

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#)
Subject: Fwd: SPR my ref 20023093 /20023092
Date: 01 February 2021 17:29:30

Dear Planning Inspectorate

I understand you are keen to learn feedback as to these virtual events and how well they are working

I have to express my dismay that I was unable to partake on my smart phone and had to resort to the landline phone connection. Serviceable but inadequate as there was interference from underlying voices whilst I was speaking and I felt detached from the proceedings. However Emre was able to move my slot to the beginning so that was helpful and I am grateful for that..

As to the time allocated to speakers this was inadequate for most other than the applicant I fear that the stumbling replies by some of them came across as deliberate to shrink available time.

This is not a slight on the deliverance of these hearings merely an observation

I am apologising for my inadequacy in delivering my submissions piecemeal I hope they do arrive and make sense!

Yours Truly

Mrs Pat Dorcey

PS

There should be an attachment to this

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 1 Feb 2021, 17:07
Subject: SPR my ref 20023093 /20023092
To: [REDACTED]

Dear Planning Inspectorate .

After speaking at the Open floor hearing on 22nd January and mentioning that Mr Rupert Thornley-Taylor was not given time enough to talk on Construction Noise, may I again request that he is given further opportunity to talk.

I would ask the panel to include Cable Corridor Construction Noise and it's mitigation in the agenda for a possible additional ISH that you are planning and that the inputs of the relevant experts and interested parties are heard.

Construction Noise is one of the issues needing much more attention as Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level is the level above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur.

I believe the applicant has noted that prevailing daytime noise is in the region of 35-45 dBA .

A 65dBA maximum limit on noise is a considerable increase on normal levels experienced at nearby residential properties. If these levels are reached residents will be forced to stay indoors to limit the impact .

Living close to the proposed cable corridor /haul road and Construction Consolidation Sites unacceptable levels of noise will occur, possibly to that level of 65dBA

This needs to be addressed and mitigated if the application is allowed to proceed.

Construction hours of working should be reduced to 8am -6pm .

Mon to Fri and 8am -1pm Sat

Unnecessary removal of hedgerows along the cable route starting at landfall is of grave

concern as up to this time I believe most of the proposed areas considered for removal has been taken on a desk topped basis further investigation is needed.

Many of the proposed removal of hedgerows surely are not necessary especially hedgerow no 13 as the track it runs along is only for pre construction and as this is a very established hedgerow removal should be avoided.

Equally hedgerow no10 needs to be thoroughly investigated as there is a very deep enclosed water hole on the northern end of the proposed removal which provides sanctuary for red deer and buzzards .

Earlier maps of the cable swathe actually went much further north therefore not disturbing this vital area of habitat .I have sent a picture of that water hole on the 25th January just prior to your site visits.

It is my understanding that vital issues like this have to be in place in the DCO to the satisfaction of all ,before the DCO is submitted to the Secretary of State.

Regarding future possible projects also connecting at the NGrid station at Friston I am sending proof that is in the public domain for your perusal This will be sent seperately in two parts in seperate e -mails also

I can add that the future SCD1 New Offshore HVDC link between Suffolk and Kent referred to as critical and to proceed and SCD2 set at stop are in the Network Options Assessment dated January 2021 .

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Fwd: EN020023-Advice-00001-1-EN020023-Advice-00001-Project Update-meeting note.pdf
Date: 01 February 2021 17:36:24
Attachments: [EN020023-Advice-00001-1-EN020023-Advice-00001-Project Update-meeting note.pdf](#)

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Patricia Dorcey [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 1 Feb 2021, 17:31
Subject: Fwd: EN020023-Advice-00001-1-EN020023-Advice-00001-Project Update-meeting note.pdf
To: <EastAngliaOneNorth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Evidence of future project in the public domain
Regards
Mrs Pat Dorcey ref 20023093/20023092

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Sat, 30 Jan 2021, 09:14
Subject: EN020023-Advice-00001-1-EN020023-Advice-00001-Project Update-meeting note.pdf
[REDACTED]

Fyi



Meeting note

Project name	Nautilus Interconnector
File reference	EN020023
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	21 October 2020
Meeting with	National Grid Ventures (NGV)
Venue	Microsoft Teams
Meeting objectives	Project Update Meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section (s) 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under s51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Project Update

The Applicant explained National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from the core regulated businesses of National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) Transmission Owner (TO) and National Grid System Operator (ESO). NGV have historically delivered other interconnectors through the Town and Country Planning regime rather than through the Development Consent Order (DCO) regime.

The Applicant advised it has a 1.5-Gigawatt connection agreement to connect to an as-yet unconsented and unbuilt substation in proximity to the Sizewell 400Kv network. A new NGET substation in this area is currently being promoted through Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) East Anglia 1 North (EA1N) and East Anglia 2 (EA2) DCOs. The Applicant stated that in the absence of a determination on the SPR applications, it is exploring options and locations to connect to the network in line with their connection agreement. Nautilus has received Project of Common Interest (PCI) status and is being promoted with Belgian partners Elia. Given the PCI status, the TEN-E Regulation applies, and the Applicant is looking to ensure they are mapped and programmed accordingly, with due regard to the schedule of permits and consultation requirements in affected Member States and the Applicant advised that Brexit doesn't affect this).

Re-classification

The Applicant stated that the Nautilus project has been re-classified as a Multi-Purpose Interconnector (MPI). This harnesses the point to point 'spine' of a typical point to point interconnector whilst also providing for an offshore convertor station platform to connect offshore wind and then for onward transmission. The ability to utilise transmission capacity for the offshore wind sector will reduce infrastructure in the marine and

terrestrial environments. The Applicant stated that the most likely comparison for the offshore convertor station would be a smaller scale offshore oil rig, which would most likely be sited a significant distance from shore, potentially beyond 12 nautical miles, and therefore not be immediately visible from the shore.

Consultation/ Engagement

The Applicant stated that pre the Covid-19 pandemic, it had been engaging with the communities of Suffolk and held a number of parish and town council meetings and ward member briefings with district and county councillors. The Applicant advised it has been engaging with the local authorities and has had regular meetings with East Suffolk and Suffolk County Council. The Inspectorate suggested the Applicant may wish to explore with the local authority opportunities to attend wider forums such as the East Suffolk Coast Energy Steering Board.

The Applicant stated it had established good relationships with other promoters working within the locality of Suffolk and that Briefing Packs and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) documents are available on the Applicant's project website.

The Applicant advised it has sought technical stakeholder feedback on the onshore siting and routing methodology. The methodology informs identification of potential locations for the routing of High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) cables, High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) cables and siting options for the convertor station siting as it related to the Sizewell overhead line and the proposed NGET substation being promoted by SPR. Further feasibility studies are being progressed into 2021.

The Applicant stated it had received constructive and positive feedback from technical stakeholders focusing on the methodology adopted to identify initial siting and routing options. The Applicant stated that the feedback included comment on the issues relating to the number of proposed developments in the area.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to pay close attention to other proposed developments timetables when carrying out engagement or consultation to avoid peak periods.

Flexibility/ Optionality

The Applicant was advised to look at the advice note published on the National Infrastructure website which discusses the Rochdale Envelope. The Applicant advised flexibility would likely be required for the offshore platform and subsequent connections to offshore wind farms, this flexibility must be robustly justified and reasonable.

The Applicant advised more work was required on the concept offshore including technical assessment to define the project elements. It stated that optionality could be connections to different wind farms which makes the scope of assessment larger and believed there were interface issues that were required to be resolved as to whether the connection would be part of the wind farm project or the MPI.

The Inspectorate stated that projects have put forward several options, as it relates to siting and routing, for scoping but with the intention that once an application is received it is then a single or reduced number of options. The Inspectorate asked for clarification on what constituted the project beyond the interconnector aspect; was it to

develop a connector and the convertor station and then allowing for a connection in a future point in time. The Applicant confirmed that scope of the DCO would be addressed with BEIS in due course via refinement of the s35 Direction.

The Inspectorate stated that they would respond to the Applicant on the question of flexibility as further internal discussion was required. A new scoping report would be required if the Applicant put forward an application which expanded the scheme in future after the EIA scoping direction.

Section 53

The Applicant stated that there may be a need for s53 authorisation to enter land for the purposes of environmental surveying. The Inspectorate recommends that efforts should be made to agree access voluntarily and that where access has been unreasonably refused, authorisation requests may be appropriate. Engagement in respect of voluntary land access is typically for a period of 6 months but this may vary dependent on the circumstances of the negotiations. The Inspectorate added that if these powers are required, to approach PINS early as it may have significant programme implications. The Inspectorate recommended that all interaction with landowners (e.g. correspondence or conversations) regarding access should be documented to inform the s53 application.

Landfall

The Applicant advised that there is no interdependency with SPR's plan for landfall and the landfall for Nautilus. The Applicant stated that although the projects are independent, it is seeking to have a conversation with SPR to find possible ways of reducing the disruption of construction, which the Applicant advised this could involve reviewing whether there may be feasible options to consider further at the landfall. If such considerations were progressed, this would be a matter for Nautilus to assess

Associated Development

The Applicant is of the view it is likely that there may be Associated Development within scope of the project. The s35 Direction allows for this. This could include Associated Development as it relates to facilitating a connection to the transmission network. Further feasibility work will inform the scope as it relates to Associated Development.

Anticipated Submission Date

The Applicant anticipates submission of the DCO application will be Q2 2023.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Inspectorate to respond on the issue of optionality and flexibility.
- The Inspectorate to arrange another meeting for Q1 2021

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Fwd: EN010115-Advice-00001-1-191128_Gallop Extension. Meeting note.pdf
Date: 01 February 2021 17:35:07
Attachments: [EN010115-Advice-00001-1-191128_Gallop Extension. Meeting note.pdf](#)

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Patricia Dorcey [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 1 Feb 2021, 17:31
Subject: Fwd: EN010115-Advice-00001-1-191128_Gallop Extension. Meeting note.pdf
To: <EastAngliaOneNorth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

This is in the public domain
Regards
Mrs Pat Dorcey ref 20023093/20023092

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Sat, 30 Jan 2021, 09:14
Subject: EN010115-Advice-00001-1-191128_Gallop Extension. Meeting note.pdf
To: [REDACTED]

Fyi



Meeting note

Project name	Gallopier Offshore Windfarm Extension
File reference	
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	28 November 2019
Meeting with	Innogy Renewables UK
Venue	Temple Quay House, Bristol
Meeting objectives	Inception meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) explained their openness policy and advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely. The Inspectorate explained that the publication of the meeting note could be delayed up to six months, if justified for commercial confidentiality / sensitivity reasons, or until a formal scoping request had been submitted.

Introduction to the project

The Applicant gave an overview of the Gallopier Offshore Windfarm Extension project and provided details of the proposed development. Following the Agreement for Lease awarded by The Crown Estate in August 2019, the proposal will cover the area of 149 km² and be located east of the existing Gallopier Windfarm, with the installation of between 67 and 107 new turbines being considered depending on the construction timeframe and technology available. A variety of foundation design options, and up to two offshore platforms are also being considered at this time

Consultation to date

The Applicant advised that the consultation approach is at an early stage of development, and it included creating a stakeholder database to establish points of contact in key organisations and also those who had taken part in Gallopier wind farm project. The applicant will be using the Evidence Plan Process to facilitate effective consultation during the pre-application period, identifying stakeholders who may wish to get involved in certain topic groups have been identified and invited to take part. The Applicant has established road maps to pinpoint key dates, and how and when stakeholders can engage in the process and to help with resource allocation. The key objective is to receive consultees' views as early as possible and continue a dialogue as the project develops, with agreement logs being maintained helping to form statements

of common ground. The Applicant said they have held initial meeting or calls with the Galloper Commercial Fisheries working group members, and held discussions with the Local Authorities (East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council), the Civil Aviation Authority and NATS. The Applicant is aware that some statutory bodies are faced with resource constraints, and may be unable to fully engage in the project's pre-application stage at present. Therefore the Applicant proposes to employ less resource intensive engagement methods such as holding teleconferences rather than face-to-face meetings. Further engagement is proposed with the Marine Management Organisation, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, The Wildlife Trust, National Trust and the Environment Agency. The Inspectorate emphasised the need to plan ahead while working with the statutory consultees and consider various constraints they might face.

Evidence Plan Steering Group

The Applicant outlined their approach to the Evidence Plan Process (EPP), the formal tool of engaging with parties during the pre-application stage which would then feed into the project design. The Inspectorate agreed that the EPP has been widely used on other NSIPs, and some EPPs led to achieving agreement on many issues including those beyond the Habitats Regulations. The Inspectorate explained that the EPP was established by Defra in an effort to positively influence the pre-application process and ensure that the approach to collecting and gathering baseline information is robust. Its benefits include the opportunity to obtain upfront agreement between parties on matters relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and providing an opportunity to discuss disagreements whilst retaining focus on the evidence-base. It is possible for the EPP to be used as a basis for agreeing Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with key stakeholders. Additionally, the EPP will become a formal record of engagement during the HRA process, while also potentially reducing the level of resources required during the examination of the application. The Inspectorate noted that certain Applicants have widened the scope for the EPP to include aspects that are more typically contained within the Environmental Statement (ES), such as site selection, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and potential for mitigation if required. The Applicant explained that it was their intent to take this approach.

The Applicant stated that at this stage some stakeholders are unable to get involved in the process as they are struggling to commit resources at the current time. The Applicant advised of the composition of expert topic groups (ETGs) and roles of those attending the groups, and provided an overview of the proposed Evidence Plan Structure, focusing on distinct offshore and onshore topics. It was noted that the current structure of the ETG groups may be amended as the project develops and more focus is required on individual topic areas. The EPP will include a shipping and navigation topic group which will include representatives from Maritime and Coastguard Agency and Trinity House. The Inspectorate asked if there was a commitment from these bodies to resource this work and whether there is sufficient resource to facilitate this for other projects.

The Applicant advised that a draft Terms of Reference for the Evidence Plan had been circulated to various stakeholders, and this proposed a mixture of meetings and teleconferences to be held at key points in the future when more information will become available or when input and advice will be needed. The Applicant wished to know whether the Inspectorate would be available to Chair the Steering Group meetings. In response the Inspectorate advised that its involvement would depend on resources and

establishing what value can be brought to the process. It was helpful to understand different aspects of the project and key issues arising at this stage. The Inspectorate advised of its role within the wider scope of the PA2008, and its impartiality.

Outline of the current timeframe for the application

Proposed dates for the submission of a scoping request and date of the submission of the application were discussed, although these dates were yet to be finalised.

Project site selection

The Applicant advised that they are currently in the process of working with National Grid to determine where the project will connect to the National Grid, and are aware of many of the constraints within the wider area to try and refine the approach, and to avoid particularly sensitive areas. The Applicant will also consider collaboration with the Greater Gabbard Extension Project on the connection approach while also ensuring they meet the requirements of The Crown Estate Cable Route Protocol. As there are several proposed developments in the area the Applicant is looking into alternatives to find a realistic proposed onshore cable route.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider future resource planning and the proposed timelines for other onshore projects, as in Q1 2020 further SoS' decisions on offshore wind farm applications are expected.

Scoping

The Applicant advised that they are currently part way through the process of developing the scoping approach and identifying the likely significant issues of the proposed development. The Applicant intends to follow the standard approach when submitting the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate advised on how to prepare the Report, focusing on keeping all information succinct and relevant, using clear terminology and ensuring consistency between documents, and to ensure that the methodology behind what is scoped in and what is scoped out is clearly presented. The Applicant explained that they intend to provide preliminary HRA screening information. The Inspectorate advised on the scoping process and the potential for flexibility to adapt the scope as the project progresses. Further aspects can be scoped out of the assessment following scoping via the use of the Evidence Plan Process. The Inspectorate also referred to [Advice Note Seven](#): Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements.

Specific decisions

The following actions were agreed:

- The parties agreed to arrange future meetings around key milestones during the pre-application stage, with the next meeting after the issue of the Scoping Opinion by the Inspectorate.
- Inspectorate to inform the Applicant of the details required to set up the project on the National Infrastructure website – completed.
- Inspectorate to set up a new project email address.

- Inspectorate will comment on the proposed Terms of Reference (ToR) for the EPP before Christmas and availability to act as Chair for the Steering Group meetings.