



Issue Specific Hearings 13 (ISHs13): Hearings Action Points

- Application by East Anglia ONE North Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the East Anglia ONE North Offshore Wind Farm.
- Application by East Anglia TWO Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the East Anglia TWO Offshore Wind Farm.

Actions arising from the **Issue Specific Hearings 13 (ISHs13)** held virtually on **Friday 12 March 2021**.

Action	Party	Deadline
1. Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) access Please could the County Council submit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated report of Council Structural Team on routes to proposed substations sites for heavy loads. • Submit .pdf version of hyperlinked document from [REP6-092]. 	Suffolk County Council	D8
2. AIL access With reference to Agenda item 2c) and their responses to ExQ2.18.10 [PD-030], please could the Applicants clarify the basis on which the use of the haul road for AIL access to the substations site is longer than the proposed route which continues via the B1069/A1094 and the A1094/B1121 junctions and through Friston?	Applicants	D8
3. East Anglia Daily Times Cllr Fellowes to submit article referred to in oral submissions made under Agenda item 2.	Aldeburgh Town Council	D8
4. Aldeburgh B1122 Applicants to consider any potential issues with HGVs exiting the roundabout northbound on the B1122 and conflict with any vehicle parked immediately north of the yellow line restriction.	Applicants	D8
5. Cumulative effects – amendments and projects involved With reference to the Applicants' Sizewell Projects Cumulative Impact Assessment Note (Traffic and Transport) submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6-043], which has been revised so that it now takes account of both the Sizewell B Relocated Facilities Project	Applicants Other IPs responses	D8 D9



	Action	Party	Deadline
	and the revised Sizewell C project, please clarify the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Does this latest cumulative impact assessment (CIA) result in any change to the mitigation already proposed? ii) Why is this? iii) Following the Norfolk Vanguard High Court judgment, do the Applicants consider that any other projects should be included in the CIA? and iv) How will the Applicants ensure that all impacts associated with all relevant activities are all properly considered, assessed and mitigated within the dDCO? 		
6.	<p>Cumulative effects – AIL movements In respect of both construction and operation, would the Applicants please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) whether or not it is considered that there is any potential for any cumulative impacts; ii) given that temporary improvements to highways and structures may be needed, whether there any benefit in undertaking several AIL movements consecutively once the Applicants’ and others’ construction programmes are known in more detail; and iii) where the commitment to these views is secured. 	Applicants Other IPs responses	D8 D9
7.	<p>Cumulative effects – East Anglia (EA) projects case 1 In the first case where, along with the other non-EA projects, each EA project proceeds separately on different timescales, would the Applicants please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) how it is envisaged that separate contractors will cooperate and work side by side, for instance in respect of the use of shared compounds; ii) whether this is realistic; iii) given that temporary improvements to highways and structures may be needed, whether there is any benefit in undertaking several AIL movements consecutively once the Applicants’ and 	Applicants Other IPs responses	D8 D9



	Action	Party	Deadline
	<p>others' construction programmes are known in more detail; and</p> <p>iv) where the commitment to these views is secured.</p>		
8.	<p>Cumulative effects– East Anglia (EA) projects case 2</p> <p>In the second case where, along with the other non-EA projects, each EA project proceeds separately on the same timescale, would the Applicants please clarify</p> <p>i) how it is envisaged that separate contractors will cooperate and work side by side, for instance in respect of the use of shared compounds;</p> <p>ii) whether this is realistic;</p> <p>iii) given that temporary improvements to highways and structures may be needed, whether there is any benefit in undertaking several AIL movements consecutively once the Applicants' and others' construction programmes are known in more detail; and</p> <p>iv) where the commitment to these views is secured.</p>	<p>Applicants</p> <p>Other IPs responses</p>	<p>D8</p> <p>D9</p>
9.	<p>Cumulative effects – Sizewell Projects</p> <p>With reference to the Applicants' Sizewell Projects Cumulative Impact Assessment Note (Traffic and Transport) submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6-043], which has been revised so that it now takes account of both the Sizewell B Relocated Facilities Project and the revised Sizewell C project, we note that this identifies potentially significant cumulative impacts at A12 Yoxford, A12 Marlesford and Lovers Lane. Would the Applicants please clarify:</p> <p>i) what mitigation measures are being put forward; and</p> <p>ii) where account has been taken of other projects such as the proposed development at Martlesham Heath, proposed improvements to the A12 between A14 Seven Hills and A1152, and other National Grid projects at or near Friston, such as Nautilus and Eurolink.</p>	<p>Applicants</p> <p>Other IPs responses</p>	<p>D8</p> <p>D9</p>



	Action	Party	Deadline
10.	<p>Cumulative effects – methodology and planning obligations</p> <p>Concerns have been expressed by Suffolk County Council in respect of the Applicants' cumulative assessment methodology, for instance the assessment of individual GEART effects just below the threshold being discounted and thereby not assessed cumulatively, particularly where the cumulative effects could be significant. The ExAs understand that discussions between the Applicants and Suffolk County Council are progressing on these and other matters examined in items 2 and 3 of these hearings.</p> <p>Please would the Applicants and Suffolk County Council submit a joint document, whether as part of the Statement of Common Ground or otherwise, which concludes on all matters agreed and matters not agreed relating to traffic and transport, with particular reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) good design outcomes;ii) cost sharing of proposed mitigation measures;iii) any updates to the revised mitigation measures tracking list [REP7-040] or to planning obligations [REP6-034];iv) the nature of the mitigation legacy to be left behind; andv) how such a legacy might best be facilitated.	Applicants, Suffolk County Council Other IPs responses	D8 D9

ISHs 13, 12 March 2021**Hearing Recording: Agenda Timings¹**Session 1 10:00am

Item 1 Welcome and introductions	00:00 ² – 00:23
Item 2 Regional Freight Strategy	00:23 – Close of Session

Session 2 11:50am

Item 2 (cont)	00:00 – Close of Session
---------------	--------------------------

Session 3 2:00pm

Item 3 Local Freight Strategy	00:00 – Close of Session
-------------------------------	--------------------------

Session 4 4:00pm

Item 3 (cont)	00:00 – 01:03
Item 4 Cumulative effects	01:03 – 01:23
Item 5 AOB	01:23 – 01:30
Item 6 Procedural decisions, review of actions and next steps	01:30 – 01:34
Item 7 Close	01:34 – 01:35

Please note that the timings given are an approximate guide.

¹ [Agenda for ISHs13](#) (from EA1N website) (the EA2 Agenda is identical).

² Livestream/ recording times in hours and minutes from the session commencement.