where necessary.	The East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 1, Chapters 6 to 29 each clearly define the methodologies used to assess the significance levels of any given impact.
Public Health England	23/07/15	Letter		PHE notes that we have replied to earlier consultations as listed below and this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence. Request for Scoping Opinion 23 November 2012, Section 42 Consultation 25 June 2014	No specific action required
Public Health England	23/07/15	Letter	General	Based on the documentation provided at this stage, we have no additional comments or queries to raise. However we will comment on the proposed Environmental Impact Assessment materials once more detailed quantitative assessments are available at the next phase of consultation.	No specific action required
Ministry of Defence	Undated	Email	Aviation and MoD	The MOD has been consulted on this project (East Anglia Three) since 2012 when we identified concerns appertaining to the Air Defence Radar at Trimingham. The MOD and Vattenfall/ScottishPower Renewables have been working together since then with the aim of trying to find an acceptable solution. Discussions regarding mitigation were held in August 2014 with further correspondence towards the end of that year. The MOD position remains extant as of that time and awaits further engagement from Vattenfall/ScottishPower Renewables regarding mitigation of the proposed East Anglia	EATL replied to the MoDs Section 42 responses by letter on the 15th September 2015 and will resume consultation with the MoD once the DCO application has been submitted.

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				Three wind farm on the Air Defence Radar at Trimmingham.	
Ministry of Defence	Undated	Email	Aviation and MoD	The MOD has no comments to make on the Phase III Report.	No action required.
South Cambridgeshire District Council	25/06/15	Email	NA	Thank you for your email. I can confirm we did receive the letter you mention and we have no comments to make at this stage.	No action required.
Tendring District Council	29/06/15	Email	Land Use; Socio-economics	Where will turbines be stored before being shipped out to the windfarm and where will all the support staff etc. be based?	A construction port has not yet been identified by EATL, however one will be identified shortly after the DCO application has been submitted.
Bawdsey Parish Council	02/07/15	Email	NA	<p>Is the Consultation asking for feedback on preferences for a one or two-phase project for EA3OW? Are these feasible alternatives? Consultation document indicates that HVDC might still be used, but we understand that there is an application for a change to the original DCO for EAOne for the use of AC cables only. Is there a possibility that HVDC will be used for EA3?</p> <p>Will there be 24-hour working at the landfall site?</p> <p>Clarify how and when Access Roads A and B will be used. Most particularly: (a) will B also be used for EAOne or just EA3? (b) when workings for EAOne are complete, will Access Road A be closed or will A and B be used for EA3?</p> <p>In the published Phase III Report p.17 Peak HGV traffic movements are given but it does not state between which locations this traffic is expected. What is the expected HGV traffic to and from Access Point B? And at what times of day is this expected?</p> <p>How will the project accommodate the very real possibility that the width of the section of Ferry Road which leads directly to Access Route B, is too narrow for the envisaged HGV traffic,</p>	<p>A letter responding to all of these questions was sent to Bawdsey Parish council on the 6th October 2015; answers are summarised here:</p> <p>The purpose of the consultation is to inform local communities that the project could be built in one phase or in two phases.</p> <p>The East Anglia THREE assessment includes both HVDC and LFAC to ensure that the worst case is captured.</p> <p>It is not envisaged as necessary for 24 hour working at landfall as horizontal directional drilling (HDD) will have been done for East Anglia THREE by the East Anglia ONE project , although there may be a requirement for security lighting at the transition bay compound during construction.</p> <p>Peak traffic movements presented at the public information day (PID) have been revised to account for final changes to the design. These were provided with the letter and are included in the ES.</p> <p>There will be working from 0700 hrs until 1900 hrs</p>

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				<p>especially in combination with general public traffic (i.e. road width 4.2 metres to junction, narrowing to 3.7m)? How will traffic management at entrance to Access Road B accommodate two 'blind' bends at either side of the road? Will Access Road B be closed after completion of project? Will there be storage on the landfall site?</p>	<p>each day. However, peak traffic windows of 0800–0900hrs and 1700–1800hrs will be avoided for HGV movement. Access B will only be used for East Anglia THREE. This is not necessary for East Anglia ONE as they will have open trenching both ways across the road at Access A. Given that there will be reinstatement after East Anglia ONE, the use of Access B will reduce impacts to landscape and habitat and avoid disruption to the farmland on the west side of Ferry Road which will have ducts beneath it. East Anglia ONE has an access at Access A going both east and west, therefore Access B was not required. East Anglia THREE will use Access A (going west into the landfall only) and Access B to access the marshes area. The assessment is based upon the assumption that any accesses used by East Anglia ONE are reinstated upon completion of that project. However, in certain circumstances it may make sense to leave accesses in place. This would need to be agreed with the individual landowners for each access on a case-by-case basis as well as the local authority. Analysis has shown that it is possible to get HGVs of 2.8m width into the access. Traffic will need to be managed during deliveries, the preference for traffic management will be via 'soft measures' (i.e. banksmen, stop/go signs and pilot vehicles) and as already noted deliveries will not be made during the periods 0800–0900hrs and 1700–1800hrs. The aim is for minimal engineering intervention;</p>

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
					<p>'soft' solutions will be found (e.g. a manned stop/go sign).</p> <p>Access B is an existing track therefore it will be reinstated to its original state once works have been completed (i.e. if it has been necessary to upgrade it).</p> <p>Yes there may be some storage within the transition bay construction compound, there might also need to be security lighting which will be minimal.</p>
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Land Use and Landscape	<p>The East Anglia One and three proposal represents a massive extension (equivalent a number of supermarket store) to the substation, which in itself will have a serious and unacceptable impact on the Burstall community and landscape. This proposal will have a serious enhanced cumulative and detrimental environmental impact on Burstall residents, landscape and amenity. The two projects taken together can now be considered as overdevelopment of a rural site. Little or no attempt has currently been made by East Anglia One and Three to coordinate the cumulative impact of the proposal with National Grid and this needs to be addressed by the planning application.</p>	<p>A letter responding comments from Burstall Parish Council was sent by EATL on the 8th October 2015; answers are summarised here and in the rows below:</p> <p>A detailed design for the East Anglia THREE substation(s) is not known at this stage therefore a design envelope has been put forward for the purposes of assessing the worst case dimensions of the substation buildings, ancillary equipment and compound. Detailed design will not take place until post consent. The Seascape, Landscape and Visual Amenity Impact Assessment will be fully presented in the final Environmental Statement. The cumulative impact assessment will cover the potential for up to three substations on the site (i.e. East Anglia ONE, East Anglia THREE and one future East Anglia Offshore Wind (EAOW) project). This is in line with the East Anglia ONE assessment and the assessment provided in last year's Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).</p>
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Landscape	<p>A further issue of concern is that there has been a lack of clarity regarding the impact of the East Anglia Three proposed</p>	<p>EATL has consulted on proposals for the East Anglia THREE project under both statutory obligations and</p>

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				development in the local and wider Burstall area. For example, there has been no official consultation with Burstall Parish Council or the residents affected by the development proposals. The East Anglia Three proposal, will significantly disfigure the landscape and cause significant environmental damage.	on a non-statutory basis. During the summer of 2014 a detailed consultation exercise took place using the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) to convey project proposals and the outcomes of assessment work completed at that time. This included information (including an assessment) on project infrastructure to be located at the proposed substation at Bramford. This exercise was widely publicised and backed up by a series of public information days at convenient locations along the cable route. In addition, a further statutory consultation exercise took place that summer/autumn which mainly focused on proposed works accesses. During the summer of 2015, a further statutory consultation exercise took place focusing on the changes brought about by the introduction of an option to construct the project in phases. This was backed up by the publication of two further reports which were made available to interested parties in a variety of ways e.g. either sent directly to them or made available on the EATL website or copies placed in libraries. The reports were Update to Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) and the Phase III Consultation Report. This exercise was also backed up by further Public Information Days. This information was sent to Burstall Parish Council C/O Ms Samantha Barber, Parish Clerk.
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Description of the development	The current proposal is based on insufficient knowledge of the high voltage direct current (HVDC) technology being used and since the DC to AC conversion will now take place at the coast	As it is not possible to choose a specific technology for East Anglia THREE at this stage in the development process, no detailed design can be

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				it is unclear as to why a very large building is still being proposed. Clearly it would be desirable prior to the proposal, to establish the actual detailed design necessary, rather than guess the requirements for the building capacity, which might not be necessary.	defined. Therefore worst case design parameters have been selected and assessed in order to allow for the flexibility required towards progressing detailed design at the post consent stage. Our engineering team maintains close links with suppliers in order to understand developments in transmission technology to ensure that a suitable and appropriate solution can be identified for East Anglia THREE if and when consent has been granted.
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Description of the development	Clearly it is now time for energy suppliers and National Grid to recognise that the Bramford facility is at maximum capacity and immediately halt further development of the Bramford Sub-Station and its use as a converter station. It is time to consider a new hub to accommodate the future energy requirements, in terms of the strategic requirements. This is because energy is now being diverted towards the Bramford Sub-Station instead of using distributed routes to consumers, which strategic considerations and logic dictate. The facility has now reached such a size as to have become out of keeping and unacceptable in this rural location. Concentration of too much energy in one location is also strategically unsound.	As an electricity generator, EATL is presented with a suitable location where the electricity generated by the windfarm can be connected to the grid. This location is determined by National Grid and not by the generator.
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Description of the development	Burstall Parish Council supports local opposition groups, the Babergh District Council, other local and County Council concerns regarding the East Anglia Three proposal design issues. We are aware that the local authorities have jointly responded on the converter substation design issues.	EATL has consulted with relevant stakeholders regarding project design proposals as appropriate for the consenting stage of the project. These discussions will continue post application towards the detailed design stage
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Description of the development	Burstall Parish Council considers the proposed building to be too high at 25m and the overall building size excessive. The building envelope needs to be significantly reduced and in particular the ridge height reduced to below 15m. This can be	A detailed design for the East Anglia THREE substation(s) is not known at this stage therefore, as was the case with East Anglia ONE, a design envelope has been put forward for the purposes of assessing the worst case dimensions of the

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				<p>achieved by redesigning the building and excavating the site to lower the visible aspect of the building, thus blending it into the natural contours.</p> <p>The roof should be sympathetically designed, be curved and grassed over.</p>	<p>substation buildings, ancillary equipment and compound for the technologies under consideration i.e. High Voltage Direct Current and Low Frequency Alternating Current. As mentioned earlier, detailed design will not take place until post consent and therefore EATL needs to maintain flexibility to allow this process to conclude.</p>
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Landscape	<p>In the limited discussion we have had with East Anglia Wind Ltd Managing Director, it emerged that their only objection to a comprehensive programme of screening is cost. When considering the overall cost of the project and the underground option for the cables, this should not be a constraint to adequate screening. The proposed screening of the development is inadequate, particularly when viewed from the south east of the substation. The screening plan should include increased banking to a height of approximately 15m and take into account all views from the Burstall direction, including across the current National Grid Site</p>	<p>As part of the Environmental Impact Assessment for East Anglia THREE, EATL commissioned the services of a Landscape and Visual Assessment Consultant to assess the likely impacts arising from siting the East Anglia THREE substation(s) at Bramford. This also considered the cumulative case which included substations for East Anglia ONE and one future project. The assessment was based in part on East Anglia ONE providing the majority of screening required for the East Anglia THREE project. The outcome of the assessment will be presented in the Landscape and Visual Assessment Chapter of the East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement. EATL will also submit an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan as part of the DCO application in November 2015 setting out our approach to landscape management to ensure the substation is adequately screened. Should any of the key assumptions that underpin our assessment change, EATL will review the position and discuss with local authorities to ensure that appropriate landscaping requirements are agreed and implemented to ensure adequate screening is maintained.</p>
Burstall Parish	07/07/15	Letter	Landscape	<p>Currently the site screening is not being considered in</p>	<p>The site screening is being considered in conjunction</p>

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Council				<p>conjunction East Anglia One and National Grid.</p> <p>Burstall Parish Council consider that it is essential that any proposed screening is effective from the start of the development, both in terms of banking and planting. Mature trees should be used to entirely screen the proposed building form Burstall Village.</p>	with East Anglia ONE and a presentation on possible landscape mitigation is to be presented to The Design Council on 21st October 2015, details of which were also presented to members of Burstall Parish Council on 29th September 2015.
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Description of the development and Landscape	Also the light pollution should be kept to a minimum and not replicate the current light pollution emanating from the substation, particularly during the winter months.	A written scheme for the management and mitigation of artificial light emissions during the operation of the onshore substation, including measures to minimise lighting pollution and the hours of lighting, will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Landscape	The proposal should be considered in terms of the overall site development and in conjunction with East Anglia One and National Grid. Of particular concern is the cumulative impact of the proposed buildings.	Addressed in the East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 1, Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Assessment
Burstall Parish Council	07/07/15	Letter	Consultation Report	We consider that East Anglia Three have not entered into a meaningful consultation process with Burstall Parish Council or the residents of Burstall. Also there has been a lack of clarity regarding the impact the proposed development.	EATL has conducted three statutory consultations on project proposals. As mentioned previously, these have been backed up with public information days at convenient locations, including Burstall and Bramford. Consultation documents were made available to interested parties by a variety of means. The team is also fully aware of the landscaping issues associated with the site through previous consultations conducted by East Anglia ONE and from forthcoming presentation to The Design Council, mentioned above, which includes mitigation for EATL.
Essex County Council	14/07/15	Email	General	On behalf of Essex County Council I would like to submit a nil return from a negative perspective on the proposal. This	No action required

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				remains consistent with our return dated 23rd June 2014.	
Essex County Council	14/07/15	Email		From a positive perspective, this is a great opportunity for the Offshore Wind sector supply chain within Essex, and if Essex County Council can assist in helping supply the development please do get in contact.	EATL will contact Essex County Council should there be supply chain opportunities within Essex were the East Anglia THREE DCO application be successful.
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Description of the development	Ducting: It is understood that it is now proposed to remove "Scenario 2" from the range of options for which development consent is sought. This means that any cabling for East Anglia THREE will be laid in pre-installed ducts resulting in a reduction in impacts, as you have identified in paragraph 15 of the consultation document. This is supported.	No action required
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Description of the development	Phasing: It is noted that it is your intention to seek consent for a project that may be constructed in one or two phases. The local authorities understand, and appreciate, that this is to create some flexibility so that the project can respond to the prevailing regulatory support framework in the years to come, which is current unknown.	No action required
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Description of the development	A two-phase approach nevertheless has the potential to prolong the impacts of the development. The local authorities would therefore urge you to make every effort to condense the development timeline to minimise the impact on local communities and expedite the restoration of the landscape post-construction.	Noted: this will inform the detailed design phase of the project.
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Landscape	Some detailed thought will also need to be given to the condition of the landscape in that interim period between the completion of Phase I and the commencement of Phase II, which in any given location could be well in excess of a year ¹ .	This is taken into consideration with East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 1 Chapter 29 Seascape Landscape and Visual Amenity
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Landscape and Land Use	In the case of the Dogger Bank Creyke Beck Development Consent Order, which enables a two-phase cable laying installation, Requirement 29 provides that land used	Addressed in East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 1 Chapter 29 Seascape Landscape and Visual Amenity

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				temporarily for construction should be reinstated within 6 months of completion of that phase, or if later by the end of the next available planting season. A similar mechanism, accounting for the fact that in a two phase approach the second phase might conceivably not progress at all, needs to be considered for East Anglia THREE.	
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Land Use	The Report states (paragraph 20) that a two-phase approach would also increase the overall amount of infrastructure required, notably the number of jointing pits, presumably because the cables for the different phases of the project may be jointed at different times/ locations. The local authorities would strongly urge that every opportunity to align jointing points to minimise the number of jointing bays is exploited, for example by providing a jointing bay large enough to provide for jointing of cables from all phases – and ideally those of East Anglia ONE.	The number of jointing bays will be the same irrespective of the approach taken. In the Single Phase approach both bays would be within the same pit and be constructed at the same time within the same jointing bay compound. The Two Phased approach would require one bay to be installed per phase, requiring a pit and a compound in each phase. Cables must be jointed and pulled through the bay prior to reinstatement. As you point out, cables may be jointed at different times or locations therefore in the Two Phased approach it is not certain that the jointing bays would be side by side. In addition, if bays were created in the same place during Phase 1 there would still be a requirement to excavate the bay and joint the cables. Whilst there may be opportunities for align works as suggested if a Two Phased approach is taken, the EIA represents the worst case in assuming that this is not possible and therefore provides the most comprehensive assessment of impacts
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Report identifies the EIA topics areas where there may be a change in significance of effect, and this will need to be corroborated in the final Environmental Statement. Some	The assessments in the East Anglia THREE ES have been reviewed and revised where necessary from those presented in the Preliminary Environmental

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				clarity behind the traffic movements set out in Table 2.2 would be helpful, to understand the rationale behind the scale of movements in both the single phase and, separately, the two phases in a two-phased approach and their distribution on the highway network.	Information (PEI) Report. The traffic numbers have been revised since the Phase III report to take account of final changes to the assumptions and these are included within the ES.
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email		Consideration should also be given as to whether there is any potential for the two separate phases to actually overlap, i.e. there is a cumulative effect between Phase I and Phase II. If the Development Consent Order does not prevent this eventuality, then it should be assessed, because a two-phase project where the phases overlap would be a worse case than a single phase project. Equally, it should be confirmed that there is no possibility for an interaction with the construction period of East Anglia ONE.	EATL considers that the two worst cases have been assessed (i.e. Single Phase in terms of peak volume of traffic or materials and Two Phased in terms of temporal effects and overall footprint). If there was overlap of phases then this would not present a worst case as the efficiencies of scale represented by the Single Phase would begin to come into play (i.e. haul road would not be removed and reinstated, plant at jointing bays would not leave and return) – if there was overlap this would not increase either the materials required or traffic movements required. EATL can confirm that there will be no overlap between the construction of East Anglia ONE and East Anglia THREE.

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Traffic and Transport; Noise and Vibration; and Landscape and Terrestrial Ecology	<p>Access Points: In respect of access points for the onshore works, the local authorities welcome the removal of a number of access points over which we identified concerns at the previous round of consultation. The local authorities do however wish to continue conversations on this topic, having regard to the following factors, which were outlined in the local authorities' previous consultation response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implications for the length of haul road required and therefore numbers of HGVs •Impact on residential amenity relating to distribution of HGVs to new accesses •Highway safety implications associated with the new access points •Whether the new access point is also a public right of way and the availability of suitable diversionary routes, if the right of way needs to be closed •Duration of works conducted through each access point •Works required to the track to facilitate access and associated landscape, ecological and public access (as relevant) impacts 	<p>A letter providing a response to each one of these points was sent to SCC on the 31st August 2015.</p> <p>Further information on the access routes and impacts of these is provided within the East Anglia THREE Environmental Statement, Volume 1, Chapter 5 Description of the Development, Chapter 20 Air quality, Chapter 26 Noise and Vibration and Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport.</p> <p>At a meeting with SCC on the 4th September EATL all draft chapters were discussed with SCC.</p>
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email		Implications for EA ONE restoration works	There are and will continue (post application) to be discussions between SCC and EATL regarding the restoration work by East Anglia ONE and the potential to leave in place haul road between the two projects to minimise disruption.
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Socio-economics	Any feedback received from local communities	Feedback from local communities has been an integral part of the refinement process for selecting access locations, with the majority of comments coming from the Section 42 Phase IIb consultation responses
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Terrestrial Ecology	To expand on the penultimate point, there is a risk that EA THREE would prolong the impacts of EA ONE if it interferes	

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				with the mitigation for that project, which anticipates the re-establishment of hedgerows etc. over a particular period of time.	
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Terrestrial Ecology and Description of the development	That project identified a number of Important Hedgerows (as decreed by the Hedgerows Regulations 1997), but also, separately, some visually important hedgerows. The local authorities would like to have further discussions about how the currently proposed access strategy interferes with/complements the restoration plans for EA ONE, particularly in locations such as those identified above, but also more broadly in other sensitive locations such as the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.	At a meeting with SCC on the 4 th September both effects on landscape and terrestrial ecology were discussed
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Land Use and Description of the development	Bramford Sub-Station As the predominant above ground infrastructure, the impact of the sub-station is of particular concern. From the Report is not clear how the characteristics of this change, other than with respect to footprint, with a single versus a two-phased approach, and also between an HVDC and LVAC option. The application should provide an indication of the scale, form and appearance of both options and their respective impacts, cumulative effects with existing and proposed infrastructure, and an approach for mitigating the impacts of both, reflecting their particular nature.	East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 1, Chapter 29 Seascape landscape and Visual Amenity includes assessment of the impacts at the substation. Chapter 5 makes clear the difference between footprint of the HVDC and LVAC solutions.
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Landscape	The local authorities note that the redline boundary encompasses the area proposed for the EA THREE and EA FOUR sub-stations and consider this should provide an opportunity for a comprehensive site-wide landscaping strategy; i.e. permitting coherent delivery of a scheme to mitigate the impacts of EA ONE, EA THREE and EA FOUR at the earliest opportunity to achieve the effective establishment of planting.	A cohesive strategy (with EA ONE) for planting has been developed, details are provided within the OLEMS (Doc ref. 8.6).

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	Landscape and Terrestrial Ecology	The local authorities would also reiterate that the ash content (circa 60%) in Gorbets Grove, immediately to the east of the substation site is a concern. The landscaping strategy should reflect this issue and East Anglia THREE is strongly encouraged to consider how the future of that woodland as an important landscape buffer can be safeguarded through early discussions with the landowner.	A strategy for dealing with Ash Dieback is detailed within the within the OLEMS (Doc ref. 8.6). Surveys have been completed at Gorbets grove to determine current percent cover of ash trees within that woodland.
Suffolk County Council	23/07/15	Email	NA	East Anglia Array Finally, the local authorities continue to emphasise the need for a cross-project approach to the development of the East Anglia Array so each successive project is thoroughly considering its interaction with the project(s) before it and the project(s) after it. A lack of cohesion and pragmatism could significantly increase the level of impacts on local communities and the local authorities are keen to work constructively with East Anglia Offshore Wind to reap the potentially significant rewards the development may bring at least disruption to the local community and local landowners.	EAWW will always seek to minimise any potential impacts of its plans and proposals on local communities and as such will continue to develop a cross-project approach as the detailed design for each of the projects is taken forward in order to minimise impacts and disturbance. Details will be discussed with Local Authorities at our regular meetings on project specific matters.
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email		Little Bealings Parish Council strongly supports the principle of underground onshore export cables to transmit power from the offshore wind turbines to the convertor station to minimise permanent landscape impact.	No Action Required
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Non-Technical Summary	The Council strongly supports the future proofing of the project, as set out in document 7.1, the Non Technical Summary (para 2.3 - 8), and in document 8.1 Cable Statement (para 3.5), for the reasons given in document 5.1 Statement of Reasons (para 3.9).	No Action Required
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Site Selection and Alternatives	The Council strongly objects to the route of the onshore export cable through Little and Great Bealings (known as Preferred Option Cable Corridor (POCC) in document 6.2(d) Consultation Appendix 39). The selection of this route is a contradiction of	These responses were to the East Anglia ONE DCO application and subsequent SEI and were appended to Little Bealings Parish Councils' response to the East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation. Therefore

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				<p>the applicant's own identification (ES Chapter 3: Site Selection) of the constraints which were applied to site selection as it involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • crossing the River Fynn • crossing a major gas pipeline at Holly Lane • impact upon services and road users during construction • tree and hedgerow loss 	they are not directly relevant to East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation.
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	<p>Moreover the selection of this route is contrary to the applicant's stated key considerations of routeing away from residences, being immediate adjacent to private houses and in a village area.</p>		
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	<p>Site Selection and Alternatives</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the route identified as Alternative Onshore Cable Corridor A (AOA) in Appendix 39 is the appropriate route for the cable.</p> <p>This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AOA can be easily amended to avoid Queech Wood and a new comparison of woodland impact should then be undertaken. • HDD (or an alternative trenchless means) would not be required for this route. • The applicant's comparison of POCC and AOA in Appendix 39 is fundamentally flawed is assessing only environmental impacts and giving no consideration to the impact on the two communities of Great and Little Bealings. No communities are affected by AOA. The Council is of the view that considerable weight should be attached to this factor. POCC crosses two of the three roads which serve the centre of Little Bealings. The Council is unaware of any Local Impact Report which assesses the traffic currently using Holly Lane and Lodge Road and the effect that the use of the haul road crossing these two roads by construction traffic will have. 		

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				<p>Local traffic includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School run traffic from the surrounding villages to Bealings School • Local agricultural traffic • Users of the Bealings Village Hall and John Belstead Playing Field. These facilities are share by Gt and Lt Bealings and used daily. • Visitors to the Churches in the Benefice of Gt and Lt Bealings with Playford and Culpho; services are rotated around the four churches • Residents commuting to Ipswich and Woodbridge/A12 • Businesses at Mallard House • Commuter traffic travelling between Ipswich and Woodbridge/Martlesham which chooses to travel via Tuddenham and Bealings to avoid the slow moving A1214 at Kesgrave. Note: this route is busy before the identified rush hour period of 8 - 9 am (TMP) • Traffic displaced by Network Rail's regular closure of the Bealings level crossing for works. 	
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Traffic and Transport	<p>The conclusions in Appendix 39 are further flawed as follows :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on agricultural land (of whatever grade) is temporary and so should not have weight attached to it • Although AOA is longer in length than POCC, less of the land crossed is within an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA): 100% of POCC (3.61km) is in ESA as opposed to 1.67km of AOA • Evaluating land in ESA Agreements and Environmental Stewardship Agreements is not a valid basis for comparing the quality of the land; in any event Entry Level Stewardship schemes close in 2014. • The comparison should include an analysis of the role of the affected public rights of way as part of the local transport 	These responses were to the East Anglia ONE DCO application and subsequent SEI and were appended to Little Bealings Parish Councils' response to the East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation. Therefore they are not directly relevant to East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation.

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				network.	
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Noise and Vibration	The Council has noted the change to ‘a non HDD trenchless technique’ to cross Lodge Road and the claim in para 208 (SEI May 2103) that this will reduce noise and vibration as previously assessed. The Council is unaware of any assessment which has considered the impact of noise, air quality and vibration on the residences in the immediate vicinity of the crossing at Lodge Road and requests that this assessment be carried out, and details of the new technique supplied.	These responses were to the East Anglia ONE DCO application and subsequent SEI and were appended to Little Bealings Parish Councils’ response to the East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation. Therefore they are not directly relevant to East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation.
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Noise and Vibration Traffic and Transport and Air Quality	Assessments (whether of traffic or noise, air quality and vibration) involving impact on The Street, Lt Bealings (ES 7.4.8 Chapter 27) are not relevant to the application. The impact on residences in Lodge Road and Holly Lane/Close of these factors is requested, especially given the long working hours proposed.	
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email		A shorter working day, ending before 1900, is supported, and no working on Saturdays in Bealings is a priority in view of the proximity to residences.	
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email		The Council is unaware of any proposals to address the impact on Footpaths Nos 3, 5 and 6 Lt Bealings, all of which are crossed by the cable corridor.	
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Traffic and Transport	The Council strongly objects to the location of a construction consolidation site at Playford (Work No 28). This site has not been chosen as a result of ‘careful location of [CCS]’ (ES Volume 3 Onshore Traffic and Transport: Table 27-2) but wholly for expediency. The Council objects because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is claimed (SEI Report May 2013 para 42) that CCS D is accessible from the Suffolk Lorry Route Network. This is not the case and the use of minor roads is proposed. • Use of the road at Playford by large construction vehicles (SEI Report para 47) will conflict with existing local users. The road provide Bealings’ direct route to Ipswich and are also used by 	

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				many commuters from the A12 to Ipswich, as identified above. • (SEI Report para 25) states that use of the haul road will minimise use of the local road network; the location of the haul road across two roads in Bealings means that impact on the local road network will actually be considerable.	
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Socio-economics	The Council deplores the applicant's refusal to provide funding for the Parish Council to take professional advice in this matter and considers that its statement that the production of Appendix 39 and mitigating works (ie HDD, now revised) constitutes the extent of its funding, to be wholly inadequate.	
Little Bealings Parish Council	29/07/15	Email	Socio-economics	The Council is also aware the applicant has refused a request from Great Bealings Parish Council for compensation payment to the community for the intangible adverse impacts of the development on community life. The applicant's reason for refusal was a wish to avoid any suggestion that there was a link between payment and withdrawal of objection to the application. However, there is no socio-economic benefit identified to the communities as a result of the project, only dis-benefits. These impacts include travel disruption, travel delays and the disruption of quiet enjoyment of the countryside (including noise, air and light pollution and visual impact). Significant community funding for Bealings is wholly appropriate in consequence and should be a requirement of any DCO.	These responses were to the East Anglia ONE DCO application and subsequent SEI and were appended to Little Bealings Parish Councils' response to the East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation. Therefore they are not directly relevant to East Anglia THREE Phase III consultation.
Norfolk County Council	08/08/15	Email	NA	I can confirm that Norfolk County Council does not have any specific concerns relating to the proposed amendments given that these relate to areas outside Norfolk (e.g. refinement of cable route etc). Please be aware that the County Council's previous comments made in June 2014 to the original proposal still remain valid (see attached).	No Action Required

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Little Bealings Parish Council	Undated	Email		From examination of Map 2.2b it is obvious that access point U will be along the track to Cherry Tree Farm via Seckford Hall Road whereas the access point V from Lodge Road appears to cut directly across the field to the south of Waveney Cottage rather than making use of the lane leading to Meadow Cottage. Is this interpretation of the map correct?	A letter responding to all of these questions was sent to Little Bealings Parish Council on 8 th October 2015; answers are summarised here: This is correct. In developing accesses EATL have tried to balance reduction of materials required during construction (of which materials for the haul road are the biggest component of the overall materials requirement) with minimising loss of amenity – in some cases therefore EATL have chosen to use existing tracks or paths. In the case of Access V, it is simpler and creates less disruption to public footpaths to access the cable route straight across the field.
Little Bealings Parish Council	Undated	Email	Description of the development; Traffic and Transport	The Parish Council wishes to have details of the operations which will be taking place as well as some indication of the likely volume of vehicle movements, the size of the vehicles that will be used, and the time scale for these operations at each access point. We are concerned to understand these issues not only in relation to construction but also for the life of the project.	A map was attached to the letter showing the indicative works around The Bealings. and a detailed description of the works and plant required was included within the letter.
Little Bealings Parish Council	Undated	Email	Description of the development	It was also been noted that in relation to the access points “suitability was discussed with stakeholders and members of the local community” – see para.23, p.8. For the avoidance of doubt, the Parish Council has had no approach on this issue. We therefore seek your assurance that we will be given the opportunity to meet your representatives so as to understand these proposals in detail.	Access locations have been the subject of two consultations (See sections 11.5, 11.6 and 11.7 in the consultation Report for further detail) and also part of on-going discussions with the local authorities particularly where these interact with public rights of way. A list of 59 potential accesses along the onshore cable route was consulted upon within Phase IIb. Of the 21 responses to the Phase IIb

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
					<p>consultation received, the majority provided information about the suitability of some of the accesses which had been proposed.</p> <p>Following that consultation, the 59 accesses were reduced to the 37 which were consulted upon this year. The locations of the accesses have been designed to, as far as possible, reduce the requirement for the laying of a haul road.</p>
South Norfolk Council	Undated	Email	General	Thank you for consulting South Norfolk Council regarding the East Anglia THREE Offshore Windfarm Project. We have had a look through the consultation documentation and as the proposals do not appear to have a direct impact on the South Norfolk area we do not have any comments to make in response to the consultation.	No action required
Bawdsey Parish Council	Undated	Email	Traffic and Transport	By using Access Road B for EA3 it will create very real road safety issues, especially as the exit point is between two bends which obscure vision of oncoming traffic both ways. Most days of the week a number of coaches from the Alexanders International School, large delivery lorries and other vehicles use this road. It is proposed that contractors will use 'minimal engineering intervention'; 'soft' solutions will be found (eg a manned stop/go sign). We cannot see that this will work effectively. To have at least two workmen (one at each end of the sharp bends) between the access site during the proposed working day of 0700 to 1900 hours is going to be a costly exercise to say the least. This stretch of road is outside the 30mph zone and is in the national speed limit area which is designated at 60mph.	Access and traffic across the entire project would be carefully managed via plans agreed with the local authorities to ensure that the safety of residents and road users is not compromised and disturbance to residents is kept to a practicable minimum at all times during all phases of the project. Specific measures that could be applied during the construction are outlined in East Anglia THREE, ES Volume I, Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport and within the Outline Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref: 8.7)
Bawdsey Parish Council	Undated	Email	Traffic and Transport	Surely a better option is to use the access opposite the EA1 landfall site. It is understood that this will incur additional costs	Access B is being proposed in addition to Access A. Access A is required to reach the landfall, Access B is

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				of construction, over a fairly short length, of a new haul road. However, surely this cost will be partly offset by negating the manned stop/go signs. It will also remove to a greater degree the road safety issue and be far less invasive to the residents of Ferry Cottages.	required to reach the cable route where it crosses Bawdsey Marshes. Due to the different techniques involved it is not possible to use access A instead of Access B.
Bawdsey Parish Council	Undated	Email	Traffic and Transport	Can Scottish Power please (i) explain why the original access road for EA1 is not being used for EA3? (ii) clarify in more detail the plans for traffic management at the proposed new access road?	This was explained in detail in a letter to Bardsey Parish Council which was sent on 8 th October 2015. The management measures are detailed in the Traffic Management Plan which is being submitted as part of the DCO application.
Bawdsey Parish Council	Undated	Email	Description of the development	What are the proposed steps ScottishPower will be taking when decommissioning the land and offshore areas they have installed after the windfarms are no longer in use?	An answer to this question was also detailed in the letter sent on the 8 th October 2015.
Bawdsey Parish Council	Undated	Email	Description of the development	Bearing in mind that water, electricity and telephone supplies are buried in or beside Ferry Road how will these supplies be maintained when trenching across Ferry Road?	An answer to this question was also detailed in the letter sent on the 8 th October 2015.
Marine Scotland	09/11/15	Email		No comments at this stage, will review ES when available	No action required

40.3 Table 40.2 Non Statutory consultee responses

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Secretary of State for Transport	20/06/15	Email	NA	I refer to your letter of 12 June 2015 to Mark Mathews in respect of the above. In order that I might re-direct this to the correct section for response please provide a plan of any relevant Secretary of State for Transport land ownership interests.	Such a plan was not available at that stage of the project, however an email was sent to this Secretary of State for Transport on the 6 th November 2015 clarifying that one could now be made available if still required. Also pointed out in the email was the

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
					fact that The East Anglia THREE cable route was very similar to East Anglia ONE and therefore the same Secretary of State for Transport land ownership interests are likely to apply.
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	23/06/15	Email	Land Use	<p>Thank you for emailing your enquiry to Fulcrum Pipelines Limited (FPL). We will check whether we own any plant in the area indicated on your request and we will contact you shortly. If you have not enclosed a map showing your area of interest and supplied co-ordinates of your site, we request that you provide this information as soon as possible as failure to do so may delay our response. We aim to provide a response within 15 days, however if your enquiry is urgent or you would like to speak with us in the meantime, please contact one of our advisors on the number below.</p> <p>Please note, it is essential to refer to the HSE document HSG47 for information regarding trial holes and safe digging practices when working near utility pipes.</p>	EATL provided Fulcrum with the outline coordinates that were requested on the 23 rd June 2015, further detail is provided within the DCO application
Vodafone	25/06/15	Email	Infrastructure and Other Users	We have received the attached for consideration. Please can you provide the turbine coordinates to enable us to assess this?	Vodafone were provided with the coordinates soon after the response was received.
Vodafone	29/05/15	Email	Infrastructure and Other Users	The Fixed line of the operation, for Vodafone, have advised no issues and it is now with the radio division, of the business, for feedback.	No action required
Suffolk Life	30/06/15	Email	Land Use	Thank you for your letter of 12th June 2015 regarding Phase III consultation. So that I can pass this to the appropriate person please could you confirm the address(es) of our properties affected? Any correspondence from us should carry a 6 digit reference beginning FA so if you could quote that reference that too would be helpful	This information was not available at the time of the Phase III consultation. However this information will be available during the examination phase.
Suffolk	07/07/15	Letter	Description of	Given their potential for adverse impacts on marine mammals,	East Anglia ONE removed the option of monopiles

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Wildlife Trust			the development; Marine Mammals	such as harbour porpoise, we are disappointed to see that monopole foundations are still included as a foundation type. As detailed in our response to the consultation on this project in July 2014 (section 1.1.3 of our letter of 8th July 2014) monopole foundations were removed from the East Anglia ONE project ostensibly to ensure the impact of the project on marine mammals was reduced. We therefore continue to urge East Anglia THREE Ltd to use foundation types which are less noisy to install and to further explain the inclusion of monopoles as a foundation type.	from the project envelope primarily to mitigate the impact on fish spawning stocks ¹ . Whilst the project noted the benefit to other marine receptors, including marine mammals, it was not the primary objective. EATL met with Suffolk wildlife Trust on the 18 th September 2015 to discuss any remaining concerns about the project.
Suffolk Preservation Society	14/07/15	Letter	Landscape	As previously stated under our response to East Anglia One Offshore Windfarm SPS remains in principle supportive of non-visual intrusive infrastructure provision through the use of undergrounding of cables. We are pleased to note that adequate provision will have been made under East Anglia One to install cable ducting suitable to accommodate both projects and that once installation activities are completed at the 'landfall site' at Bawdsey there will be no buildings or above ground infrastructure at this location. However, although of minor size, we are concerned that the number of kiosks along the cable route to the Converter Station has been significantly increased and would ask that appropriate consideration is given to their appearance and positioning to minimise any further visual impacts, however minimal.	A Letter was sent to Suffolk Preservation Society on the 6 th October 2015 providing a reply to all of their concerns raised during S42 consultation. Summaries included below. The visual impact of kiosks and substations are assessed in the East Anglia THREE, ES, Volume 1, Chapter 29 Seascape Landscape and Visual amenity.
Suffolk Preservation	14/07/15	Letter	Landscape	Based upon the information provided for East Anglia Three, SPS's principle focus is on the impacts from the Converter	The impact assessment for the substation of relevance to heritage is covered in the East Anglia

¹ <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010025/2.%20Post-Submission/Application%20Documents/Environmental%20Statement/7.3.5%20Volume%202%20Chapter%2010%20Fish%20Ecology.pdf>

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Society				Station which will be, as you have also recognised, a further significant development in this locality. Not only does SPS have concerns regarding the setting of local designated heritage assets immediately affected including the Church of St Mary, Flowton and Bullenhall Farmhouse, Bramford, Canes Farm, Half Moon House Burstall and Hill Cottage, Burstallhill but also the overall cumulative impact that this structure, its supporting infrastructure and future identified expansions will have in the wider rural landscape setting. The SPS has strong reservations about the extent and coverage of the Heritage Impact Assessment, in particular during the operational period of the Converter Station and would ask that you revisit this prior to finalisation of the Environmental Statement.	THREE, ES, Volume 1, Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Amenity and Chapter 25 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Statement.
Suffolk Preservation Society	14/07/15	Letter	Landscape	We are pleased to understand that the final grid connection will be entirely via underground cables from the Converter Station to the National Grid's substation at Bramford which has the capacity and infrastructure already in place to receive these additional inputs without the need for any upgrades or provision of additional infrastructure.	No action required
Suffolk Preservation Society	14/07/15	Letter	Landscape	The Converter Station will be uncharacteristically large and dominant for its location yet very little detail has been provided to comment upon at this stage, including any design form or mitigation proposed. Currently it is unclear how this installation will interact in terms of siting, scale and massing with other buildings being proposed under East Anglia One or required later under East Anglia Two and Four.	Further detail on the substation parameters is provided in the East Anglia THREE, ES, Volume 1, Chapter 5 Description of the Development and of the mitigation measures in the OLEMS (doc ref 8.6) which is being submitted as part of this application.
Suffolk Preservation Society	14/07/15	Letter		We are pleased to understand that it is intended to undertake a more detailed independent design review using the services of CABE during the latter part of the summer to further inform your considerations around these issues and that detailed discussions are taking place with the local authorities, some of	The above is a comment which relates to East Anglia ONE work with the Design Council and not East Anglia THREE; consideration will be given to working with the Design Council for East Anglia THREE at the

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				the affected parish councils and landowners in respect of the level of the required on-site and off-site mitigation works to be provided.	post consent stage.
Suffolk Preservation Society	14/07/15	Letter		Reaching a suitable level of agreement and support with all interested parties at the earliest stage of the project will certainly aid the later examination stage process. To this extent SPS would also be willing to engage further with East Anglia THREE Limited at this time to provide more commentary around siting, design principles and landscape provision prior to any design review submission.	As detailed design for the East Anglia THREE substation(s) is not known at this stage, a design envelope has been put forward for the purposes of assessing the worst case dimensions of the substation buildings, ancillary equipment and compound. Detailed design will not take place until post consent. EATL will engage with the relevant parties at that time to discuss matters relating to detailed design.
Suffolk Preservation Society	14/07/15	Letter	Socio-economics	Finally we would reiterate, as at East Anglia ONE, the case for an environmental fund to be established to provide a degree of compensation to those local communities that will be undoubtedly impacted upon during both the construction and lifetime operation of this project. The absence of any such recognition of the impact from such significant infrastructure provision within small rural communities we see as being both unacceptable and inequitable to those communities.	The points above have been noted. This issue was raised with the Local Planning Authorities with regard to the East Anglia ONE Development Consent Order (DCO) application. Please see an extract from their Local Impact Report below, for details of their conclusions.
West Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust	17/07/15	Email	NA	I have been forwarded information about consultation for the above project. I would like to speak to someone about the relevance of the Trust regarding feedback on the proposals outlined - we are frequently sent planning/106 correspondence which it should be directed to the local Clinical Commissioning Group. I am keen to make sure you are directing your information to the right organisation. Unfortunately the correspondence I have only contains this email or an address as a method of communication. I would therefore be grateful if you could advise me of a name and number of someone I	The East Anglia THREE project managers details were provided to this stakeholder.

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				would speak to, to clarify this matter.	
Suffolk Constabulary	22/07/15	Letter		<p>Suffolk Constabulary holds no view as to the merits of a specific development, only that the development does not have an adverse impact on the current level of policing in Suffolk's communities. If it is deemed that a development will have an adverse impact on the current level of policing afforded to the community, Suffolk Constabulary will seek the appropriate mitigation through the planning process and other such channels. It is therefore important that our organisations work together, maintaining good communications, throughout the planning and construction phase of the proposed development.</p> <p>We have taken this opportunity to consult with those forces who have already been the recipients of this type of development, allowing for a better understanding in Suffolk of the potential impact.</p>	No action required at the application stage. All of the comments received by Suffolk Constabulary will be considered should the project receive consent.
Suffolk Constabulary	22/07/15	Letter		<p>It is envisaged that the main impact from the development on policing would occur during the construction phase: traffic management, abnormal loads, influx of work force, theft from site, protests. It is anticipated that as the developer, measures will be put in place to ease the impact of the above and other issues. However, criminal elements will be attracted to large development sites therefore Suffolk Constabulary will be the investigating Force for criminal activity resulting from the development. Staff working on the development could potentially be the victims and perpetrators of crime, which again will require investigation.</p>	No action required at the application stage.
Suffolk Constabulary	22/07/15	Letter		<p>The other element of the construction phase is that it is likely to generate police activity in the form of policing protests. While it is not anticipated the off shore element will attract protests, it is however possible that the laying of cables will</p>	No action required by East Anglia THREE at the application stage.

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				generate protester activity. Whilst Suffolk Constabulary supports the right to lawful protest, and acknowledges that where appropriate protests will be managed by the developer's staff and security, there may be points where the Constabulary will need to engage. It is therefore in all parties interest to understand the rules of engagement, and circumstances, for the police when attending protests. Some of the activities alluded to above may result in the East Anglia One phase, for example the ducting laid in East Anglia One will be used in the East Anglia Three phase to minimise the impact of the cabling being laid during East Anglia Three Stage. As a result, any protests against the cabling could occur in the East Anglia One phase 2017-2018?	
Suffolk Constabulary	22/07/15	Letter		It is acknowledged that upon completion, due to the main part of the development site being offshore and requiring minimal staffing, there will be a nominal impact on day-to-day policing. As with other Forces that have this type of development in their area, Suffolk Constabulary will develop a contingency plan. This will be worked on in conjunction with colleagues from Norfolk Constabulary, who already have an off shore development of this nature. I would ask that when the above is being developed, that the appropriate resources to assist in this work are made available from Scottish Power Renewables	No action required
Suffolk Constabulary	22/07/15	Letter		With regard to the way forward as the developers of similar projects to that proposed in Suffolk it is acknowledged that you will have experience in the areas alluded to above. As indeed Suffolk Constabulary has experience of policing other infrastructure developments.	
RSPB	22/07/15	Letter	Offshore Ornithology	Table 3.1 indicates that phasing requires more vessel movements for construction; this would be likely to result in a longer period of piling activities (noise) and would result in a	The changes in project description which will impact upon ornithology are reflected in the East Anglia

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				longer duration overall for disturbance effects during construction. It is concluded that these represent limited changes compared to the scale of the project and that these changes are not therefore likely to change impact levels significantly, however, we consider that justification for these conclusions should be provided. This should be supported by quantification of the magnitude of such changes (e.g. duration, timing and number of vessels). We also consider that in-combination assessments of disturbance to offshore ornithology should be revisited to reflect changes in timing or duration and subsequent crossover with other projects.	THREE ES, Volume 1 Chapters 13 Offshore Ornithology and Chapter 24 Onshore Ornithology.
RSPB	22/07/15	Letter	Onshore Ornithology	Paragraph 19 indicates that the phased approach would result in a doubling of the time required for onshore construction (to two periods of 13 months each). As above, it is concluded that these represent limited changes compared to the scale of the project and that these changes are not therefore likely to change impact levels significantly. Given the potential for disturbance to brent geese of the Deben Estuary SPA, we consider that further assessment will be necessary, alongside provision of further details, including the timing and duration of these activities and any potential mitigation. We also note that the haul road will be left in place between the two works phases. Again, we would like to see further details regarding this, such as precise locations, and if necessary, mitigation options for any loss of brent goose foraging habitat.	The changes in project description which will impact upon brent geese are reflected in the East Anglia THREE ES, Volume 1 Chapter 24 Onshore Ornithology.
Office of Rail and Road	Undated	Email	General	We have reviewed your proposals and can confirm that the ORR has no comment to make on this particular document.	No action required
Suffolk Branch of Butterfly Conservation	Undated	Email	Terrestrial Ecology	Our concern is for the Wall Brown butterfly (<i>Lassiommatia megera</i>) which is a UKBAP species in decline across the country. In Suffolk, it has retreated to coastal sites, and one of	EATL wrote to the Suffolk Branch of Butterfly Conservation on the 8 th October 2015 responding to their concerns and summaries are provided below:

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				its few remaining strongholds is at East Lane, Bawdsey, precisely at the landfall location for Anglia ONE. Now that the necessary approvals for Anglia ONE have been granted, it is clear that we have no alternative but to accept that a section of its most favoured habitat will be wiped out when the landfall site is constructed, and to hope that the strip of coastal grassland will recover in the years following the conclusion of work at Bawdsey. It may be optimistic to hope that the butterfly will return, but if it retains its breeding strip to the north of Bawdsey, the butterfly could spread back over the restored grassland.	<p>EATL recognise that the landfall is a relatively important area for invertebrates and note the presence of Wall Brown. However, the route selected at the landfall location is the least damaging location along that section of coastal habitat and avoids the vegetated shingle habitat. There would however be a direct negative temporary impact through habitat loss on the shingle and coastal cliff through construction of the temporary access route.</p> <p>The East Anglia ONE project will be undertaking works at the landfall to install cables for that project together with ducts for two future projects, which includes East Anglia THREE. Installation of the ducts means that impacts from future projects will be much reduced in this area. As regards the works for East Anglia ONE, impacts would be dependent upon the construction method (i.e. whether there is a requirement to access the beach from the land) and on completion of the works, all habitat loss would be reinstated.</p>
Suffolk Branch of Butterfly Conservation	Undated	Email	Terrestrial Ecology	The Wall does still fly in the Lowestoft area, but the chosen landfall for Anglia TWO is not of comparable importance to the Bawdsey “hot spot”, so no objection was lodged. The choice of the same Bawdsey site for East Anglia THREE seemed to be doing less damage to habitat than choosing a site at , say, 2 miles up the coast – which could be seen as severing the line feature at a new point. In saying that, I have assumed that the landfall work for ONE and THREE will be conducted as cost-effectively as possible – i.e. enlarging the task, but conducting	As described above, the use of pre-installed ducts will reduce the impacts at the landfall (and indeed along the whole onshore cable route) for East Anglia THREE and as a wider measure the use of the same landfall location limits any impacts to one location. Dependent upon the methods used for installing the ducts by East Anglia ONE there may be a requirement to have temporary access to the beach

Organisation	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				the work as one extended operation, spoiling only the same section.	over the cliff. If no access is required, there would be no impact to the cliff from East Anglia THREE works. At this point in time, the construction methods for East Anglia ONE have not been fully refined and therefore in the assessment for East Anglia THREE we have assumed the worst case in which there is disturbance to the habitat from both projects.
Suffolk Branch of Butterfly Conservation	Undated	Email	Terrestrial Ecology	I hope that explains the grief that the selection of Bawdsey caused us, and the reasoning that found us more relaxed about THREE and TWO. The butterfly's prospects have not been improved by its poor performance during the 2015 season. Sadly, its numbers, and its extent along the coast have both reduced. By the time your sites are delivering electricity, the Wall Brown will probably be a very rare butterfly in Suffolk.	Noted and no action required at this stage.

40.4 Table 40.3 Public responses

Member of Public	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
Member of the Public 23	15/06/15	Email	General	I keep receiving letters from yourselves about the windfarm, the letters are in the name of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] this is my address but no one here has that name, so you either have the wrong house or it is the right house but you have put the wrong name, I am getting worried as I do not know if this has something to do with my property or not, this has been going on since you started this, I have telephoned you about this before and was told you had been sending these to the wrong address and does not affect me and the lady said she was going to sort it out but I am still receiving them	Member of the Public 23 has been removed from the EATL consultation list as not a landowner.
Member of the Public 24	08/07/15	Letter	Traffic and Transport	In response to the phase 3 Consultation document re East Anglia Offshore Wind Farm I require better information/clarification re access point 'J'. At the Waldinfield Crossroads. It would appear to follow an existing path currently used by myself and others to avoid walking along the road to the village and its amenities. This road is unsuitable/ unsafe for pedestrian use. Will there still be access to the path during construction? I was unable to attend either of the consultation days due to work commitments. I attended the previous consultation event at Woodbridge but no mention re light or noise pollution during construction was available. No information was forthcoming as to how the traffic flow will be managed during construction. In the light of the proposed Adastral Park development, the extended extraction of gravel from the local pits and increased activity/ access of the industrial units and services/ crevices Engineering in Newbourne Road some information would be appreciated.	As a result of stakeholder concerns raised during the Phase III consultation, EATL removed Access J from the East Anglia THREE application. This was conveyed to Linda in a letter sent on the 19 th October 2015.
Member of the Public 25	16/09/15	Email	General	My first question was if anyone had sought a joint project with other utilities, not to speculate on the likely success of such a venture. I	The East Anglia THREE cable route has been designed to minimise impacts to people and

Member of Public	Date	Method	Topic	Comment	Action / Response/ or reference to relevant document
				can only hope that maybe the utilities in question might get in contact with you guys if they see possibilities in sharing infrastructure.	properties and therefore unlikely to coincide with the geographical requirements for utilities which by their nature will need to be close to properties. The East Anglia THREE cable route is fixed in terms of location as it follows the East Anglia ONE cable route; therefore it is unlikely that we would be able to move it to fit the requirements of a utilities company.
25	16/09/15	Email	Description of the development	My second question was if the screening areas around the site could be made accessible to the public as a bridge building exercise. I'm shocked to hear that areas such as these in close proximity of the site are considered a health and safety risk. Are there any plans to make these screening areas more dangerous than a park or footpath? Or is there a radiation risk from the site itself?	All of the current proposed screening will be located on the land purchased for the EAOW projects. For health and safety reasons it will be unlikely that access will be possible to these areas. A letter was sent to Member of the public 25 replying to these comments.

Appendix 40 Ends Here