



## The Planning Act 2008

East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two  
(EA2) Offshore Wind Farms

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EA1N – EN010077,  
EA2 – EN010078

Deadline 12 – 28 June 2021

East Suffolk Council's Responses to the Examining  
Authorities' Rule 17 Questions of 18 June 2021

The table below details East Suffolk Council’s (ESC) comments in relation to the Rule 17 questions issued by the Examining Authorities (R17QF).

| R17QF                                       | Question to:  | Question asked:  | 1 | 2 | ESC Response   |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Onshore Substation Siting and Design</b> |   |  |   |   |  |
| R17QF. 7                                    | The Applicants, SCC, ESC, Historic England, SASES and any other Interested Parties. | <p><b>Landscape and Visual Impact</b></p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) version 6 dated 11 June 2021 [AS-127] contains an updated design for the proposed SuDS basins. The revised designs remove previous areas of wet woodland within the basins and appears to reorientate the basin for the proposed southern substations. In addition, text within the OLEMS has been amended to state that SuDS basins “may” be encompassed by bunds (as opposed to “will”)</p> <p>To the Applicants:</p> <p>a) How likely is it that bunding will be required for the SuDS basins?</p> <p>b) Para 138 of the OLEMS states that bunding for landscaping purposes is subject to detailed design and the availability of suitable material on site during construction. If suitable material is on site during construction,</p> |   |   | <p>c) ESC has noted the proposed revised SuDS basin layout but does not consider that it will have any meaningful overall reduction of screening effects with the removal of the previously proposed wet woodland within the basins. However, it is possible that there may be some reduction in effectiveness of screening some views especially those on the public right of way that runs north-north-west along eastern boundary to Friston House, and most likely during the winter when leaves are off the trees, and also in the early years of screen planting establishment. This conclusion is based on an assumption that the Applicants achieve the predicted new planting growth rates that have been relied on throughout the examination process.</p> <p>d) It is ESC’s understanding that the creation of wet woodland within the proposed SuDS basins represented an ecological enhancement rather than being necessary for mitigation or compensation purposes. Therefore, the removal of this habitat type from the design of the site will result in a potentially lower amount of ecological enhancement being achieved by the developments as there will be a less varied suite of habitats created around the substations. The justification provided by the Applicants as to why wet woodland cannot be created in this location is noted and given the constraints stated, ESC understands why the design change has been proposed.</p> |

|                     |   |  |  |   |
|---------------------|---|--|--|---|
|                     |   | <p>provide examples of what bunds may be constructed and to what purpose.</p> <p>To SCC, ESC, Historic England and other Interested Parties:</p> <p>c) Provide any further submissions you may wish to make on the landscape and visual impact of the latest iteration of the proposed SuDS basins.</p> <p>d) Does the removal of the previously proposed wet woodland have an adverse effect on the ecological aims of the proposed developments?</p> <p>e) Does the removal of the previously proposed wet woodland have an adverse effect on the role of the OLEMS proposals as landscape or historic environment mitigation?</p> |  | <p>e) As noted in ESC’s response to c), the Council does not consider that the revised SuDS basin layout will have any meaningful overall reduction of screening effects with the removal of the previously proposed wet woodland within the basins. However as stated above, it is possible that there may be some reduction in effectiveness of screening some views from the public right of way along the eastern boundary during the winter months and early years of planting establishment.</p> <p>On this basis, there is potential scope for a reduced role in the effect of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) in mitigating potential landscape or historic environment impacts, but the Council considers that this is minor, seasonal, and temporal albeit dependant on the rate of early years plant establishment. ESC therefore considers that there would be no change to the overall impact on the setting of the listed buildings.</p> <p>The issues raised in this document highlight the need for ESC to be the discharging authority for all requirements that affect the layout of the area around the substation to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the final detailed designs.</p> |
| <b>Construction</b> |   |  |  |   |
| R17QF. 10           | The Applicants, SCC, ESC, Historic England, SASES and any other | <p><b>Landscape and Visual Impact: Construction Drainage Management</b></p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP11-015] provides an example construction surface water drainage scheme at the Substations Location</p>  |  | <p>In relation to other construction activity, ESC does not consider that these temporary construction drainage basins will have any meaningful impact on the overall landscape and visual impacts arising during the construction phase. The only caveat to this would be if the substations were not built simultaneously but sequentially and any screen planting that was planted after a first phase was later disrupted or removed to achieve later phase</p>   |

|  |                    |  |  |   |
|--|--------------------|--|--|---|
|  | Interested Parties | <p>(Appendix 2, Figure 3). This is described in the text as a worst-case indicative general arrangement (para 176).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide any submissions you may wish to make on any impacts of this proposed construction surface water drainage scheme on matters of landscape, visual impact and the setting of heritage assets.</li> </ul> |  | <p>construction including temporary drainage provision. In such circumstances the mitigation benefit of initial new planting would be potentially severely set back, thus having an ongoing or indeed returning adverse impact on landscape character and visual amenity.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice does not assess the potential impacts on the setting of the heritage assets. Notwithstanding this, as the temporary construction drainage basins would not have a meaningful impact on the structural landscape mitigation planting, ESC considers there would not be a notable impact on the settings of the heritage assets.</p> |
|  |                    |  |  |   |