

East Anglia THREE
Offshore Windfarm

East Anglia THREE

Written Summary of Oral Submissions EM ISH

Document Reference – Deadline 6/EM ISH/Written
Summary of Oral Submissions

Applicant's Written Responses: Issue Specific Hearings October 2016

Applicant's reference for Examining Authority Question	Question	
	Applicant's Response	
Agenda Item: Onshore Ornithology - SKYLARK mitigation plan; whether there is a need for this to be secured through the DCO.		
EMHQ1	Applicant's response	<p>The Applicant can confirm that the payment towards Skylark mitigation was made on Friday 21 October. The payment has since been received by SCC and SCC has confirmed that the contribution will be used to mitigate any impact from East Anglia THREE on skylark. Accordingly, SCC has confirmed that it is now content to remove its representation in relation to the need for skylark mitigation.</p> <p>Given that the payment has already been made by the Applicant and received by SCC, there is no need for the payment to be secured through the draft Order.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that the contribution is sufficient to comply with the requirements of the Countryside Stewardship AB4, but will clarify the position with SCC following the hearing.</p>
Agenda Item: Restrictions on winter working in relation to mitigation of any potential impacts on wintering Brent Geese on the Deben Estuary SPA and Ramsar.		
EMHQ2	Applicant's response	<p>The Applicant can confirm that Requirement 21(3) of the draft Order has already been amended to deal with timing of construction works, by reference to signposting in that Requirement to the relevant section of the OLEMS. In its submission of 24 October 2016 Natural England confirmed that it was content with the amendment made to Requirement 21(3) in this respect.</p>
Agenda Item: Offshore Ornithology - Changes to the East Anglia ONE number of turbines and implications for East Anglia THREE collision modelling.		
EMHQ3	Applicant's response	<p>The East Anglia ONE Offshore Wind Farm Order 2014 (2014 Order) provided for the construction and operation of an offshore wind farm and associated offshore and onshore infrastructure of up to 240 wind turbines with a maximum</p>

		<p>capacity of 1,200MW utilising High Voltage Direct Current technology (HVDC).</p> <p>In the 2014 Contract for Difference (CfD) allocation round, administered by the Low Carbon Contracts Company, East Anglia ONE Limited (EAOL) bid and was awarded a contract for a 714MW offshore wind farm. On the basis of the CfD award a decision was taken to reduce the capacity of the project from 1,200MW to 750MW and to change the type of transmission technology.</p> <p>In order to secure consent for the change of technology, a Non Material Change application was submitted to DECC. The principal purpose of the requested change was to vary the 2014 Order to include the option to construct a 750 MW wind farm consisting of up to 150 wind turbines using a High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) transmission system as an alternative to the consented project which was configured to use a High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) system. The Non Material Change was granted and given effect by The East Anglia ONE Offshore Wind Farm (Corrections and Amendments) Order 2016 (Change Order). The Change Order only permits either the HVDC scheme or the HVAC scheme to be taken forward and no combination of the two is permitted. The Change Order also requires the undertaker to notify the Secretary of State, the MMO and relevant local authorities of the scheme which will be taken forward under Requirement 35(1).</p> <p>On 16th September 2016, EAOL wrote to the Secretary of State, the MMO and relevant authorities to provide notification that the HVAC technology had been selected and, further, that the windfarm would be constructed using 102 x 7MW turbines. On providing such notification, the right to revert to a 1,200MW HVDC project fell away. Therefore the effect of the Change Order was to reduce the maximum number of wind turbines for the East Anglia ONE wind farm from 240 to 150 turbines.</p> <p>Further, the Contracts for Difference (CfD) regime sets strict deadlines for developers of renewable energy projects successful in winning a CfD, with the risk of contracts being cancelled if deadlines are not met. The CfD regime requires significant financial commitment within 1 year following signing of the contract, which must demonstrate that 10% of total pre commissioning costs have been spent or material contracts entered into – i.e. for turbines and foundations. In addition, the project must be constructed within the set timelines, including commissioning 80% of the capacity for a phase within the target commissioning window or face erosion of the CFD term, and commissioning of at least 85% of the capacity for the phase prior to the longstop date or face termination. CfD requirements are therefore a critical driver for project delivery in terms of economic penalties or contract termination and leave very little scope for major shifts in wind farm construction contracting strategy. Contracts to construct the East Anglia ONE project are currently being placed in order to meet the existing CfD timelines. In particular, in April 2016, EAOL announced the award of a contract with Siemens for the supply of 102 x 7MW turbines. Therefore, the commercial reality is that a contract for 102 turbines has been entered into and only 102 turbines will be constructed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, collision risk modelling has been undertaken for 150 turbines, and this was presented within <i>Deadline 5 [REP5-026]</i>. Both Natural England and RSPB were sent copies of this prior to Deadline 5. Accordingly,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the Applicant does not consider it necessary to vary the East Anglia ONE Order to restrict the maximum number of turbines permitted to 102 turbines, neither is it considered necessary to restrict turbine numbers by way of commercial agreement.</p> <p>Finally, this question needs to be kept in context. Numbers of turbines to be constructed by EAOL, at both 150 and 102, have been put forward to reinforce the position where it is accepted already that the contribution of East Anglia THREE to the overall collision risk is small. What has been said is that as a result of the election to construct the HVAC option, the contribution is even smaller than an already small contribution.</p> <p>Notes</p> <p>The “commissioning window” is specified by the developer at the point on application and lasts for a period of one year. If the project has not been commissioned within this window then then the payment term begins to erode.</p> <p>The “longstop date” lasts for 2 years following then end of the “commissioning window”. If the project is not commissioned by the end of this date the CfD will be terminated.</p>
<p>Agenda Item: Proposed changes in turbine draught height.</p>		
EMHQ4	Applicant's response	<p>Discussions with RSPB on the potential for an increase in turbine draught height to reduce collision risk mortality have been ongoing since the beginning of the examination process.</p> <p>The number of operational wind turbines within a wind farm has a direct bearing on the likelihood of ornithological collision risk. In general terms, the greater the number of wind turbines the greater the risk of collision for species of concern. Again in general terms, the greater the draught height of each turbine (distance between the sea and lower tip height), the lower the collision risk for the species of concern.</p> <p>In order to address these concerns and in discussion with RSPB, the Applicant made a commitment to increase turbine draught height by 2m across 70% of turbines within the wind farm area, the effect of which was to reduce collision risk numbers across species of concern. This commitment was well received by RSPB.</p> <p>The decision on exact turbine draught height is usually taken much later in the development process, so making any judgements about such matters at the pre-consent stage needs to be given careful consideration in terms of risk to the project. Modelling was carried out which looked at variations in collision risk with increase in draught height using 22m MHWS as the baseline. Similarly technical risk, commercial risk, potential supply chain implications, CfD consideration and other relevant project constraints were then evaluated and the results brought together for analysis. There are 3 main drivers in influencing turbine draught height being radar restrictions; tip height restrictions (and limitations on rotor diameter which limits choice of turbine); and foundation design, which has driven the project to</p>

		<p>keep the draught height change as small as possible. The site has varying water depths within which foundations will need to be installed. However, it was felt that a 2m increase across 70% of turbines could be agreed without introducing unacceptable project risk at the pre-consent stage.</p> <p>Requirement 33 of the draft Order sets out height restrictions that have been agreed with the MOD in order to avoid impacts on radar. Turbines can be constructed outwith these restrictions (to the maximum tip height of 247m) subject to suitable mitigation measures being agreed with MOD. In recognition of these constraints and until suitable mitigation is agreed with the MOD, maximum flexibility is required in terms of turbine design. The Applicant considers that proposal allows the project sufficient flexibility to accommodate radar and other constraints across the entire wind farm site. For the avoidance of doubt, the maximum turbine tip height of 247m will not be exceeded despite the increase in draught height. This is illustrated in diagram submitted at Deadline 6 in response to the ExA's Action Points. It should also be noted that the commitment relates to turbines. It does not have a spatial requirement or therefore relate to a particular area of the offshore Order limits.</p> <p>A new parameter for the DMLs has been drafted to secure the proposed increase in draught height and comments on the draft parameter are being sought from the MMO, Natural England and the RSPB. It is also proposed to secure this with the parameters contained in the Requirements to the draft Order. The draft parameter requires a draught height of 24m or greater for no less than 70% of turbines. Under the DMLs condition 13 requires the Applicant to submit the proposed layout plan to the MMO for approval. Clearly part of that submission would be a demonstration by the Applicant that there was compliance with the draught height parameter.</p>
<p>Agenda Item: Marine Mammals - Ground-truthing/monitoring of noise during pile installation.</p>		
EMHQ5	Applicant's response	<p>The monitoring of the first four piles is undertaken to determine that the predictive noise modelling is comparable to the actual noise levels as soon as possible, in order to verify that the mitigation measures based on the predictive noise modelling are adequate. If the monitoring of the first four piles is considered to be inadequate to determine that the predictive noise modelling reflects the actual noise measurements, then the MMO would request that further noise measurements are undertaken. The monitoring is secured by Condition 18 of the relevant DMLs. In particular, condition 18(3) states that:</p> <p><i>"The results of the initial noise measurements monitored in accordance with sub-paragraph (1) must be provided to the MMO within six weeks of the installation of the first four piled foundations of each piled foundation type. The assessment of this report by the MMO will determine whether any further noise monitoring is required."</i></p> <p>Therefore, there is already provision for further monitoring should it be required.</p> <p>The details of the noise monitoring must be agreed with the MMO prior to construction and will take into account any new best practice/procedures, managed through the In Principle Monitoring Plan. The Applicant has also committed</p>

		in the SIP to provide a noise prognosis to the MMO, based on final design, a minimum of 9 months prior to the start of piling. It is anticipated that noise models at that time will be reflective of experience/calibration against the number of projects installing before East Anglia THREE.
Agenda Item: Marine Mammals - Contribution of acoustic data to the Noise Registry.		
EMHQ6	Applicant's response	<p>In accordance with condition 20 of the relevant DMLs, the Applicant is required to:</p> <p>(1) Submit information on the expected location, start and end dates of impact pile driving to the Marine Noise Registry (MNR), in order to satisfy the 'Forward Look' requirements of the Registry, prior to the commencement of the licensed activities. This will include notifying the MMO of the successful submission of 'Forward Look' data within 7 days of the submission.</p> <p>(2) Submit the exact locations and dates of impact pile driving to the Marine Noise Registry, in order to satisfy the 'Close out' requirements of the Registry, at 6 month intervals from the commencement of impact pile driving. The final data will be submitted within 12 weeks of completion of impact pile driving. The MMO will be notified of the successful submission of 'Close out' data within 7 days of the submission.</p> <p>The Applicant is also committed to the voluntary submission of site investigation works (as appropriate) to the MMO via the voluntary process (as applicable).</p>
Agenda Item: Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)		
EMHQ7	Applicant's response	<p>Information required for a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) with respect to the potential implications for the Southern North Sea possible Special Area of Conservation (pSAC) for harbour porpoise <i>Phocoena phocoena</i> from the proposed East Anglia THREE project has been updated.</p> <p>Revision B (Document Reference: Deadline 6 / HRA / The Applicant) represents an updated version of Revision A (Document reference: Deadline 4/HRA). The document has been updated to include additional spatial assessments and in-combination assessments of the potential effect of disturbance from underwater noise on the Southern North Sea pSAC and the North Sea Management Unit. In particular, the Applicant would draw attention to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An update to the HRA report with the new information rather than production of an addendum. The Applicant considers this is a preferred approach to ensure that all the information is contained in one document and cross-referencing is minimised. • The original assessment which looks at number of animals affected based on the site specific densities and

modelling has been retained.

- A spatial assessment has been undertaken for project alone and in-combination:
 - This assessment has focused on the advice provided by Natural England on 28th September 2016, that in the absence of finalised management measures, the parameters for assessment that were discussed at workshops with the industry on 9th February 2016, 23rd March 2016 and 31st March 2016 should be used, as outlined below:
 - A distance of 26km from an individual piling location should be used to assess the area of pSAC habitat harbour porpoise may be disturbed from during piling operations.
 - Displacement of harbour porpoise should not exceed 20% of the seasonal component of the pSAC at any one time and or on average exceed 10% of the seasonal component of the pSAC over the duration of that season.
 - The effect of the project should be considered in the context of the seasonal components of the pSAC, rather than the pSAC as a whole.
 - The worst-case scenario (WCS) and indicative scenario from the previous iteration has been retained, but a second indicative scenario to capture NE's points (REP4-029, Appendix 2) on multiple projects piling in the same zone and concurrent piling has also been included.
 - The assessment does not reproduce exactly Hornsea Project 2's assessment due to lack of access to their methodology, GIS etc. In addition the pSAC boundary and project boundaries have been refined since the publication of the Hornsea Project 2 assessments; therefore there are minor differences due to these factors.
 - Given the number of potential variables and projects, the Applicant considers that a simplistic approach is proportionate at this stage in the absence of an agreed detailed methodology.
 - As a general point, all parties (NE, MMO, NGOs) agree that a strategic assessment is required (with agreed assumptions over the project designs, turbine locations, vessel downtime etc.), therefore, at this stage, the finer detail of the revised East Anglia THREE assessment should not be a major focus – attention should instead be placed upon whether appropriate methods and general assumptions have been used and whether this provides sufficient indication of the likely significant effects (LSE)

based on the spatial impact model.

- The single impact areas for seismic and UXO have been calculated, but this has not been included in the in-combination assessment due to lack of information. Should further information be made available on the approach to incorporate this in terms of number of events per year, whether seismic is a day or multi-day impact etc. the assessment can be updated.
- The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to include further detail on potential mitigation as this would be highly speculative at this stage, particularly in light of the assessment conclusions (i.e. that for the project alone there is unlikely to be potential for likely significant effect (LSE); and for in-combination there is potential for LSE dependent upon the number of projects considered in the scenario). The SIP is provided separately to consider and secure potential available mitigation methods. The Applicant considers that any discussion on percentage impact decreases to be achieved by mitigation measures would pre-empt any future strategic assessment (with agreed inputs for all projects and accurate information on programmes, final design, agreed thresholds for impacts etc.). The conclusions are therefore that, based on the updated assessment, some scenarios may result in LSE and therefore may require mitigation and, if so, that the SIP is an appropriate way to manage this.
- **These conclusions mirror those presented in the original assessment (i.e. based on individuals affected) that the project alone should not have impacts requiring mitigation, but that dependent upon the scenario, multiple projects under construction at the same time in the same season have potential for LSE.**
- Note that for the pSAC winter season area the only pathway for a significant effect requires projects either currently under construction or due to commence construction in the next two years to be building at the same time as East Anglia THREE. In reality, piling at these projects will have been concluded long before piling at East Anglia THREE commences offshore (currently assumed to be 2021/2022).
- Note that for the pSAC summer season area there are more projects with potential overlap. Therefore in some scenarios there is greater potential for impact. Again, the worst-case includes a project which is due to complete piling before EA3 commencement.

The in-combination assessment considers all plans or projects where the predicted impacts have the potential to interact with impacts from the proposed construction, operation and maintenance or decommissioning of the East Anglia THREE project. The in-combination assessment is based on the currently available information, where

		<p>available, on these plans and projects, and where possible takes into account the uncertainty in this type of assessment by using a highly precautionary approach.</p> <p>To take into account the high level of uncertainty as to when pile driving may occur on the various projects, as timing will be affected by available infrastructure and supply chain as well as economic decisions, two scenarios have been assessed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The first scenario is the worst-case and allows for any delays and changes in project development. All Tier 1-3 (as described in JNCC & NE advice, REP5-027) projects have been given a seven year construction window from the year of consent during which the projects could commence construction (as advised by Natural England) to assess their potential overlap with the proposed construction of the East Anglia THREE project. Tier 4 project construction windows are based on the best available information on the potential year of consent. Where possible, this has been based on values for concurrent piling, including East Anglia THREE (this is considered to be a highly precautionary approach).2. The second scenario is based on more realistic (but still precautionary) approaches of the currently consented UK offshore windfarm developments that could be piling at the same time as the proposed East Anglia THREE project. Two approaches to this scenario have been used, they are based on the best currently available information on when the developments are likely to be piling. These 'indicative' approaches are for illustrative purposes only and are also likely to change, but are considered to more accurately reflect the limitations and constraints to project delivery, such as expectations around technology, limitations in the supply chain and Contracts for Difference (CfD) auctions. To account for these limitations and constraints the indicative scenario has been approached in two ways:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Approach A assumes (presented in the previous iteration of this assessment):<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Only one piling operation per project. In this scenario a piling schedule is assumed where only one piling vessel is operational at any one time as this most accurately reflects the majority of the piling programme; and○ Only one project piling per year per development zone. This scenario is still in excess of the Committee on Climate Change (CCC) target of 1-1.3GW per year which is roughly equivalent to East Anglia THREE alone.b. Approach B (added to reflect a Natural England request to include concurrent piling and multiple projects piling within the same zone) assumes:
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There can be multiple piling within projects and zones. In this scenario the number of piling vessels and any spatial constraints are based on information provided in the developer's ESs (or subsequently available public information). <p>In relation to the Greater Wash pSPA, the Applicant can confirm that this was considered as part of the assessments undertaken to date. This was included within the HRA on the advice of Natural England, and Natural England has confirmed that it is content with the assessment.</p>
<p>Agenda Item: Accepting that discussions are continuing between the Applicant and Natural England regarding the Southern North Sea possible Special Area of Conservation (pSAC), there are a number of issues raised in Deadline 5 representations that the ExA would like to investigate in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Southern North Sea pSAC HRA report. • The draft Site Integrity Plan. 		
EMHQ8	Applicant's response	<p>For the HRA on Hornsea 2 the Secretary of State (SoS) was prepared to accept, at this stage, a condition within the DMLs (the equivalent of the Applicant's SIP) which secured mitigation measures in order to provide sufficient certainty that there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the pSAC, albeit that the form of that mitigation was to be settled at a later date. In conducting the Appropriate Assessment for East Anglia THREE, the SoS will need to satisfy himself that there is sufficient certainty that the mitigation measures secured will avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the pSAC. As with Hornsea 2, thereafter and within that framework it is left for the MMO to judge refinement of the mitigation measures and if necessary, the MMO may (as Competent Authority) consider the need to undertake a further appropriate assessment. As set out by the Applicant at the DCO hearing, the SoS explained the rationale as to why the MMO was the appropriate body to approve these mitigation measures, which included the MMO's strategic oversight on other projects within the vicinity of the pSAC. Accordingly, the Applicant considers that the MMO is the appropriate body to approve the SIP with advice from Natural England.</p> <p>The Applicant has drafted the SIP to require consultation with stakeholders as it is devised and on its final form. However, the Applicant believes that the role of an 'expert working group' would be better placed to inform strategic discussion on the management of the pSAC rather than being replicated for each project.</p>
<p>Agenda Item: Fishing and Navigation - Exploration of the MMO's view that the requirement for a cable burial risk assessment should be carried through to a post-consent requirement.</p>		
EMHQ9	Applicant's response	<p>It was agreed with the MMO that a new condition 13(1)(g)(iii) would be included in the relevant DMLs to secure monitoring of offshore cables, including cable protection, during the "<i>operational lifetime</i>" of the authorised scheme. Notwithstanding this, the MMO has also requested that a new condition 19(4) is incorporated within the relevant</p>

		DMLs given that condition 19 specifically deals with "Post construction". Condition 19(4) has been agreed with the MMO and will be incorporated into the next draft Order.
Agenda Item: Cable exposure and provision of a distributed temperature sensing system.		
EMHQ10	Applicant's response	Distributed Temperature Sensing is a means of monitoring temperatures in cables utilising fibre optics. If sediment increases temperature can also be expected to increase and conversely, if sediment decreases a reduction in temperature is expected. The system will be implemented on the East Anglia ONE project, but it is a fairly new technology. Therefore, until more operational experience of the system is gained it is not possible to say whether the technology will be adopted for East Anglia THREE. If it is perceived to have operational benefits which justify the cost then it is anticipated that the technology will be installed on East Anglia THREE. However, it should be noted that the primary system on which both East Anglia ONE and East Anglia THREE will rely on is to survey cables with a frequency based on perceived risks. Accordingly, given that DTS is not the primary system relied on and given that the technology is at a fairly early stage, it is not considered appropriate to secure its use in the DMLs.
Agenda Item: Technological Issues - Existing examples of the use of Low Frequency Alternating Current technology and any implications for the East Anglia THREE proposal.		
EMHQ11	Applicant's response	LFAC is not a new concept. For example, in rail systems some lower frequency systems were introduced as higher frequencies were not compatible with motors. In terms of power transmission, LFAC is still just a concept but it is an attractive option for East Anglia THREE. Lower frequency allows cables to extend over longer distances and this concept does not require a large and complex offshore converter. However, it is still at a concept stage and would require modifications to the turbines and a complex design for substation. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the LFAC option fits within the parameters included in the draft Order and the Applicant does wish to retain this option.
Agenda Item: Socio-Economic Issues - Explanation of the current situation regarding the relationship between the EA ONE Skills Strategy and the EA THREE proposal and how the skills agenda principles will be accounted for.		
EMHQ12	Applicant's response	The Socio Economic Impact Assessment concludes that East Anglia THREE will have a beneficial employment effect. It should be noted that in arriving at this conclusion, the benefits derived from the East Anglia ONE skills strategy are not included in the baseline of the assessment. The sensitivity of the labour market is defined using the criteria outlined in Table 28.3 (Socio-economic Sensitivity Criteria) of the Environmental Statement (ES). Table 28.9 of the ES (Assessed Sensitivity of each area's labour market) summarises the reasons for the assessed level of labour market sensitivity. The definition of sensitivity is based purely on socio economic profile and skills set, and is defined to be of low sensitivity. Therefore the conclusions of the assessment are not contingent on East Anglia ONE or the provision of the East Anglia ONE skills strategy.

		<p>Given that the assessment concludes that there is no need for a skills plan for East Anglia THREE, a Requirement is not considered appropriate, and would not meet the test of being necessary to make the development acceptable. A position statement has been agreed between ScottishPower Renewables and SCC in relation to impacts on skills and the need to include a Requirement for East Anglia THREE. The position statement will be submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>The skills plan for East Anglia ONE refers to extending its benefits through East Anglia THREE as a future ScottishPower Renewables project. However, these obligations rest with ScottishPower Renewables and East Anglia ONE so that if there is a transfer of East Anglia ONE to a third party, like the other situation on transfers, it would be essential from the transferor's point of view that there was clarity on whether it was left with the transferor to develop the plan or whether the transferee was taking on that obligation.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted the East Anglia ONE skills strategy at Deadline 1 (Ref: <i>Deadline 1/DCO/ISH/EAONE Skills Strategy</i>). The submitted document contained a number of minor errors so a further version has been prepared. The latest version of the East Anglia ONE skills strategy will be submitted at Deadline 6.</p>
Agenda Item: Consideration of the views expressed in regard to the ExA's Second Written Question SE10 (changes in the labour market).		
EMHQ13	Applicant's response	<p>The baseline assessment and labour market sensitivity used in the ES was based on existing labour market profiles using Experian 2015 Labour Market Data. Any new information which is now available, such as the CTIB research, fits well with the East Anglia ONE skills plan objectives by developing skills and capacity in the construction sector. It should also be noted that the new information is not a material factor in the definition of labour market sensitivity which is based on socio economic profile and skills readiness of the area.</p>
Agenda Item: Archaeology - Update on the further archaeological works.		
EMHQ14	Applicant's response	<p>As stated in the Applicant's response to written question LH17, East Anglia ONE is undertaking archaeological mitigation work encompassing excavation, strip, map and record and watching brief elements. By way of an update to this, the final contract has been awarded and work is underway to complete the written scheme of investigation. A final version of this is programmed to be submitted to the local planning authorities in mid-November 2016. There are no implications which have arisen from this work which will affect the East Anglia THREE project.</p>
Agenda Item: Construction - Update on the proposed layouts for the EA ONE Primary Construction Consolidation Sites.		
EMHQ15	Applicant's response	<p>The Applicant provided an update on the East Anglia ONE PCCs in its written response to question TT10, and no changes have occurred since that response was given. East Anglia ONE has developed a preliminary design for the accesses into the two Primary CCSs. These have been submitted to SCC but are still under review so are not in a final form. The Applicant will submit a copy of preliminary drawings showing the proposed accesses in more detail at</p>

		Deadline 6.
Agenda Item: Discharge of East Anglia ONE DCO Requirements and DML Conditions, and relevance to the EA THREE proposal		
EMHQ16	Applicant's response	A document tracker dealing with the discharge of the East Anglia ONE requirements can be submitted to the Examining Authority at Deadline 6, with a note of which discharges of requirements might be relevant to the East Anglia THREE project.