East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarms

Applicants' Comments Suffolk County Council's Deadline 9 Submissions

Applicant: East Anglia TWO and East Anglia ONE North Limited
Document Reference: ExA.AS-5.D10.V1
SPR Reference: EA1N_EA2-DWF-ENV-REP-IBR-001055

Date: 6th May 2021
Revision: Version 1
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Applicable to East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO

Revision Summary				
Rev	**Date**	**Prepared by**	**Checked by**	**Approved by**
001	06/05/2021	Paolo Pizzolla	Lesly Jamieson / Ian MacKay	Rich Morris

Description of Revisions			
Rev	**Page**	**Section**	**Description**
001	n/a	n/a	Final for Submission

Table of Contents

Glossary of Acronyms

AIL	Abnormal Inadvisable Load
ANPR	Automatic Number Plate Recognition
DCO	Development Consent Order
dBA	Decibels
ES	Environmental Statement
ESC	East Suffolk Council
ESDAL	Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads
ExA	Examining Authority
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
NPS	National Policy Statement
OAMP	Outline Access Management Plan
OCoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
OCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
OCTMPCo	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan Coordinator
OODMP	Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan
OLEMS	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
OTP	Outline Travel Plan
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage System
SWMP	Surface Water Management Plan
UK	United Kingdom

Glossary of Terminology

Applicant	East Anglia TWO Limited / East Anglia ONE North Limited
Construction operation and maintenance platform	A fixed offshore structure required for construction, operation, and maintenance personnel and activities.
East Anglia ONE North project	The proposed project consisting of up to 67 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure.
East Anglia ONE North windfarm site	The offshore area within which wind turbines and offshore platforms will be located.
East Anglia TWO project	The proposed project consisting of up to 75 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure.
East Anglia TWO windfarm site	The offshore area within which wind turbines and offshore platforms will be located.
European site	Sites designated for nature conservation under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive, as defined in regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and regulation 18 of the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. These include candidate Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Community Importance, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas.
Generation Deemed Marine Licence (DML)	The deemed marine licence in respect of the generation assets set out within Schedule 13 of the draft DCO.
Horizontal directional drilling (HDD)	A method of cable installation where the cable is drilled beneath a feature without the need for trenching.
Inter-array cables	Offshore cables which link the wind turbines to each other and the offshore electrical platforms, these cables will include fibre optic cables.
Jointing bay	Underground structures constructed at intervals along the onshore cable route to join sections of cable and facilitate installation of the cables into the buried ducts.
Landfall	The area (from Mean Low Water Springs) where the offshore export cables would make contact with land, and connect to the onshore cables.
Link boxes	Underground chambers within the onshore cable route housing electrical earthing links.
Meteorological mast	An offshore structure which contains metrological instruments used for wind data acquisition.
Mitigation areas	Areas captured within the onshore development area specifically for mitigating expected or anticipated impacts.
Marking buoys	Buoys to delineate spatial features / restrictions within the offshore development area.

Monitoring buoys	Buoys to monitor *in situ* condition within the windfarm, for example wave and metocean conditions.
Natura 2000 site	A site forming part of the network of sites made up of Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas designated respectively under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive.
Offshore cable corridor	This is the area which will contain the offshore export cables between offshore electrical platforms and landfall.
Offshore development area	The East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and offshore cable corridor (up to Mean High Water Springs).
Offshore electrical infrastructure	The transmission assets required to export generated electricity to shore. This includes inter-array cables from the wind turbines to the offshore electrical platforms, offshore electrical platforms, platform link cables and export cables from the offshore electrical platforms to the landfall.
Offshore electrical platform	A fixed structure located within the windfarm area, containing electrical equipment to aggregate the power from the wind turbines and convert it into a more suitable form for export to shore.
Offshore export cables	The cables which would bring electricity from the offshore electrical platforms to the landfall. These cables will include fibre optic cables.
Offshore infrastructure	All of the offshore infrastructure including wind turbines, platforms, and cables.
Offshore platform	A collective term for the construction, operation and maintenance platform and the offshore electrical platforms.
Platform link cable	Electrical cable which links one or more offshore platforms. These cables will include fibre optic cables.
Safety zones	A marine area declared for the purposes of safety around a renewable energy installation or works / construction area under the Energy Act 2004.
Scour protection	Protective materials to avoid sediment being eroded away from the base of the foundations as a result of the flow of water.
Transition bay	Underground structures at the landfall that house the joints between the offshore export cables and the onshore cables.
Transmission DML	The deemed marine licence in respect of the transmission assets set out within Schedule 14 of the draft DCO.

1 Introduction

1. This document presents the Applicants' comments on Suffolk County Council's (SSC) Deadline 9 submissions as follows.

    - SCC Deadline 9 Archaeology Comments (REP9-043);
    - SCC Deadline 9 Floods Comments (REP9-044);
    - SCC Deadline 9 Floods topographical survey (REP9-045);
    - SCC Deadline 9 Highways Comments (REP9-046) and
    - SCC Deadline 9 Planning Comments (REP9-047).

2. This document is applicable to both the East Anglia TWO and East Anglia ONE North DCO applications, and therefore is endorsed with the yellow and blue icon used to identify materially identical documentation in accordance with the Examining Authority's procedural decisions on document management of 23rd December 2019 (PD-004). Whilst this document has been submitted to both Examinations, if it is read for one project submission there is no need to read it for the other project submission.

2 Comments on Suffolk County Council's Deadline 9 Submissions

2.1 SCC Deadline 9 Archaeology Comments (REP9-043)

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
Comments on the Applicant's updated draft DCO (dDCO) submitted at Deadline 8 (D8).		
1	Not applicable – DCO requirements 19 and 20 previously agreed, and no further amendments made.	Noted.
Comments on Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and Statement of Commonality received by D8.		
2	Statement of Common Ground with East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council: SCC are happy to agree this document and the matters set out within it in relation to Archaeology and Cultural Heritage.	The Applicants note and welcome this.

2.2 SCC Deadline 9 Floods Comments (REP9-044)

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
Comments on Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and Statement of Commonality received by D8.		
Statement of Common Ground, East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council (REP8-114)		
1	LA-05.02 SCC can now agree this item. Whilst SCC would have liked to have seen a sensitivity analysis of baseline flows from the proposed development site to the Friston Main River, the OODMP sensitivity test of discharge rates, which reduces the potential discharge rate to 5l/s, is sufficient as this is likely the lowest feasible discharge rate from the site. Any potential increase in flood risk resulting from this would need to be assessed after detailed modelling post-consent.	Noted. The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) will be updated and submitted to Examination at Deadline 12.
2	LA-05.04 SCC can now agree this item. Whilst SCC would have liked to have seen a sensitivity analysis of baseline flows from the proposed development site to the Friston Main River, the OODMP sensitivity test of discharge rates, which reduces the potential discharge rate to 5l/s, is sufficient as this is likely the lowest feasible discharge rate from the site. Any potential increase in flood risk resulting from this would need to be assessed after detailed modelling post-consent.	Noted. The SoCG will be updated and submitted to Examination at Deadline 12.
3	LA-05.07 SCC's position remains unchanged. The Applicant still has not demonstrated that they can deliver sufficient mitigation for the construction phase within the Order Limits to mitigate the identified potential impacts.	**Section 11** of the ***Outline Code of Construction Practice*** submitted at Deadline 8 (REP8-017) presents details on sediment and surface water management during construction, including an explanation of the onshore cable route configuration to accommodate surface water management provisions. The construction sequence and methods will be established as part of the detailed design process, which inform the final Surface Water and Drainage Management Plan and a Flood Management Plan which must be approved by

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
		the relevant planning authority under **Requirement 22** of the ***draft DCO*** (document reference 3.1). The Applicants consider that it has demonstrated its ability to deliver sufficient mitigation for the construction phase within the Order Limits to mitigate the identified potential impacts. The precise detail of mitigation to be adopted will inevitably be a matter that can only be confirmed as part of the detailed design. The Applicants do not consider that any additional information is necessary given the information presented to Examinations to date, the design flexibility required for nationally significant infrastructure projects (as recognised in EN-1), and the measures secured in the ***draft DCO*** (document reference 3.1) to protect against flood risk.
4	LA-05.09 SCC's position remains unchanged. The Applicant still has not demonstrated that they can deliver sufficient mitigation for the construction phase within the Order Limits to mitigate the identified potential impacts.	Please see ID3.
5	LA-05.13 SCC's position remains unchanged. The Applicant still has not demonstrated that they can deliver sufficient mitigation for the construction phase within the Order Limits to mitigate the identified potential impacts.	Please see ID3.
6	LA-05.14 SCC's position remains unchanged. The Applicant still has not demonstrated that they can deliver sufficient mitigation for the construction phase within the Order Limits to mitigate the identified potential impacts.	Please see ID3.
7	LA-05.18 SCC's position remains unchanged. The Applicant still has not demonstrated that they can deliver sufficient mitigation for	Please see ID3.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	the construction phase within the Order Limits to mitigate the identified potential impacts.	
8	LA-05.19 SCC's position remains unchanged. The Applicant still has not demonstrated that they can deliver sufficient mitigation for the construction phase within the Order Limits to mitigate the identified potential impacts.	Please see ID3.
9	LA-05.20 SCC's position remains unchanged. Whilst SCC acknowledge that some progress has been made, the proposals are still insufficient, as detailed further in SCC's Deadline 9 response to the Flood Risk and Drainage Clarification Note & Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (below). The hybrid solution does not comply with National Design Guidance. The infiltration only option is still conditioned on the basis that there is sufficient land available, dependent on land requirements for the mitigation of other identified impacts. The Applicant has not clearly identified the potential land use clashes for the worst-case scenario.	The Applicants have committed to maximising the use of infiltration where practicable within the surface water drainage design for the Projects. The nature of the ground, groundwater, final substation design and conclusion of community consultation on landscaping and biodiversity measures will all influence the final design, in line with ESC Policy SCLP9.5: Flood Risk and Policy SCLP9.6: Sustainable Drainage Systems 11. The Applicants commenced onshore site investigation works within the onshore development area in April 2021. Part of these works are infiltration testing at the indicative location of the onshore substation and National Grid Substation SuDS ponds. The Applicants will continue to discuss this matter with the Councils in light of the infiltration testing.
Comments on any additional information/submissions received by D8.		
Flood Risk and Drainage Clarification Note (REP8-038)		
10	Table 2.1 SPR Statement Within the OODMP (document updated at Deadline 8, document reference ExA.AS-3.D8.V4) the Applicants have presented preliminary layout drawings relating to both the primary option (i.e. maximising infiltration without consideration to other competing land	The statement by SCC is misleading. The Applicants have consistently given consideration to other competing land uses at and around the onshore substation and National Grid substation locations and indeed refer to these competing land uses within the text that SCC has highlighted (i.e. landscaping, biodiversity and access).

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	uses such as landscaping, biodiversity and access) and the secondary option for the provision of attenuation / storage. SCC Comment Yellow – This point is key. No consideration has been given to other competing land uses. Neither in this document or anywhere else in the submission. Without having a clear appreciation of any potential land use clashes it is not possible to determine what is or is not deliverable within the Order Limits, whilst delivering SuDS in accordance with National and Local requirements. SCC acknowledges that the SuDS hierarchy is applied so as to prioritise options as high up the hierarchy "as reasonably practicable", and that this recognises that non-drainage considerations (such as landscaping or biodiversity mitigation) may have a role to play when determining what is reasonably practicable in a given case. However, the Applicants have not provided the information that is needed to test how an infiltration only option would be integrated with those other considerations so as to provide confidence that it will be a genuine priority as the design is further progressed. SCC maintain the position that a sub-optimal surface water drainage solution should not be accepted due to insufficient land being available, or because land that otherwise would be available is being prioritised for other mitigation unless it is clearly demonstrated that the optimum solution is not reasonably practicable.	***Figure 3*** of ***Annex 2*** of the ***Outline Ecological and Landscape Management Strategy*** (OLEMS) (REP8-019) shows the indicative attenuation basins alongside the proposed general mitigation planting and biodiversity arrangements. This **outline plan** represents a balanced and deliverable solution to the landscaping, biodiversity and surface water drainage requirement of the substation site which complies with the drainage hierarchy and importantly would be compliant with ESC's Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Policy SCLP9.6: Sustainable Drainage Systems. It is noted that SCC has a wider remit than that of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and has contributed effectively in the development of the Project's outline landscaping and biodiversity mitigation plans. The LLFA appears to be focusing on an infiltration only scheme at any cost and eluding to the need for additional land to deliver this. The LLFA is not giving any consideration of third party land use considerations and the need to justify the need for such land through the Compulsory Acquisition process, which must consider the need for such land and the availability of alternatives (such as an attenuation solution). In doing so, the LLFA is reducing the drainage hierarchy to a single 'infiltration' solution and ignoring the fact that should an infiltration only solution not be practicable, that there is a perfectly acceptable and reasonable alternative of attenuation (with infiltration) which is adopted for new projects throughout the UK. The Applicants have confirmed that the primary solution is infiltration only, with attenuation as a secondary option (potentially with infiltration incorporated – a hybrid solution). ***Figure 3*** shows that as a worst case, the attenuation basins and the proposed mitigation are deliverable within the Order Limits whilst ensuring that the rate of surface water discharge to the Friston Watercourse does not increase above the pre-development level. The Applicants have not produced such a figure showing indicative infiltration basins as they are not practicable within the Order limits alongside the proposed mitigation planting,

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
		hence the Applicants have stated within the ***Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan*** (OODMP) (REP8-064) that an infiltration only scheme **using the conservative infiltration rate of 10mm/hr** is not feasible. Once infiltration testing has been undertaken (typically post consent as part of the detailed design, but being undertaken by the Applicants in April 2021), the infiltration only SuDS pond presented within **Appendix 4** of the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064) will be updated to reflect the recorded infiltration rate and the Applicants will further consider the practicality of an infiltration only solution (although, noting the design flexibility provisions within EN-1, the design of the onshore substation, National Grid substation and surface water management system remains in outline at this stage). The Applicants disagree that a sub-optimal surface water drainage solution has or would be proposed and have committed to implementing infiltration as far as reasonably practicable within the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064). SCC's statement is misleading as it does not reflect the viability and deliverability of an attenuation solution should full infiltration not be achievable, nor the fact that an attenuation solution will not increase the downstream flood risk.
11	Paragraph 33 SPR Statement The Applicants have committed to maximising the use of infiltration where practicable within the surface water drainage design for the Projects. Using a series of conservative criteria, based on guidance set out in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015) and the SCC Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) a Local Design Guide Appendix A to the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy (May 2018), it has been demonstrated within the OODMP (document updated at Deadline 8, document reference ExA.AS-3.D8.V4) that there is sufficient space	Please see ID10.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	within the Order limits for the indicative design to accommodate the worst case scenario; however due to other constraints on land use (i.e. landscaping), and infiltration capacity, further design iterations are required. SCC Comment No further clarity has been provided RE the interaction of landscape mitigation and surface water flood risk mitigation. SCC maintain the position that a sub-optimal surface water drainage solution should not be accepted due to insufficient land being available, or because land that otherwise would be available is being prioritised for other mitigation unless it is clearly demonstrated that the optimum solution is not reasonably practicable.	
12	Paragraph 44 SPR Statement The Applicants have updated the OCoCP at Deadline 8 (document reference 8.1) including further provisions within section 11 regarding construction surface water management. However an Appendix has not been included within this submission as the Applicants do not consider it useful or accurate to undertake such an assessment at this stage given the level of detail regarding the precise construction footprint, construction techniques, specific (varying) ground conditions within the onshore development area and micrositing of works SCC Comment	As explained in ***Section 4*** of the ***Flood Risk and Drainage Clarification Note*** (REP8-038), *"the Applicants do not consider it useful or accurate to undertake such an assessment at this stage given the level of detail regarding the precise construction footprint, construction techniques, specific (varying) ground conditions within the onshore development area and micrositing of works"*. **Section 11** of the ***OCoCP*** (REP8-017) clearly shows an indicative cross section of the onshore cable route, as previously requested by SCC. However, the Applicants consider it inappropriate to provide any additional design information at this stage as it will be subject to review and change once the necessary surveys along the onshore cable route are completed and additional information on construction techniques from the appointed Contractors is received.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	The Applicant has not attempted to provide further information to demonstrate that the listed mitigation options are deliverable within the Order Limits during the construction phase.	
Outline Operational Drainage Management Plan (REP8-064)		
13	Paragraph 16c SPR Statement Confirm the optimal SuDS basin(s) size, capacity and location using the above data. This will reflect either the infiltration rate, or both the infiltration rate and the discharge rate to the Friston Watercourse should a hybrid infiltration and attenuation scheme be adopted. During this SuDS design stage, additional factors will be taken into account such as revisions to the substation infrastructure footprint and its detailed design; landscaping requirements; and the optimum use of land. SCC Comment This approach leaves the design of SuDS and ultimately, the option progressed, subject to other design considerations, including landscape. This approach does not comply with NPS EN-1, para 5.7.9 which requires priority to be given to SuDS. It is SCC's opinion that this priority should equally be given to achieving an optimal SuDS solution, as per the surface water disposal hierarchy contained within the NPPG.	The Applicants would like to clarify that the design of the SuDS and the option progressed will prioritise the use of infiltration subject to ground conditions (informed by infiltration testing) and the site specific hydraulic model. Appropriate consideration will be given to landscaping requirements, use of the land, mitigation and ecology. This approach is fully compliant with NPS EN-1, paragraph 5.7.9 whereby the requirement is that *"…priority has been given to the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)…"* as there is a clear commitment to the prioritisation of the use of SuDS within the Projects. It is inappropriate for SCC to draw parallels with the clear statement on prioritising SuDS within EN-1 (which the Applicants are compliant with) with what appears to be its own priority of seeking an infiltration only solution without consideration of landscaping, biodiversity, access and indeed land use considerations.
14	Paragraph 126 SPR Statement	Please see ID13. The Applicants are surprised that SCC states *"It is therefore not possible for SCC to conclude that **any** of the SuDS mitigation options are deliverable within*

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	If an infiltration only design is shown to be practicable through percolation testing, establishment of the ground water levels and consideration of other land use such as landscaping, biodiversity and access, then an infiltration only SuDS design will be adopted SCC Comment As above, this approach leaves the design of SuDS and ultimately, the option progressed, subject to other design considerations, including landscape. At ISH11, SCC suggested it would be useful for the Applicant to clarify exactly what land use clashes could result in an infiltration only approach not being practicable. This clarification has not been provided and no evidence or assessment has been submitted which clearly identifies the potential land use clashes or the extent of any clashes. Given the above assessment has not been undertaken, it is not possible to say with absolute certainty that any of the proposed SuDS options put forward are deliverable alongside other worst case scenario land use requirements (for example, for landscaping). Using the Rochdale Envelope approach, the worstcase land use required for mitigation options should be clearly identified. This should be the case for landscape and surface water drainage. This would at the very least identify the land use clash. However, this information has not been submitted. It is therefore not possible for SCC to conclude that any of the SuDS mitigation options are deliverable within the Order Limits, as per the options put forward in this document, alongside worst case scenarios for other mitigation	*the Order Limits"*. Should an infiltration only solution not be achievable, the Applicants have clearly demonstrated that an attenuation only solution is achievable whilst delivering effective landscaping and biodiversity mitigation measures, see the ***OLEMS*** (document reference 8.7). The incorporation of infiltration measures will only seek to reinforce this integration demonstrated within the masterplanning of the substation area. The uncertainty arises from SCCs instance that an infiltration only solution should be developed without consideration of landscaping, biodiversity, access and indeed land use considerations. As stated, landscaping requirements, use of the land, mitigation and ecology could 'clash' with an infiltration only scheme due to the potential (but as yet unknown) size of the infiltration basins.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	options, such as landscape. This information has simply not been provided.	
15	Paragraph 130 SPR Statement Should there be a need for the permanent substation operational access road to be located over an existing surface water flood storage basin, either it will be relocated to an alternative suitable location (as shown in Appendix 4, Appendix 6 and Appendix 8) or the existing volume reduction will be offset and accommodated within the final SuDS design. SCC Comment The proposed location for the relocation of the existing flood storage basin (shown in Appendix 4, 6 & 8) has not changed since the Deadline 6 submission. As such, this is still unacceptable to SCC, as per our representation made at Deadlines 7&8.	As the Applicants have previously stated, the proposed location for the relocation of the existing natural depressions (as shown in **Appendix 4**, **6** and **8** of the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064)) is indicative and so for demonstration purposes only. The final location will be concluded during detailed design once a hydraulic model for the site has been undertaken. The Applicants have committed to either the relocation of existing features such that they can continue to function as part of the wider natural drainage system or alternatively, where depressions are required to be removed then sufficient storage for these are incorporated into the proposed drainage scheme.
16	Paragraph 155 SPR Statement When looking at both of the assessments undertaken within section 6.3, it has been confirmed that for both the 1 in 100 year storm event and a 1 in 10 year storm event 24 hours after an initial 1 in 100 year storm event, using an infiltration rate of 10mm/hr, the 24 hour half drain time cannot be achieved. SCC Comment See response to paragraph 156.	Please see ID17 which confirms that the half drain is a design check pass..

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
17	Paragraph 156 SPR Statement Therefore, this model has proved that an infiltration rate of 10mm/hr would mean that an infiltration only design for the site is unviable SCC Comment As per previous representation from SCC, including at Deadline 8, the assessment undertaken by the Applicant (1:100+40% + 1:10+40%) is acceptable to demonstrate there is sufficient storage in the design for a subsequent rainfall event, despite the basin not half draining within 24 hours. This is a design check pass. The Applicants continued statement that this makes an infiltration only approach unviable is not correct. See also SCC's further comments (below) at ID24 of the response to the Applicant's comments (REP8- 046) on SCC's submissions at Deadline 7.	The Applicants have reviewed SCC's ***Deadline 3 submission – Comments on Floods*** (REP3-101) which states *"SCC require a half drain time of 24 hours for 1:100+CC. If this is not achievable then it should be demonstrated that any attenuation structures can accommodate an additional 1:10 storm event after 24 hours."* The Applicants acknowledge that the indicative infiltration basins can accommodate an additional 1:10 storm event after 24 hours and that this is a design check pass. This will be updated in the ***OODMP*** at a future Deadline. However, the Applicants still consider the extent of this infiltration only solution to be not practicable for the reasons set in ID10. As infiltration testing results become available and detailed design progresses, the Applicants are confident that the required size of the infiltration only SuDS pond will reduce, however the planning balance must be maintained between an effective SuDS design (which may be full infiltration or full attenuation or a hybrid of both) and the landscape, biodiversity and access requirements of the development, and wider land use considerations.
18	Paragraph 158 SPR Statement As the assumed infiltration rate of 10mm/hr indicates an infiltration only scheme to currently be unviable, the Applicant presents a scheme utilising both infiltration and attenuation as well as an attenuation only scheme. This is in line with the SuDS drainage hierarchy (SCC, 2018), discussed in section 6.1. SCC Comment	Please see ID10, ID17 (which confirms that the half drain is a design check pass), ID13 and ID14.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	No justification or evidence provided as to why this is unviable, other than the half drain point, discussed above. If this is the only reason (no other reason stated in section 6.1), then why is the below approach acceptable for the hybrid option? See below response to paragraph 170.	
19	Paragraph N/A SPR Statement N/A SCC Comment The Applicant has demonstrated that an infiltration only scheme is viable. The half drain checks are considered a design pass. The plan provided in Appendix 4 demonstrates that an infiltration only option is technically feasible and deliverable within the Order Limits when considered in isolation.	The Applicants have demonstrated that an infiltration only scheme, based on the conservative assumptions, is not practicable considering the competing land uses (and it is noted that an attenuation only scheme or a hybrid attenuation/infiltration scheme remains compliant with EN-1, the drainage hierarchy and ESC planning policy, and does not increase flood risk downstream). Through establishment of infiltration rates and the detail design of the Projects and surface water management system, the Applicants will continue to prioritise an infiltration only solution where practicable. Please also see ID17 which confirms that the half drain is a design check pass..
20	Paragraph 170 SPR Statement As the 24 hour drain time was not viable the Applicant assessed the storage required for a secondary 1 in 10 year storm event (plus 40% climate change scenario), 24 hours after the initial 1 in 100 year (plus 40% climate change scenario) storm event, as requested by SCC. By adopting these parameters it has been confirmed that sufficient storage can be provided within the Order Limits for the hybrid scheme. SCC Comment	SCC is misrepresenting the Applicants position. For the reasons described above, namely in ID10, an infiltration only solution, based on various conservative assumptions, is not practicable. The Applicants consider an attenuation only scheme to be practicable and has demonstrated, through the ***OLEMS*** (document reference 8.7), that the outline masterplan of the substation area can satisfy the landscaping, biodiversity, access and wider land use constraints. The detailed design will seek to adopt a full infiltration system (reflecting the final detailed design of the substations and results of infiltration testing) where practicable, considering the necessary planning balance necessary as set out in ESC planning policy.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	The Applicant acknowledges that this design (hybrid option) also does not half drain within 24 hours, and as such have added an additional 1:10+40% rainfall event. This is the same approach used for infiltration only. However, for this approach, the Applicant has not concluded that this option is unviable, despite the same methodology and the same result (in terms of half drain times) as for the infiltration only approach.	Please see ID17 which confirms that the half drain is a design check pass.
21	Table 6.2 & 7.2 SPR Statement N/A SCC Comment The total storage volumes provided for the infiltration only and hybrid options are as follows: Infiltration only = 37,388m^3 Hybrid = 36,913m^3 Based on the above numbers, from their respective Tables, the Hybrid solution only results in a 1.28% reduction in attenuation volume provided. However, based on the Tables provided in the Appendices, which provides details on the plan areas of the basins, there would be a 34.6% reduction in plan area for the Project substations and a 34.7% reduction for the National Grid basin for the hybrid option, when compared against the infiltration only option.	The Applicants would note that the hybrid solution was not developed in order to reduce the footprints of the basins, rather to show that the infiltration element of the scheme can still be maximised. The hybrid solution is based upon the original storage volumes proposed for the attenuation pond with the addition of infiltration applied.. SCC is incorrect in its statement on depths and the 'Note to ExA' is incorrect and misleading - the maximum depth of the hybrid solution basins is the same as for the other solutions, 1m or 1.3m including freeboard, as detailed in **Appendix 5** of the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064).

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	Such a significant reduction in land take, despite only a minor reduction in attenuation volume required is achieved by increasing the depth of the basins for the hybrid solution. The hybrid solution utilises basins with a water depth of 1.5m and a total depth of 2.0m. Both the infiltration only and attenuation design options accommodate basins with a maximum water depth of 1.0m and a maximum total depth of 1.5m, as per CIRIA SuDS Manual design guidance. Therefore, the reduction in land take illustrated in Appendix 6 is inaccurate as it does not comply with National Design Guidance, specifically CIRIA SuDS Manual. Note to ExA: You can see this difference without digging into the calculations. Compare the plans in Appendices 4,6 & 8. Note the difference between the base level and the basin top level for each basin in each design option. You can make the same comparison using the maximum water level.	
22	Paragraph 190 SPR Statement As discussed in section 6, although an infiltration only scheme is currently proving unviable due to the worst case 10mm/hr infiltration rate assumed, this is a worst-case scenario and is likely to change once percolation testing has been undertaken. If an infiltration only design proves viable once percolation testing has been undertaken and ground water levels are established, it will be implemented as the final SuDS design. SCC Comment	Please see ID14 and ID17 (which confirms that the half drain is a design check pass).

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	Yellow - In section 6, the only possible reason stated for infiltration being unviable, is due to the half drain times, which as above, is an incorrect conclusion. No further evidence has been provided in Section 6 to justify any other reason for the infiltration only method to be unviable, despite what was discussed at ISH11. Cyan – This does not make reference to the other potential issues that could present a barrier to an infiltration only approach, as discussed at ISH11 and stated elsewhere in this document.	
23	Appendix 2 <u>SPR Statement</u> N/A <u>SCC Comment</u> It is acknowledged that the Applicant has presented an option to connect to the Friston Main River. However, Suffolk County Council do not view this option as achievable without increasing maintenance and/or flood risk. The topographic survey used by the Applicants was undertaken in November 2019. On 30/03/2021 SCC took approximate measurements based off identified points on the topographic survey (attached to this response) to establish a present-day condition of the watercourse. The footbridge at the northern end of the river, adjacent Church Road, is 150mm deep. The riverbed level was between 450-500mm below the underside of the footbridge. Based on the topographic survey which identifies the top level of the bridge to be approx. 10.5mAOD, it is reasonable to estimate, using the above measurements, that the current river bed level is	SCC state that the flood risk has increased to the village of Friston prior to the development of the Projects due to silt load within the Friston Watercourse. The development of the Projects' substations will change land use within part of the catchment which will prevent a significant portion of sediment from entering the Friston Watercourse compared to the pre-development silt loading. The current situation must therefore be managed by SCC or the Environment Agency in any event. Where infiltration only is adopted for the Projects, there will be no positive discharge to the Friston Watercourse. Where an attenuation only, or a hybrid solution is adopted, the SuDS pond itself and the upstream/downstream pipework system will prevent a significant portion of sediment from entering the Friston Watercourse compared to the pre-development silt loading. This is due to the SuDS pond acting as a settlement pond, removing sediment prior to it entering the discharge pipe and subsequently the Friston Watercourse. Any siltation within the SuDS pond will then be regularly removed by the Applicants as part of its continuous SuDS maintenance activities. As the Friston Watercourse is a Main River at this location, the Applicants will undertake consultation with the Environment Agency to confirm connection, permitting and maintenance requirements during detailed design.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	9.9mAOD. This is 80mm higher than the level identified in the topographic survey (9.82mAOD). This is relevant as the proposed invert level of the pipe is flush with the river level obtained in the topographic survey. Whilst SCC appreciate this is the best information the Applicant has, this demonstrates how prone to siltation the Main River is. Any pipe installed at bed level has the potential to be buried below silt over time. The Main River is so shallow that the velocity of water is not sufficient to transfer sediment downstream. Neither the Environment Agency, nor Suffolk Highways should be expected to increase maintenance of the Main River or any culvert leading into it. Siltation is known to be an issue with this Main River. The proposals also see the removal of the current slope arrangement into the Main River, adjacent Church Road, with this being moved to the track to the north, with what SCC assume to be some form of open cover/grill, such as a cattle grid over the top (SCC assume this feature would not be put forward for adoption), to allow vehicle traffic to pass over but also to allow water to enter upstream of Church Road before passing through the culvert? If the proposal is not a cattle grid style approach, SCC require further clarification. The above approach would again have significant maintenance consequences. The track north of Church Road is unmade. Even without rainfall, this could result in debris entering the culvert. With rainfall, the debris (not just silt) entering the culvert would increase further. This has the potential to block the outfall pipe from the SuDS basins before this water even enters the culvert. Again, the shallow gradient of this system cannot generate velocities sufficient for the culvert to be self-cleansing. As such, the culvert would	The Applicants would also like to reiterate that ***Appendix 2*** of the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064) is indicative. A C-C cross section was not provided within ***Appendix 2*** as it is identical to the B-B cross section. The Applicants have utilised a detailed topographic survey provided by SCC in the indicative design, which is calibrated to ensure accuracy in the understanding of topographical levels at the time of the survey. Whilst it is noted that SCC has identified a number of indicative levels for the current status of the watercourse, it is also noted that these are approximate measurements and as such there is considerable uncertainty in these values. The Applicants will review the topographical information at this location and undertake targeted topographic survey post consent to confirm levels relevant to the watercourse and to inform the detailed design. The area referred to as the cattle grid area is to be infilled and surfaced, as shown in **Appendix 2** of the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064). SCC are incorrect stating that there will be increased maintenance liability for Suffolk Highways as a result of the proposed developments as the site operator is responsible for all maintenance activities, as stated in **Paragraph 138** of the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064): *"Inspection and maintenance of the onshore substations and National Grid infrastructure drainage systems (to the point of connection to the Friston Watercourse) will be the responsibility of the site operator during the operational phase of the Projects (until the site is decommissioned)."*If any of the pipes associated with the SuDS basins were to become blocked the water would flow along the same pathway that it would currently before entering the watercourse. In response to SCC's comments: 1) A Section C-C has not been provided as it is the same as Section B-B

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	continually silt up, resulting in an increased maintenance liability for Suffolk Highways to ensure the culvert remains clear, without even considering the condition of the Main River downstream. This is not acceptable to SCC. If the pipe from any SuDS basins or the proposed culvert were to be blocked, surface water would flow overland. However, it would no longer enter the Friston Main River at the current location. Instead, it would only be able to do so downstream of the existing footbridge. This would require surface water to flow over/around the footbridge before entering the watercourse. The consequences of this flow deflection are unknown, but it is unlikely to reduce flood risk. SCC would also like to draw attention to the following comments: 1) Section C-C has not been provided 2) No details have been provided to suggest that the 100mm cover is suitable for the likely loads the culvert will need to carry. 3) The 100mm cover is insufficient to prevent road surface cracking, resulting from the movement of culvert joints. This will increase maintenance requirements of the road surface. 4) The diversion of services and the potential maintenance consequences of this work for the relevant utility companies should be noted.	2) The drawing sections detailed in **Appendix 2** of the ***OODMP*** (REP 8-064) depict a concept design to illustrate outfall levels are achievable. There are a number of options that can be developed within this 'concept window' to achieve a satisfactory technical solution (e.g. monolithic structure, geomembrane, highway surface re-profile). In accordance with **Requirement 41** of the ***draft DCO*** (document reference 3.1) the final technical design details will be included in the final ODMP to be submitted to, and approved by, the relevant planning authority, in consultation with SCC and the Environment Agency. 3) Please see response to 2). The Applicants will update the ***OODMP*** (REP 8-064) at Deadline 11 to confirm that any additional costs associated with the highway maintenance on Church Road, above the surface water discharge culvert, will be incorporated in the maintenance responsibilities within the final Operational Drainage Management Plan. 4) This is a matter for the Applicants and utility owners, not SCC.
Outline Code of Construction Practice (REP8-017)		
24	The Control Measures identified as potential options in section 11.1 of this document are appropriate, as options. This has been acknowledged by SCC previously. However, despite this topic being the subject of lengthy discussion at ISH11, the Applicant has	**Section 11.1** of the ***Outline Code of Construction Practice*** (OCoCP) (document reference 8.1) sets out general control measures available to the Projects that can be delivered within the Order limits. These are demonstrated in **Plate 11.1** of the ***OCoCP*** (document reference 8.1). However, as stated in

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	not demonstrated that any of these mitigation options are deliverable within the Order Limits. Indeed, the Flood Risk and Drainage Clarification Note (REP8-038), paragraph 44, states that 'the Applicants do not consider it useful or accurate to undertake such an assessment at this stage'. SCC strongly dispute this, which ultimately, is the Applicants failure to demonstrate that sufficient mitigation can be delivered within the Order Limits during the construction phase.	the ***Flood Risk and Drainage Clarification Note*** (REP8-038), the precise design and integration of such measures (including full integration with landowners, existing drainage systems as per clause 6 of the Option Agreement (REP9-086)) cannot be established at this stage, hence they are included in the ***OCoCP*** (document reference 8.1), the final detail of which must be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority prior to commencement (such detail benefiting from the detailed design of the works and the construction methodology). This is standard and accepted practice for nationally significant infrastructure projects as without the parameters and conclusions reached during detailed design it is not possible to define the exact control measures which are required or suitable. The control measures that will be implemented will be refined post consent and presented in the final Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) to be approved by the relevant planning authority.
Applicants' Comments on Suffolk County Council's Deadline 7 Submissions (REP8-046)		
25	Paragraph 7 SPR Statement Within this document, the Applicants reiterate its commitment to a primary solution of infiltration only where practicable, considering other competing land uses such as landscaping, biodiversity enhancement and access. Integration of landscaping and the surface water management measures will prevent competing land uses from being developed in isolation and recognises the importance of proving a balance between effective landscape screening, surface water management infrastructure, and biodiversity enhancement.	The Applicants acknowledge that landscaping and surface water management measures need to be carefully considered together, and that the final SuDS design, which will be detailed in the final ODMP, will take into consideration the effects of the final landscaping proposals (and vice versa). When the Applicants used the term 'integration' it is meant that both landscaping and surface water management measures will work to complement one another and both be feasible within the Order limits, the Applicants do not mean literal integration. The Applicants appreciate that there will naturally be leaf or branch fall which could interfere with the SuDS design, hence why the Applicants have committed to ongoing maintenance of the SuDS features within the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064). The final landscaping proposals and SuDS design will be defined post consent once ground investigation works and detail design of the Projects have been

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	This approach is entirely consistent with the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Policy SCLP9.6: Sustainable Drainage Systems, which states that "Sustainable drainage systems should be integrated into the landscaping scheme and green infrastructure provision of the development; • Contribute to the design quality of the scheme; and • Deliver sufficient and appropriate water quality and aquatic biodiversity improvements, wherever possible." SCC Comment See above SCC response to the D8 OODMP & Flood Risk and Drainage Clarification Note. Yellow - SCC maintain the position that a suboptimal surface water drainage solution should not be accepted due to insufficient land being available, or because land that otherwise would be available is being prioritised for other mitigation. Cyan - SCC made it clear during ISH11 and in our Deadline 8 submission that integration of landscaping with SuDS cannot be considered at this stage due to the impact some landscape features can have on the long-term operation of some SuDS features. The landscaping being discussed here is screening using trees. This will inevitably result in leaf fall. As such the leaf debris can block infiltration surfaces and branches/leaves and other detritus can block the outfall from any attenuation system.	undertaken. This will ensure that the final site design will be optimal and sustainable and appropriate maintenance is committed to.
26	Paragraph 24 SPR Statement	Please see ID17 which confirms that the half drain is a design check pass.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	The Applicants note this additional approach and have undertaken this secondary assessment within the OODMP (REP6-017), however concluded that this also did not meet the required half drain time of 24 hours. SCC Comment The 1:100+CC event should half drain within 24 hours. The purpose of half draining within 24 hours is so there is sufficient storage for any subsequent storm event. If the half drain time cannot be met, the joint probability of a 1:100+ CC event, followed by a 1:10+CC event is deemed to be a reasonable alternative. The likelihood of a further significant rainfall event is deemed to be so low that it would be unreasonable to design for. The rainfall accommodated from the 1:100+CC & 1:10+CC events will therefore drain down slowly, utilising infiltration and ultimately dissipating over an extended period of time.	
Written Summary of Oral Case (ISH11) (REP8-096)		
27	Paragraph 27 SPR Statement In terms of the assessment of flood risk during the construction phase this is carried out in accordance with the same policy and best practice guidance, as for the operational phase i.e. considering the requirements of NPPF and its accompanying NPPG. SCC Comment SCC agree that the construction and operation phases should be treated the same. Using the same policy and guidance. However,	The Applicants contest SCC's statement that the assessment of flood risk during the construction phase has not been carried out in accordance with the relevant policy and best practice guidance. The Applicants assessment can be found in ***Chapter 20*** of the ES, ***Water Resources and Flood Risk*** (APP-068) and further details on flood risk during the construction phase can be found in **Section 11** of the ***OCoCP*** (document reference 8.1).

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	SCC do not agree that this work has been undertaken by the Applicant.	
28	Paragraph 33 SPR Statement The principles for management of risk during the construction phase, focusing on the need to ensure no change in surface water runoff and flood risk, no increase in sediment supply and no accidental release of contaminant are set out as embedded mitigation measures in Environmental Statement Chapter 20 (APP068) and within the OCoCP. SCC Comment As previously stated, SCC acknowledge that the mitigation measures identified are suitable, providing SuDS options are prioritised. However, it has not been demonstrated that sufficient mitigation is deliverable within the Order Limits.	Please see ID24.
29	Paragraph 34 SPR Statement The Applicants have ensured that the Order limits are of sufficient width to accommodate a range of surface water and sediment control measures, as outlined within the onshore development area (this is discussed further in the Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Clarification Note submitted at Deadline 8 (ExA.AS-13.D8.V1). SCC Comment	Please see ID24.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	No evidence or justification has been provided to demonstrate that the Order Limits are sufficient to accommodate sufficient mitigation.	
30	Paragraph 35 SPR Statement The Applicants have committed to ensuring that the SuDS design and landscape mitigation requirements are both attainable within the Order Limits. The Applicants have provided further detail on this in the Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Note submitted at Deadline 8 (document reference ExA.AS13.D8.V1). SCC Comment No evidence or justification has been provided to demonstrate that the Order Limits are sufficient to accommodate sufficient mitigation.	Please see ID10, ID13 and ID14.
31	Paragraph 36 SPR Statement The OCoCP presents a range of measures which may be drawn upon by the Applicants to manage surface water drainage and sediment during construction within the onshore development area. SCC Comment No evidence or justification has been provided to demonstrate that the Order Limits are sufficient to accommodate sufficient mitigation.	Please see ID24.
32	Paragraph 38 SPR Statement	The Applicants note that SCC does not expect a climate change allowance to be included for construction drainage. The Applicants request further clarification from SCC regarding its revised assessment of the return period for the event affecting Friston in 2019 given that

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	With regards to storm events, storm return periods for design purposes are normally based on the expected design life of the constructed infrastructure, or building, together with the affordability of mitigation measures. In the instance of the Projects, the construction design life is likely to be less than two years, therefore it would be unreasonable to design the protection measures for a one in 100 year event plus a 40% allowance for climate change. Therefore, the design storm return period that will be used will be appropriate and reflect the design life of the construction works. An example of this would be that a one in five year event may be deemed suitable protection for construction that only lasted two years. SCC Comment As per SCC's Deadline 8 response, we would not expect a climate change allowance to be included for construction drainage due to the timescale for construction. As per paragraph 27 of this document, the policy and guidance for the proposed development should be the same for construction as it is operation. Suggesting construction drainage is designed for a 1 in 5 year rainfall event is entirely unsuitable. The Applicant has provided no justification or supporting evidence for this approach. The Applicant acknowledges in the OODMP that Friston experienced a 1 in 40 year rainfall event in October 2019 (REP8-064, paragraph 73). It should be noted that SCC have challenged this statement and believe the event to be closer to 1 in 5 to 1 in 10, however the Applicant maintains the statement contained in the OODMP.	the return period adopted by the Applicants was provided by SCC via email (09.10.2020). The Applicants maintain that the design storm return period to be used is likely to be a 1 in 5 year event as this adequately reflects the design life of the construction period which will last approximately two years. This is compliant with the guidance set out in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015).

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	On this basis, given the established surface water flood risk to Friston, it is unclear why the Applicant thinks it would be acceptable to only accommodate a smaller rainfall event. Ultimately, in the event of a larger rainfall event, the consequences would be felt by the residents of Friston. This is not an acceptable approach and is evidently an increase in surface water flood risk during the construction phase. This proposed approach further supports why SCC insist on seeing that sufficient mitigation for surface water flood risk is deliverable within the Order Limits during construction.	
33	Paragraph 39 SPR Statement When considering turbidity, the expected level cannot be estimated at this stage and it will be primarily governed by the soil type which will be concluded during the site investigation works that will be undertaken post consent. SCC Comment It is evident from photos in the Friston Surface Water Management Plan and looking at the observed condition of the Friston Main River, which is heavily silted in part, that the surrounding land generates significant amounts of sediment in surface water runoff at present. Construction activities are likely to only increase this issue further. SCC believe this is a reasonable assumption to make.	Please see ID23.
34	Paragraph 45 & 46 SPR Statement	Please see ID24 and **Plate 11.1** of the ***OCoCP*** (document reference 8.1).

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	A key part of this CoCP, is the production of a detailed construction phase surface water and drainage management plan. The OCoCP presents a range of measures which may be drawn upon by the Applicants to manage surface water drainage and sediment during construction within the onshore development area. These measures can only be finalised on appointment of a construction contractor, allowing their works programme and procedures to feed into the selection of the most appropriate techniques to manage surface water and sediment. SCC Comment No evidence or justification has been provided to demonstrate that the Order Limits are sufficient to accommodate sufficient mitigation. SCC are not asking for finalised options to be presented. We are asking to see that sufficient mitigation can be accommodated within the Order Limits.	
35	Paragraph 60 SPR Statement The drainage strategy will benefit, where possible, of the infiltration rates and the SuDS systems will be implemented in such way that the land use is maximised where land is not required for other uses within the site. SCC Comment SCC maintain that SuDS should be prioritised and that achieving an optimal SuDS solution should not be conditional based on the land take requirements for other mitigation measures.	Please see ID10.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
36	Paragraph 61 SPR Statement Should infiltration be possible but prove not to be suitable as the sole mean of disposing of surface water, then a hybrid infiltration and attenuation approach will be considered. This solution will dependent on the soil's available infiltration rates and of a positive discharge rate, no greater than the site's pre-development greenfield rate SCC Comment SCC maintain that if infiltration is found to be possible it should be relied upon as the sole method of surface water disposal.	Within the ***OODMP*** (REP8-064) the Applicants have committed to implementing infiltration as far as reasonably practicable. However, as stated at ID13, the Applicants are also required to give consideration to landscaping requirements, use of the land, mitigation and biodiversity. This approach complies with NPS EN-1, paragraph 5.7.9 as it prioritises the use of SuDS in the Project, and ESC planning policy.
37	Paragraph 65 SPR Statement The Applicants have committed to ensuring that the SuDS design and the landscape mitigation requirements are both attainable within the Order Limits. The Applicants have provided further detail on this in the Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Note submitted at Deadline 8 (document reference ExA.AS-13.D8.V1). SCC Comment Contrary to this statement, whilst not clearly identified in the submissions, it is still apparent that landscape mitigation clashes with surface water mitigation. The extent of this clash is still yet to be clearly identified, and as such, it is not possible to comment on this aspect further.	SCC continue to consider surface water mitigation in isolation. Whilst the role of the LLFA is to consider other matters, SCC also has a wider remit which includes interests in landscape and biodiversity matters. Landscaping and surface water management do not 'clash' as presented by SCC, rather they are developed as an integrated solution which meets the requirements of EN-1, ESC planning policy and the drainage hierarchy. In addition, please see ID3 and ID10.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
Applicants' Responses to Hearings Action Points (REP8-093)		
38	Section 1.3 of this document responds to Action Point 3 of ISH 11 (EV-123a), to which the Applicant has responded as below: *The Applicants have submitted an updated Outline CoCP at Deadline 8 (document reference 8.1), which includes an appendix which addresses the matters raised through oral submissions within ISH11 and requested by the ExA in their Hearing Action Points* The above is directly contradicted by REP8-038, paragraph 44, which is provided below: *The Applicants have updated the OCoCP at Deadline 8 (document reference 8.1) including further provisions within section 11 regarding construction surface water management. However an Appendix has not been included within this submission as the Applicants do not consider it useful or accurate to undertake such an assessment at this stage given the level of detail regarding the precise construction footprint, construction techniques, specific (varying) ground conditions within the onshore development area and micrositing of works.* The above two statements are directly contradictory. However, the Applicant appears to have not provided the information requested.	The Applicants acknowledge that these two statements contradict each other. The first quote, in response to Action Point 3 of ISH 11 (EV-123a), is incorrect and should be disregarded. The second quote is correct. **Section 11** of the ***OCoCP*** (document reference 8.1) details various surface water drainage control measures which could be implemented during the construction phase, however as stated: *the Applicants do not consider it useful or accurate to undertake such an assessment at this stage given the level of detail regarding the precise construction footprint, construction techniques, specific (varying) ground conditions within the onshore development area and micrositing of works.* During detailed design an evaluation of the proposed development area will be undertaken. Such evaluation will include liaison with the relevant landowners and therefore ensure integration with existing landowner drainage systems. The findings of this will inform the final design and will be detailed in the Surface Water and Drainage Management Plan and the Flood Management Plan, both of which will be produced post consent as part of the final CoCP.

2.3 SCC Deadline 9 Floods Topographical Survey (REP9-045)

3. The Applicants note that SCC have submitted the Topographic Survey that SCC carried out in November 2019 as a reference document into the Examinations.

2.4 SCC Deadline 9 Highways Comments (REP9-046)

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
Comments on the Applicant's updated draft DCO (dDCO) submitted at Deadline 8 (D8). REP8-004		
1	At D8 SCC submitted its own proposed protective provisions (REP9-175) to be included in Schedule 10 of the dDCO. Subject to some further minor revisions to the text of the OCTMP the OAMP and the OTP in relation to the Planning Performance Agreement, which have been discussed and agreed between the Applicants and SCC and which SCC expects to be put forward by the Applicants at Deadline 9, SCC anticipates that it will be possible to avoid the need for protective provisions. SCC expects to provide a formal confirmation at Deadline 10.	The Applicants can confirm these amendments are incorporated in the ***Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan*** (OCTMP) (document reference 8.9), ***Outline Access Management Plan*** (OAMP) (document reference 8.10) and ***Outline Travel Plan*** (OTP) (document reference 8.11) submitted at Deadline 9. SCC has subsequently confirmed to the Applicants that the changes are satisfactory and that incorporation of protective provisions into the **DCO** is no longer required.
Comments on any additional information/submissions received by D8.		
Outline Code of Construction Practice (REP8-018)		
2	No additional comments.	Noted.
Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (REP8-022)		
3	Paragraph 23: Proposed changes to planning agreement are acceptable, subject to some further minor revisions which have been discussed and which SCC expects the Applicants to put forward at Deadline 9 (see para 3.35 below).	Please refer to the Applicants' response at ID1.
4	Paragraph 24: Proposed changes to appropriate approvals are acceptable.	Noted.
5	Paragraph 46: Proposed changes to control of HGV routes are acceptable.	Noted.
6	Paragraph 49: Proposed changes to control of HGV routes (B1122) are acceptable.	Noted.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
7	Paragraph 54 and 55: Proposed changes to control movements at the A1094/B1122 junction at Aldeburgh and access 5 and 6 are accepted as appropriate.	Noted.
8	Paragraph 58: The applicant should note that the LHA would not permit overnight parking or waiting on the local highway network, but otherwise the measures are acceptable.	Bullet point three of Paragraph 58 in the ***OCTMP*** (document reference 8.9) addresses SCC's representation as follows: *"The delivery instructions will include advice that drivers will not be permitted to wait overnight unless at a licenced location"*.
9	Paragraph 80 and 83: Accepted that Work No. 36 is required before Additional Works Nos. 19 to 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 34, 38 to 43, excepting creation of highway accesses is acceptable.	Noted.
10	Paragraph 88: It is accepted that the design of the footway amenity schemes are 'in principle' acceptable, but that amendments may be required and that these will be agreed with the LHA.	Noted.
11	Paragraph 92: It is accepted that the applicants will not commence Work No. 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17,18, 19 north of Hundred River, (with the exception of the creation of highway access) until mitigation in accordance with the Theberton Mitigation Scheme is completed.	Noted.
12	Paragraph 97: It is accepted that the applicants will not commence Works Nos. 19 south of Hundred River, 20 to 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 34, 38 to 43 (with the exception of the creation of highway accesses) until mitigation in accordance with the Snape Mitigation Scheme is completed.	Noted.
13	Paragraph 101: It is accepted that the applicants will not commence Works Nos. 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16 to 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 34, 38 to 43 (with the exception of the creation of highway accesses) until mitigation in accordance with the Marlesford Mitigation Scheme is completed.	Noted.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
14	Paragraph 105: It is accepted that the applicant will not commence Works Nos. 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16 to 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, 34, 38 to 43 (with the exception of the creation of highway accesses) until mitigation in accordance with the Yoxford Mitigation Scheme is completed.	Noted.
15	Paragraph 115: The LHA accepts the proposal that the traffic management are developed and agreed with the LHA prior to construction.	Noted.
16	Paragraphs 125 to 127: The LHA supports the proposals to use ANPR as a measure to support a booking system to record HGV movements.	Noted.
17	The proposed measures to monitor delivery vehicles to ensure NO2 levels do not exceed the prescribed threshold in Stratford St Andrew as detailed in paragraphs 137 to 143 are acceptable to the LHA.	Noted.
18	Table 5.1, installation of the APNR cameras should be at commencement of the construction works as this forms key part of the monitoring system.	It is not possible to establish an ANPR system at the start of construction as preparation works need to be established in order to ensure an effective system is in place (i.e. as noted in the ***OCTMP*** (document reference 8.9), such considerations extend to security, power and connectivity to be established to serve the ANPR system). Suitable provision is made in advance of the ANPR system being put in place as outlined in the ***OCTMP*** (document reference 8.9), in that up to the point of installation, HGV registrations and arrival/departure times would be recorded manually by a marshal (appointed by the CTMPCo).
Outline Access Management Plan (REP8-024)		
19	Paragraph 4: It is accepted that SCC approves the AMP in consultation with the relevant planning authority.	Noted.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
20	Paragraph 9: Noted that there are five public highway accesses (1, 2, 9, 10 and 13) and four haul roads. It would be useful for the applicant to clarify the details of the four haul roads and the LHA notes the temporary use of accesses 5 and 6 (paragraph 29).	***Figure 1*** of the ***OAMP*** (document reference 8.10) details this information and clarifies haul road crossings 3 and 4 (Cable Section 2), 7 and 8 (Cable Section 3) and 11 and 12 (Cable Section 4). Access 5 and 6 (Cable Section 3) would also serve as haul road crossing when not being used for temporary access.
21	Paragraph 13 and 14: Proposed changes to planning agreement and appropriate agreements and approvals are acceptable, subject to some further minor revisions which have been discussed and which SCC expects the Applicants to put forward at Deadline 9 (see para 3.35 below).	Please refer to the Applicants' response at ID1.
22	Paragraph 23 to 25 and 29: Proposed changes to control of HGV routes (B1122) are acceptable.	Noted.
23	Paragraph 34: The LHA notes the proposal for a method statement in the Onshore Preparation Works Management Plan to control safe entry and egress. This document is within the CoCP approved by the LPA and the LHA would expect to be consulted on these proposals. The applicant should confirm whether these method statement will be the same for AIL movements in the construction phase.	The majority of abnormal load movements would be undertaken during the Projects' construction phase (as detailed in ***D1 Traffic and Transport Clarification Note*** (REP1-048)). The traffic management associated with access and egress for these movements would be secured via method statements contained in the final Access Management Plan to be approved by SCC in consultation with the relevant planning authority. All abnormal loads movements will be notifiable through the established application process known as Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads (ESDAL) and subject to Highways England approval and Police permission and direction. The larger loads would be subject to Police escort.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
24	Table 2.3: The LHA notes the visibility to signal heads of 120m as shown on drawing TP-PB4842-DR008.	Noted.
25	Paragraph 56: the LHA considers that a minimum width of footway should ideally be 1.5m with an absolute minimum of 1.0m where this cannot be achieved (as stated in code of practice for streetworks https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/321056/safety-at-streetworks.pdf)	Noted. **Paragraph 56** of the ***OAMP*** (document reference 8.11) sets out the specified parameter for footway width, full details of roadworks will be submitted with the final AMP for approval by SCC in consultation with the relevant planning authority.
Outline Travel Plan (REP8-026)		
26	Paragraph 5: It is accepted that SCC approves the Travel Plan in consultation with the relevant planning authority.	Noted.
27	Paragraph 24 and 25: Subject to some further minor revisions to the text of the OCTMP the OAMP and the OTP in relation to the Planning Performance Agreement, which have been discussed and agreed between the Applicants and SCC and which SCC expects to be put forward by the Applicants at Deadline 9, SCC anticipates that it will be possible to avoid the need for protective provisions. SCC expects to provide a formal confirmation at Deadline 10.	Please refer to the Applicants' response at ID1.
Applicants Comments on SCC's Deadline 7 Submissions (REP8-046) Section 2.3: Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority		
28	ID2: Incomplete text has been completed. No further comment	Noted.
29	ID3: SCC confirm that a draft s278 agreement has been completed and accept this will be secured by the OCTMP.	Noted.
30	ID5: The LHA note the applicant's response and that this matter remains as a matter not agreed in the SOCG. The LHA notes that if the development (Planning Application reference: DC/20/5181/OUT) is constructed it is not in a position to secure removable traffic islands on the B1122 Abbey Road and that the costs of	For clarity, the developments that SCC are referring to are two central islands proposed on Abbey Road to the north of Leiston to assist pedestrians in safely crossing the road.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	removal and replacement may be passed onto the applicant if this is required to allow for their AIL movements. See proposed access arrangement plan http://publicaccessdocuments.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/NorthgatePublicDocs/01610645.pdf	***Section 1.3*** of the ***OCTMP*** (document reference 8.9) secures commitment to a Planning Performance Agreement which will allow SCC to recover reasonable costs for the relocating / removing street furniture and all other highway infrastructure to facilitate AIL movements.
31	ID7: As ID5.	Please refer to the Applicants' response at ID30.
32	ID8: The LHA accepts that use of STOP-WORK signs is acceptable.	Noted.
33	ID12: The LHA notes the comments regarding use of single lane working over a period of 2 days and that this will avoid daytime traffic sensitive restrictions. In effect this would restrict such work to weekends (but not weekends in summer peak periods) if the A12 is in use by either SZC or SPR construction traffic.	The short bridge span and adjacent laydown area means that a temporary overbridge can be quickly installed and uninstalled. It therefore follows that the work may not necessarily be undertaken at the weekend. The exact timing of the roadworks to accommodate AIL movements over Marlesford Bridge (should they be required) will be agreed with the Police and SCC as part of the application process for a Special Order Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movement(ESDAL).
34	ID13: Noted. No further comment.	Noted.
35	ID21: Noted. No further comment.	Noted.
36	ID23: The proposal of a planning agreement is accepted by the LHA, subject to minor changes in text in the OCTMP, OAMP and OTP. It is understood that these changes will be made at deadline 9. *The Applicants will not undertake any works to any highway or highway asset that is the responsibility of SCC until a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) has been agreed with SCC, "both parties acting reasonably and in good faith", which will allow SCC to recover reasonable costs including but not limited to (Any dispute or difference arising in connection with the terms of the proposed PPA between the*	The ***OCTMP*** (document reference 8.9), ***OAMP*** (document reference 8.10) and ***OTP*** (document reference 8.11) submitted at Deadline 9 contain the suggested wording.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	Applicants and SCC, shall be referred to arbitration in accordance with Article 37 of the Order).	
37	ID26: Noted.	Noted.
38	ID27: Noted and acceptable.	Noted.
39	ID28: See ID23.	Noted.
40	ID31: The LHA accepts the proposals to use ANPR to aid tracking of HGV deliveries, but notes this should also apply to vehicles leaving site.	ANPR specification would be incorporated in the final CTMP, which will be submitted to SCC for approval in consultation with the relevant planning authority.
41	ID34: Acceptable.	Noted.
42	ID35: The LHA's concerns remain that the improvements to the A1094/B1069 junction require delivery early in the construction program to avoid disruption to the applicants' construction vehicles gaining access to the main site compound south of Knodishall.	The Applicants confirm that the works at A1094/B1069 junction would be undertaken early in the construction programme. This will be incorporated within the final CTMP.
43	ID36: The changes to the OCTMP are acceptable.	Noted.
44	ID37: The changes to the OCTMP are acceptable.	Noted.
45	ID39: The changes to the OCTMP are acceptable.	Noted.
46	ID41: 'as required' has been removed. Changes are acceptable.	Noted.
47	ID43: The LHA maintains its position that the use of open trenches will require substantial replacement of the road construction to prevent long term settlement of trench backfill.	Open trenches will be reinstated in accordance with the latest national specification, currently The Specification for the Reinstatement of Openings in Highways, Third Edition (Department for Transport, 2010).

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
48	ID44: The LHA accepts that the proposed methods of managing and auditing of HGVs are acceptable in principle but will be further refined during discharge of the CTMP.	Noted.
49	ID46: See ID23.	Please refer to the Applicants' response at ID23.
50	ID48: The LHA accepts that the notification period for works should align with NRSWA guidance noting that any stopping up or diverting of a street would be considered major works.	Noted.
51	ID50: The commitment to an abnormal load access method statement is included within the OAMP.	Noted.
52	ID51: The applicant states that access 13 will use be used by NG substation construction vehicles. Can the applicant confirm this is for light vehicles only (	**Table 2.1** of the ***OAMP*** (document reference 8.11) confirms that National Grid will only use access 13 for light vehicles.
53	ID55: The applicant states that pedestrians are considered in the OAMP. With regards to Paragraph 56 of the OAMP, which relates to this issue, the LHA considers that a minimum width of footway should ideally be 1.5m with an absolute minimum of 1.0m where this cannot be achieved (as stated in code of practice for streetworks https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/321056/safety-at-streetworks.pdf).	Please refer to Applicants' response at ID25.
54	ID56: The LHA accepts that the applicant will monitor speeds where temporary speed reductions are in place. However, if vehicle speeds are exceeding the temporary limit the LHA will expect the applicant to implement additional measures to protect the safety of road users.	Noted. The monitoring and enforcement procedure set out in ***OCTMP*** (document reference 8.9) will address any road safety concerns during the Projects' construction phase, including speeding.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
55	ID59: How will the operational route through Leiston avoiding turns from the eastbound A1094 to the B1121 be communicated to drivers?	The HGV operational route through Leiston avoiding turns from the eastbound A1094 to the B1121 will be communicated to suppliers via delivery instructions.
56	ID60: Accepted.	Noted.
S278 agreement (REP8-080)		
57	No additional comments.	N/A
Sizewell Gap Construction Method Statement (REP8-087)		
58	Paragraph 10: The changes to reflect the LHA as the discharging authority, in consultation with the local planning authority for the Access Management Plan is accepted.	Noted.
Outline Port Construction Traffic Management and Travel Plan (REP8- 092)		
59	Paragraph 8: SCC considers that as Highway Authority it must be consulted on the transport impacts of a port being selected outside the authority's administrative boundaries rather than the looser 'liaison' proposed by the applicant. This maintains our position stated in our deadline 7 response (REP7-076) paragraph 2.51 and is contrary to the position stated in the applicants deadline 8 response in ID60 (REP8-046).	The ***Outline Port Construction Traffic Management and Travel Plan*** was updated at Deadline 8 (REP8-092) to provide clarification that the Applicants will consult with SCC following the selection of a preferred port location. In any case any relevant construction traffic will be covered by the final CTMP which requires to be approved by the relevant highway authority.
60	At deadline 8 (REP8-175) paragraph 1a in response to ISH13 the authority explained our position with respect to the scope of the Outline Port Construction Traffic Management and Travel Plan (OPCTM&TP): In REP5-055 para 6.5 SCC responded: "Whilst we note the Applicants' commitment to assessing port traffic once the exact location of the port is known, as noted in our	Please see ID 59 above.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	oral submission, we remain concerned that the omission of these impacts does not allow for all parties to understand the total, holistic, impacts of the development. This issue is further exacerbated when trying to understand in combination impacts with other developments (both for NSIPs and applications determined under the Town and Country Planning Act)". SCC also expressed concern that the Port Construction Traffic Management Plan should not exclude any need to consider whether port traffic for the construction of the onshore works should be included within the remit of the Plan. Whilst SCC notes the Applicants' expectation that aggregates in particular will be sourced from within the region, over the duration of the project(s), the potential for marine aggregates to be used (whether for commercial/pricing/continuity of supply or other reasons) cannot be precluded, and SCC would therefore wish to see the remit of PTCMP revised to allow the interaction between port traffic and the onshore works to be addressed as necessary. This has not yet been addressed by the applicant and reference is still made in paragraph 31 of the OPCTM&PP only to deliveries and not export from the port(s).	
Statement of Common Ground with ESC and SCC (REP8-114)		
61	No additional comments.	N/A
Responses to any further information requested by the ExAs for this deadline.		
62	Not applicable.	N/A

2.5 SCC Deadline 9 Planning Comments (REP9-047)

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
Comments on Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) and Statement of Commonality received by D8.		
1	SCC has made separate comments at Deadline 9 on the draft SoCG Version 04 (REP8-114) submitted at D8 in its capacities as lead local flood authority, as archaeological authority, and as local highway authority. This response addresses some over-arching matters. The draft SoCG records the Applicants' assessment of areas of agreement and disagreement as at D8 but is not a document that is agreed by SCC. SCC is working with the Applicants (and with ESC) to refine the text of the SoCG where there are areas of disagreement, with a view to a Final SoCG being submitted to the Examination at Deadline 12 in line with the (revised) timetable.	The SoCG is a document produced jointly by the Applicants, SCC and ESC and the drafting has been developed collaboratively with the Councils. Notwithstanding that the SoCG is unsigned, the 'agreed' and 'not agreed' statements within the SoCG were established with the technical specialists and Development Manager at SCC as at Deadline 8. SCC, ESC and the Applicants agreed that the unsigned SoCG would be submitted to Examinations to reflect the position at Deadline 8 and an updated (as required) and signed version of the SoCG would be submitted at a subsequent deadline.
2	One specific matter to identify at this stage is that the text at paragraph 12 of the SoCG has not been updated to reflect the information that the Examination has received about other projects potentially co-locating at Friston. Whilst the wording will be a matter for further discussion with the Applicants and ESC, SCC is currently of the view that the text of the second sentence of the first bullet point of paragraph 12 should be revised to read: 'The Councils understanding is that some of these projects would or could connect to the new National Grid substation proposed at Grove Wood, Friston for which the Applicants are seeking consent, and that these future connections would result in the enlargement or extension of the National Grid substation. Since the commencement of the Examination, information has been submitted to the Examination to indicate that the promoters of Five	The Applicants will review the wording of paragraph 12 of the SoCG with the Councils. It is of particular importance to recognise the scope of The Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects, when considering what projects to include within the Projects' cumulative impact assessment. Such early and undefined energy projects identified by the Councils cannot be cumulatively assessed as the detail is simply not available until such projects are further developed and therefore better defined. For instance, the North Falls and Five Estuaries projects have confirmed that they will not be located at Friston (REP7-066 and AS-100 respectively) – this demonstrates such projects and associate grid connections are subject to considerable change until the point at which they enter the planning/consenting phase. None of the projects identified by the Councils have entered the planning/consenting phase and none

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
	Estuaries (Additional Submission accepted on 17 March 2021) and North Falls (REP7-066) are not now seeking a connection at Friston, but in all other respects the Councils' concerns remain.'	are sufficiently defined to allow inclusion within the Projects' cumulative impact assessment.
3	SCC also notes that within various of the table of the SoCG addressing individual topics (such as but not limited to Tables 7 and 13), there are crossreferences to paragraph 13 of the SoCG which should be cross-references to paragraph 12. SCC would expect these to be corrected in the Final SoCG.	The Applicants will correct the cross reference within the SoCG and submit at Deadline 12.
Comments on any additional information/submissions received by D8.		
4	At D8 the applicants submitted an updated Substations Design Principles Statement (as REP8-083).	Noted.
5	This does not include any additional design principle to reflect SCC's suggestion for flexibility/adaptability to be included in the design principles (a point made at para 6.3 of the SCC D5 submissions on landscape (REP5-056). The applicants said in their D6 comments (section 6, ID7 of REP6-027) that they thought the proposed wording was inappropriate and inconsistent with the need for the development to remain within the stated parameters and the Order limits.	Noted.
6	SCC does not agree that the extra design principle would be inconsistent with either the parameters or the Order limits because it would be applied within those constraints (and already includes the words 'in so far as practicable').	The Applicants position has not altered from the ***Applicants' Comments on Suffolk County Council's Deadline 5 Submissions*** (REP6-027). The Applicants cannot develop alternative technology that have nether been assessed nor is within the parameters of the DCO, and inclusion of SCC's proposed design principle would be misleading and unimplementable.

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
		The Substations Design Principles Statement (REP8-083) provides sufficient control and flexibility to ensure an appropriately designed onshore substation and National Grid substation is developed which meets each and every constraint and parameter set out within the DCO. In particular, the following design principles are noted: • Reduction of visual impact of onshore substations, National Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds (i.e. where cost effective and efficient to do so, the Applicants will seek to further reduce the visual extent of the onshore substations, National Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds, through appropriate equipment procurement and layout considerations). • Operational equipment will be designed and installed to achieve low noise levels of no more than 31dBA at SSR2 and SSR5 (NEW) and 32dBA at SSR3 (i.e. The Applicants will seek to minimise the operational noise rating level below the limits set out in Requirement 27 of the draft DCO (REP7-006) and avoid any perceptible tones and other acoustic features at any residential receptor that would attract a correction in accordance with BS4142:2014+A1:2019, insofar as these mitigation measures do not add unreasonable costs or delays to the Projects or otherwise result in adverse impacts on other aspects of the environment (e.g. landscape and visual impacts). • Consider 'Good Design' in line with the requirements of Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) and the National Infrastructure Commission's 'Design Principles for National Infrastructure' (National Infrastructure Commission, February 2020)

ID	SCC Comment	Applicants' Comments
		• The visual impacts of the substation buildings will be minimised as far as possible by their sensitive placing, the use of appropriate design, building materials, shape, layout, coloration and finishes. • The design will optimise generation of renewable energy to displace carbon emissions and meet national and international carbon reduction and renewable energy targets, in line with the project objectives. • The Applicants, through the applications and proposed design process, will ensure an integrated approach to the design. The process will ensure both individuals and community representatives will have the opportunity to be involved as set out in the ***Substation Design Principles Statement*** (REP8-083).