



The Planning Inspectorate

Application by East Anglia Three Offshore Wind Limited

East Anglia Three Offshore Wind Farm

The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

Published on Thursday 22 September 2016

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA) second written questions (SWQs) and requests for information.

Column 2 of the table indicates **to whom questions are directed**. In no way does this preclude an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a **unique reference number** which combines a section number and a question number.

When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are answering a limited number of questions, responses in a letter format will suffice. If you are answering several questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on that used below. An editable version of this table, in Microsoft Word, is available on request from case team by emailing:

EastAngliaThree@pins.gsi.gov.uk

PN	Principle and nature of the development	
PN9	Applicant	The East Anglia ONE (EA ONE) project considered the use of either High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) or High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) electrical solutions, the latter having now been chosen and the effect of which is to lessen the height and amend the design of its substation elements at Bramford. The EA THREE project is considering the alternative electrical solutions of HVDC and Low Frequency Alternating Current (LFAC). Please explain the differences between HVAC and LFAC and why the latter is being considered as an option for EA THREE rather than HVAC.
ECO	Ecology offshore - ornithology	
ECO12	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	In response to the ExA's First Written Questions (FWQ) [REP3-002, question EC03 – impacts of the project alone] a paper by Green et al, <i>Lack of sound science in assessing wind farm impacts on seabirds</i> is referenced. Please could the RSPB supply to the ExA a copy of this paper?
ECO13	RSPB	In its comments on responses to the ExA's FWQ [REP3-002], the RSPB notes that the approach of using any Biologically Defined Minimum Population Scales population for Population Viability Analysis (PVA) is novel, and requires greater explanation and consideration. Is the RSPB now satisfied that the Applicant has provided sufficient explanation and, if not, what further information does RSPB require?
ECO14	RSPB	In its comments on responses to the ExA's FWQ [REP3-002], RSPB recommended changes to the Collision Risk Model (CRM) assessment approach for gannet, to which the Applicant responded [REP3-005]. Does RSPB have any outstanding concerns?
ECO15	RSPB	The Applicant has submitted a PVA for great black-backed gull [REP3-005]. Does this address the RSPB's concerns?
ECO16	RSPB	Natural England takes the view that although a significant cumulative effect on the kittiwake population is likely, the contribution from the project is so small as to not alter the significance of the overall cumulative mortality figure. Does the RSPB agree with this position? If not, please explain.
ECO17	Applicant	The Applicant's collision risk update [REP4-011] is calculated on the basis of EA ONE being reduced to 102 turbines. The ExA notes that the non-material change consented by the Secretary of State decision reduces the consented EA ONE turbine number to 150. The Applicant is requested to provide an updated CRM which is calculated on the basis that EA ONE includes 150 turbines.

ECMM	Ecology offshore – marine mammals	
ECMM15	Whale and Dolphin Conservation (WDC)	WDC and the Applicant in their Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) [REP2-056] had a number of areas of disagreement. In its comments on Written Representations [REP3-005] the Applicant highlighted recommendations made by WDC which had not yet been addressed, including ground-truthing of modelled noise assessment data and making collected data available to stakeholders, and provided its response. Have WDC's concerns been addressed by the Applicant and, if not, what additional information does WDC consider should be provided?
ECMM16	Natural England (NE)	At the first Development Consent Order (DCO) Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) on 29 June 2016, Schedule 1 Part 3 Requirement 5 of the dDCO was discussed. The Applicant described footprints for foundation bases and that wider 4m diameter piles would be required for triangular bases with smaller 3.5m diameter piles for square bases, but the square bases would have a greater pile footprint. Can NE confirm that it is content with the temporal and spatial piling assessment, and that it is immaterial for EIA or HRA assessment whether 3.5m or 4m diameter piles are used in the way the Applicant proposes?
ECMM17	Applicant	In its post-hearing submission for Deadline 4 [REP4-032] the MMO states that it would not expect the Secretary of State to instruct the MMO who to consult. MMO suggests it more appropriate for the Applicant to consult with The Wildlife Trusts (TWT) during drafting, and the Trusts should be named in the draft Deemed marine Licence (dDML). Is the Applicant willing to name TWT and WDC in the dDML?
ECMM18	Rijkswaterstaat	In the SoCG between Rijkswaterstaat [REP2-047] and the Applicant, it is stated that the Applicant will discuss the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) with Rijkswaterstaat once the document has been progressed with the relevant UK authorities. Is Rijkswaterstaat satisfied with this approach?
EL	Ecology onshore	
EL8	Applicant	The Applicant's response to the ExA's FWQs [REP2-028] states that ' <i>an Arboricultural Clerk of Works will be appointed during construction</i> '. Please clarify the timescale for the appointment of the Arboricultural Clerk of Works. Is this secured in the dDCO?
EL9	NE	Is NE content that Schedule 1 Part 3 Requirement 21 of the dDCO submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-003] sufficiently secures mitigation in relation to wintering Brent Geese?

EL10	Applicant, Suffolk County Council (SCC)	At the Environmental ISH on 7 September 2016, the Applicant and SCC responded to the ExA question regarding mitigation measures for skylark, saying that the measures had been agreed. Can the parties confirm this and state what the measures are and how they are secured?
MGPP	Marine Processes	
MGPP10	Applicant	Please provide further details of the various methods for the removal of concrete mattresses that were referred to in response to the ExA's FWQ, MGPP3 [REP2-028].
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment	
HRA11	RSPB, Applicant	In the SoCG with the Applicant [REP2-049] the RSPB, using its preferred parameters, calculates that for Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA gannet, the in-combination collision risk from EA3 is 11% of the population, which it does not consider a small contribution. The RSPB states that mortality could be significantly reduced through an increase in draft height, and that it is in discussion with the Applicant. Can the parties provide an update on these discussions and whether the issue can be resolved?
HRA12	Applicant and NE	In Appendix 2 of Information for Habitats Regulations Assessment [APP-103] at paragraph 16, the Applicant refers to a NE and JNCC document (Natural England 2013). Could either party please provide this as an examination document?
HRA13	All Interested Parties	The ExA invites responses related to the Applicant's assessment of effects on the Southern North Sea pSAC [REP4-016], the draft Site Integrity Plan (SIP) [REP4-013] and the drafting of Condition 13 of the dDMLs to secure the SIP [REP4-003 and 004].
HRA14	Applicant	The Applicant states in its answers to the ExA's FWQ [REP2-028] that it has provided the revised/additional HRA Integrity Matrices as REP2-088. However, this submission only includes amended HRA Screening Matrices. Please can the Applicant also provide the amended Integrity Matrices as requested at HRA9 of the ExA's FWQ [PD-012]? Please also provide these in Word version.
HRA15	RSPB	NE takes the view that although an adverse effect on the kittiwake population of the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA and Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA due to in-combination collision mortality cannot be ruled out, the EA THREE contribution is so small as to not materially alter the

		significance or the likelihood of an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA. Does the RSPB agree with this position?
HRA16	Applicant	In NE's Appendix 3 of its written submission for Deadline 4 [REP4-029], it is noted that cumulative and in-combination CRM total figures presented in the Applicant's Deadline 4 submission document - EA ONE CRM Revised for Final Wind Farm Design [REP4-011] - differ from those in the EA3 Environmental Statement (ES) and for the Hornsea 2 Offshore Wind Farm. Can the Applicant provide an explanation of the differences and confirm the correct figures for both EIA and HRA CRMs?
HRA17	Applicant	Please could the Applicant respond to the comments made by NE regarding the Updated Southern North Sea pSAC HRA report in Appendix 2 of its Deadline 4 response [REP4-029]?
HRA18	Applicant	Please could the Applicant respond to the comments made by NE on the draft SIP in Appendix 1 of its Deadline 4 response [REP4-029]?
HRA19	MMO	Could the MMO enlarge on its comments on harbour porpoise impacts provided in paragraph 2.1 of its post-hearing submission [REP4-032]? Is the MMO seeking to have all the proposed mitigation measures for the pSAC included in the draft SIP?
HRA20	NE	The approach proposed by the Applicant in relation to the draft SIP leaves detailed mitigation to be determined post-consent. Is NE satisfied that this approach meets the requirements of the Habitats Directive?
FN	Fishing and navigation	
FN9	Applicant	In FWQ, question FN2 [PD-012], the ExA asked whether a copy of the Cefas report on shark by-watch could be provided. Although the Applicant has said in response to question FN2 [REP2-028] that it has reviewed this report and has not identified any content within it which would result in any material change to the assessment in the ES, the ExA would welcome the report being submitted as an Examination document.
FN10	VisNed and NFFO, Applicant	Within the SoCG with the Applicant [REP2-058], VisNed and NFFO at ID6 have expressed reservations as to whether vessels would return to fish within operational wind farms, and the viability of doing so.

		What evidence exists that fishing activity within the North Sea does not return or is maintained at previous levels in the context of operational wind farms? Please provide any evidential documentation relating to this.
FN11	Applicant	<p>The SoCG with VisNed and NFFO [REP2-058] states that in the event of a cable becoming exposed, notification will be issued via the SeaFish Kingfisher Information Service and Notice to Mariners.</p> <p>a) How will it be known if a cable becomes exposed?</p> <p>b) How is notification secured in the dDMLs?</p> <p>c) What provision would be made (and how would this be secured in the DMLs) for the appropriate protection of cable assets pending the completion of any necessary remedial works?</p>
FN12	Applicant, VisNed and NFFO	<p>In the SoCG with VisNed and NFFO [REP2-058], VisNed expresses concern about the snagging potential of the nose of Pulse/Sum Wing gear on cable installations within the project area where buried to a depth of 0.5m.</p> <p>a) Can the Applicant please comment on this?</p> <p>b) How many vessels use or are likely to use this type of gear during the project's lifetime?</p>
FN13	Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes (Nord Pas-de-Calais Picardie)	In its SoCG [REP3-013], Comité Régional des Pêches Maritimes (Nord Pas-de-Calais Picardie) has concerns (ID4) regarding increasing fishing activity on grounds fished by French fleets arising from cumulative displacement of other fleets as a result of wind farm development and other activities. Are there any specific comments on the cumulative assessment methodology of displacement effects used in the ES?
FN14	Applicant, MMO	Harwich Fishermen's Association reiterated at the Environmental ISH on 7 September 2016 its expressed concern relating to the ability of its members to fish, and their assessment of risk, in areas of the export cable route where cable crossings would occur. Similar concerns are also stated in the SoCG with the UK Commercial Fisheries Working Group [REP4-009].

		<p>a) What assurances can the Applicant provide as to safety and the ability to fish within the cable corridor?</p> <p>b) Who would be the arbiter of whether the area of the cable corridor was fishable or not?</p> <p>c) If it falls to individual fishermen to make the assessment of risk, what up-to-date information would be available to inform them?</p>
FN15	Applicant	In the SoCG with Rijkwaterstaat [REP2-047], the position is noted that when the final layout of the EA THREE array is available prior to construction, Rijkwaterstaat will be consulted regarding the nautical safety aspects south of the array. Please explain how such consultation is secured within the dDCO.
FN16	Applicant	Please comment on the NFFO/VisNed view expressed at ID24 of the SoCG [REP2-058] that, whilst welcoming the provision within the DMLs for trawl or drift net surveys, this should also include an over-trawlability survey covering areas trawled on the offshore cable route and the inter-array cables.
LH	Visual, landscape and heritage	
LH15	Applicant	Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC) has now discharged Requirement 10 Parts (1) to (5) of the DCO for EA ONE, relating to design aspects of the Bramford substation (response at Deadline 4 to action points arising from the Environment ISH on 7 September 2016 [REP4-027]). In the approved details the external cladding for the EA ONE substation elements are shown as being shades of grey. This being the case, can the Applicant please explain the rationale for the colouring of the proposed EA THREE substations as dark green, as shown in the Other Environmental Information (OEI) visualisations [AS-024 to AS-027].
LH16	Applicant	In response to FWQ question LH11 [REP2-028] it is stated that the Design and Access Statement will be updated to refer to the design principles developed for EA ONE. Please provide this update.
LH17	Applicant	As referenced in the Applicant's response to the ExA's FWQs [REP2-028] and the SCC/MSDC/ Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) response to the ExA's FWQs [REP2-002], please provide an update on the further archaeological works that are being undertaken in connection with EA ONE and please confirm the timescale for the submission of a Revised Written Scheme of Investigation.

LH18	Suffolk Preservation Society (SPS)	Further to comments contained within the SoCG between SPS and the Applicant [REP3-014], please comment on whether, following further review, it is considered that the Applicant's Schedule of Listed Heritage Assets accurately reflects all the listed heritage assets contained within the assessment Zone of Theoretical Visibility, and that the assessment methodologies for the cultural heritage and landscape and visual assessments are appropriate.
LH19	SPS	Further to the SPS comments contained within the SoCG [REP3-014] in relation to the conclusions of the Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA) and the adequacy of the proposed mitigation, please can SPS state its current position following review of the Applicant's OEI?
LH20	Applicant and SPS	Please provide any comments you may wish to make in regard to the paper submitted by Babergh and MSDC's [REP4-027] which addresses methodological issues arising from LVIA and heritage assessments.
CL	Construction onshore	
CL10	Suffolk Coastal District Council and Waveney District Council, Applicant	In answer to FWQ question CL6 [REP2-002] it is stated that an appeal has been lodged against the refusal of an outline planning application for up to 215 dwellings etc. on land to the east of Bridge Farm, Top Street, Martlesham. The appeal is likely to be considered at a public inquiry in 2017. The proposed cable corridor passes through the centre of this site. Please comment on what implications there may be for the present EA THREE DCO application.
CL11	Environment Agency, NE, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs)	Please comment on the acceptability of the amendments to Schedule 1 Part 3 Requirement 13(2) in the dDCO (Landfall method statement) [REP4-004].
NV	Noise and Vibration	
NV6	Applicant	Please set out any amendments and/or additions to the noise assessment that may be required as a result of the use of Henley Road rather than Lower Road for the routing of construction traffic as detailed in the Henley Road Assessment [AS-023].

NV7	Applicant	Please set out any amendments and/or additions to the noise assessment that may be required as a result of the potential implementation of a HVAC substation for EA ONE.
TT	Traffic and Transport	
TT8	Applicant, SCC, Ipswich Borough Council (IBC), SCDC, MSDC.	Included in the Applicant's OEI [AS-023] is an alternative route for construction traffic, using Henley Road rather than Lower Road to serve access 'AD'. Please provide any comments you may wish to make in regard to this alternative route.
TT9	Applicant	Please provide copies of any amended plans required to be submitted as a result of the amended route along Henley Road [AS-023].
TT10	Applicant	In response to the ExA FWQ question PN2 an indicative layout for the Paper Mill Lane Primary Construction Consolidation Site (PCCS) [REP2-091] was provided. SCC's response to the ExA's FWQs [REP2-002] indicated that detailed designs for the PCCSs are being drawn up by the EA ONE developer. If available, please provide copies of these detailed plans. If not yet available, then please provide clarification on the specific layout of the access/egress arrangements for both of the PCCSs and confirm whether or not these arrangements would remain the same for both the EA ONE and EA THREE proposals.
SE	Socio-economic	
SE9	Applicant	In the SoCG Annex 1, Table 1 item nos. 179 to 182, and Table 2 [REP2-036] SCC and SCDC/Waveney District Councils raise concerns about the evidence base from EA ONE not being up-to-date and it needing to be broadened and improved in regard to the EA THREE proposal to reflect, for example, the evolution of the New Anglia LEP Skills Manifesto. Please confirm the mechanisms by which the EA ONE Skills Strategy will be updated and improved and how in turn this will be considered and secured in the dDCO for EA THREE.
SE10	Applicant and SCC	In Annex 1, Table 1, item no. 176 of the SoCG [REP2-036] SCC states that the labour market has changed significantly since the original submission for EA ONE. Please provide additional comment on this matter.

SE11	Applicant	Please provide further comment in regard to SCC's assertions regarding displacement and skills shortages that are detailed in Annex 1, Table 1, item no. 183 of the SoCG [REP2-036].
DCO	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	
DCO1	Applicant, LPAs, NE and other agencies with an interest in securing mitigation	<p>Article 2(1) – “Commence”</p> <p>Further to the discussion of this definition at the first DCO ISH [PD-005 Annex F at pg iv], the most recent version of the dDCO [REP4-003-4] still contains a broad range of terrestrial operations that can take place before formal commencement, defined as:</p> <p><i>‘site clearance, demolition work, archaeological investigations, environmental surveys, investigations for the purpose of assessing ground conditions, remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions, diversion and laying of services, erection of any temporary means of enclosure, the temporary display of site notices or advertisements...’.</i></p> <p>Later in the dDCO, there are Requirements which provide for the approval of plans or documents that are relevant to such operations; for example Requirement 20 (archaeology) provides that:</p> <p><i>‘20.—(1) No stage of the connection works may commence until for that stage a written scheme of archaeological investigation (which accords with the outline written scheme of investigation (onshore)) has, after consultation with Historic England and Suffolk County Council, been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.’</i></p> <p>As a consequence of the drafting in Article 2(1), it is still possible that ‘archaeological investigations’ could be carried out before formal commencement. As currently drafted, there is nothing to ensure that the written scheme of archaeological investigation has to have been approved before the start of ‘archaeological investigations’ that are carried out before formal commencement, or to prevent pre-commencement works from having an uncontrolled adverse effect on archaeological assets.</p> <p>Similar considerations apply to elements of Requirements 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28 and 29 all of which require the approval of a plan or document before commencement. These relate to documents such as the ecological management plan, the code of construction practice and the traffic management plan, or protection and mitigation for European protected species, again protecting or</p>

		<p>managing significant assets or outcomes from adverse effects.</p> <p>a) The Applicant is asked to propose a change to the drafting of Article 2(1) to ensure that pre-commencement works are not exempted from the operation of relevant plans and documents, or to explain more clearly why such a change is not required.</p> <p>b) LPAs are asked to respond to the Applicant's proposals at (a) above by Deadline 6 in the Examination timetable.</p>
DCO2	Applicant and LPAs	<p>Article 2(1) – “Maintain”</p> <p>Further to the discussion of this definition at the first DCO ISH [PD-005 Annex F at pg vi], the most recent version of the dDCO [REP4-003-4] still contains a broad definition of “maintain” as follows:</p> <p><i>“maintain” includes inspect, repair, adjust, alter, remove, reconstruct and replace, and further includes remove, reconstruct and replace any of the ancillary works in Part 2 of Schedule 1 (ancillary works)...</i></p> <p>The ExA understands that the qualification ‘and further includes’ was added to the definition to address concerns about the inclusion of ‘remove, reconstruct and replace’ in the definition, by limiting these to ancillary works in Part 2 of Schedule 1. However, as currently drafted, the dDCO also retains ‘remove, reconstruct and replace’ as general and unqualified elements of the definition.</p> <p>In the absence of any qualification, it is not clear that maintenance including an unqualified and general power of removal, reconstruction and replacement has been assessed within the ES and falls within the Rochdale envelope for the application proposal.</p> <p>For the reasons raised at the first hearing and having regard to the ES / Rochdale envelope point above, it does not appear appropriate to the ExA that these elements should remain as general and unqualified. Nor has the ExA found an explanation for the current drafting in the relevant documents submitted for subsequent deadlines that addresses these concerns.</p> <p>a) The Applicant is asked to propose a change to the drafting of Article 2(1) to provide that ‘remove, reconstruct and replace’ in the definition of “maintain” are limited to ancillary works in Part 2 of Schedule 1, or to explain more clearly why such a change is not required, with specific reference to the manner in which removal, reconstruction and replacement has been assessed within the ES.</p>

		<p>b) LPAs are asked to respond the Applicant’s proposals at (a) above by Deadline 6 in the Examination timetable.</p>
DCO3	Applicant and MMO	<p>Article 5 and the draft Deemed Marine Licences – Transfer of benefit</p> <p>Article 5 of the dDCO has the effect of permitting the transfer of each Deemed Marine Licence (DML) to another person. Whilst the ExA notes the intention of the Applicant, as made clear at the first DCO ISH, was that the primary reason for the DML structure was to support the intended phasing of delivery by the same undertaker, it remains theoretically possible that all six DMLs might be held by different undertakers. Were this to be the case, the ExA would retain concerns about the need for greater security for works coordination than is currently provided in the dDCO. In order to respond to this:</p> <p>a) The Applicant is asked to review the drafting of Article 5 and/or the DMLs and to recommend a means of drafting to ensure that the intention that the DMLs will benefit a single undertaker is appropriately secured.</p> <p>b) MMO comments are sought.</p>
DCO4	Applicant, MMO, LPAs	<p>Article 5(4) and (8) – Transfer of benefit</p> <p>As presently drafted [REP4-003 -004], Article 5(4) provides for the transfer of benefit of any of the Order, including offshore works, without the consent of the Secretary of State, in circumstances where any/all onshore compulsory acquisition/injurious affection claims (the CA claims) have been resolved (5(8)(b)).</p> <p>The ExA does not fully understand the need or reasoning for this provision, beyond the fact that equivalent provisions have been included in made DCOs. Particularly, what is the relevance of the resolution of the CA claims to the question of whether or not a transfer of benefit needs the consent of the Secretary of State?</p> <p>a) The Applicant is requested to provide a clear explanation of the underlying reason for this drafting.</p> <p>b) Views of the MMO and LPAs are also sought.</p>

DCO5	The Applicant and the Crown estate (TCE)	<p>Article 37 – Crown rights As presently drafted [REP4-003-4], this Article does not provide unconditional Crown consent and still reserves what amounts to a post-approval consent mechanism to TCE.</p> <p>Is there any reason why TCE requires a post-approval consent?</p>
DCO6	Applicant	<p>Requirement 12 – Detailed design parameters onshore Further to the ExA’s request to the Applicant to review the application of the term “shall” throughout the dDCO [PD-005 Annex F at pg iv], this provision as currently drafted [REP4-003 - 004] includes use of the term “must” instead of “may”. In 12(4) & 12(8)(a) this does not appear to make sense.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to reconsider the changes of “may” to “must” and to propose alternative drafting or provide a view why the currently proposed drafting is appropriate.</p>
CA	Compulsory Acquisition (CA)	
CA18	Applicant	In the response to the ExA’s schedule of issues arising from the dDCO [REP1-011] in respect of Article 15 (compulsory acquisition of land) it is stated that land subject to freehold acquisition is not subject to temporary possession powers or subject to acquisition of new rights, and can only be compulsorily acquired through freehold acquisition. The ExA believes this to be incorrect. Article 23(a)(ii) expressly permits the undertaker to take temporary possession of any of the other Order land (i.e. apart from that in Schedule 7 over which temporary possession is permitted by (a)(ii)) in respect of which no notice of entry has been served under section 11 of the 1965 Act (other than in connection with the acquisition of rights only) and no declaration has been made under section 4 of the 1981 Act. Article 17 permits the compulsory acquisition of existing rights and new rights in all of the Order land including the land which is subject to freehold acquisition. Please comment.
CA19	Applicant	Please explain if temporary possession powers will be used over land which is subject to freehold acquisition in accordance with Article 23(1)(a)(ii).
CA20	Applicant	Can the Applicant please confirm if all the land shown in Schedule 5 is also in Schedule 7? If not, please explain if it is intended to exercise temporary possession powers over the plots in Schedule 5 in accordance with Article 23(1)(a)(ii)?

CA21	Applicant	It has been explained that it is not possible to narrow down the extent of the cable corridor until the construction design and methodology for EA ONE develops and is finalised. What provisions are in place to ensure that this is effectively communicated to the undertaker of EA THREE by the undertaker of EA ONE, to ensure that EA THREE decisions on the extent of compulsory acquisition can be taken as soon as possible and communicated to landowners?
CA22	Applicant, Crown Estate	In light of section 135(1) of PA 2008, (the need for Crown consent for the compulsory acquisition of an interest in Crown land which is being held otherwise than by or on behalf of the Crown) and the ExA's understanding that such consent should be obtained before a DCO is made, please explain what progress has been made towards obtaining consent in respect of Plots 65, 66 and 190. In this regard, the Applicant's response to CA7 [REP2-028] is noted in which it is suggested that the Crown Estate's letter of 22 June 2016 [REP1-008] granted consent. However, whilst this letter granted consent for the inclusion of such rights in Article 37 of the dDCO, the Crown Estate Commissioners state that they reserve their rights as regards their consent to exercise such compulsory acquisition powers. (See also Second Written Question DCO5).
CA23	Applicant	In answer to FWQ question CA13 [REP2- 028] the Applicant refers to advice provided on compulsory acquisition liability by Andrew Highwood of Savills, supported by Tim Cooper of Whirledge & Nott. Could a copy of this advice be provided as an Examination document?
CA24	Applicant	In response to FWQ question CA14 [REP2-028] a copy of a signed Funding Agreement has been provided. However, the agreement is now incorrect in its recitals as it refers to the shareholders of East Anglia Offshore Wind Ltd as being Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd and Scottish Power Renewables. However, in the revised Statement of Reasons (Version 2 [REP2-033]) Scottish Power Renewables is now the sole shareholder. Can a revised Funding Agreement be provided to reflect this?
CA25	Applicant	Please provide an update in the form of a plot-by-plot analysis on negotiations and positions reached with all relevant parties where land and rights acquisitions and temporary possession are required, setting out the specific rights/interests that are being sought.
CA26	Applicant	The revised Statement of Reasons [REP2-033] at 7.34 notes that Plots 199-218 (excluding plot numbers not used) include powers for cable installation and may be used as a construction compound for construction of the scheme (Work No. 29). Work 29 in the dDCO makes no reference to a construction

		compound. Can the Applicant please clarify the position?
CA27	Applicant	In responding to FWQ CA15 [REP-028] the Applicant did not fully explain the implications in terms of CA having regard to jointing bay locations. Is the Applicant able to expand on the previous response?
CA28	Applicant	Please review the Statement of Reasons (Version 2) [REP2-032], in particular the section on 'route description' as there appear to be a number of omissions and anomalies. For example, whilst the description refers to Works (as set out in Schedule 1, Part 1 of the dDCO), not all Works appear to be specifically referred to. Also, paragraph 7.37 refers to Work No. 35A although the dDCO only refers to Work No 35. Paragraph 7.37 describes Work No. 36 as including temporary rights to lay hardstanding, but the dDCO describes Work 36 as the temporary widening and upgrade of an existing track. Paragraph 7.43 refers to Work 53 as a permanent access, but the description of this Work in the dDCO is a new temporary vehicular access. Paragraph 7.45 refers to Plots 413 and 414 as lying to the east and not west of Bramford Road.