



## SPR EA1N & EA2 PROJECTS

### DEADLINE 8 - POST HEARING SUBMISSION (CAH3)

Interested Party: SASES

IP Reference Nos: 20024106 & 20024110

Date: 25 March 2021

Issue: 1

1. SASES did not attend CAH3 although Michael Mahony did attend in a personal capacity as an Affected Person. In addition a number of SASES members were listening to the hearing on the livestream. SASES wishes to make submissions in relation to the 70m wide cable corridor (the subject of Action Point 3), Broom Covert (the subject of Action Point 7) and Reasonable Alternatives (the subject of Action Point 9). However in relation to these matters SASES would like to see the responses of the Applicants to these Action Points before making submissions to ensure it fully understands the Applicants' position. In addition SASES makes the following submission.

#### **Agenda items 5 a) vi) and 6 c) vi) : Works accesses at Aldringham**

2. The Applicants referred at CAH3 and in Section 1.3 on page 1 of EA1N & EA2 Project Update Note' **[REP7-042]** to the maximum width of works at the River Hundred crossing having been reduced from 50m to 34m, but does not make clear that should both projects go ahead that would be  $2 \times 34 = 68\text{m}$ . The Project Update Note is confusing in this respect in that its title refers to both projects. The same comment applies to EA1N & EA2 Project Update Note **[REP3- 052]** 2.2 on page 6.
3. Evidence that the maximum width would be 68m may also be found in the Applicants' Outline Watercourse Crossing Method Statement **[REP6-041]**, Section 4.8 : Onshore Cable Route Width which is explicit at para 64:

"Since submission of the Application, the Applicant has reduced the working width of the onshore cable route where the cables cross the Hundred River from 50m to 34m **per project**. This working width applies for a distance of 40m from the Hundred River's western bank and eastern bank (the Hundred River Crossing buffer)".

4. The Applicants' documentation and their responses to questions posed by ExA's Mr Rigby at CAH3 Session 3 (at Video Recording time 33:13 to 47:34) were confusing as to whether the reduced width of 34 m refers to each project or both projects. Draft DCO Requirement 12 and paras 23 and 75 of Statement of Reasons **[REP7-013]** for **each** project both refer to a 34 metres width being required for that one project. The Applicant has variously mentioned the purpose for such wide separation as to make sufficient room for construction vehicle turning and to facilitate cooling of cables during the Operation phase. It is not clear why such a large spacing of the cable ducts is required only at the watercourse.

A width of 68m is 250% wider than the maximum width commitment of 27.1m for the cable route at the Aldeburgh Road pinch point, just a few metres away and would seem excessive for vehicle turning purpose.