



## Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs2): Hearings Action Points

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

Actions arising from the **Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs2)** held virtually on **Wednesday 2 and Thursday 3 December 2020**.

Action	Party	Deadline
<p>1.</p>	<p><b>Submissions in relation to onshore substations</b>  Updated details of finished ground levels and reductions in equipment height within the proposed substation development site at Friston will now be provided at D3 and D4.</p> <p>The ExAs formally invite and agree to accept an outline submission at D3 and detailed proposals, including mitigation plans, at D4 on the basis that the amendments introduced do not amount to a material change.</p>	<p>Applicants</p> <p>D3/D4</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>Information on natural environment effects and the absence of NE from the hearings</b>  The ExAs requested attendance at ISHs2 by NE in respect of its biodiversity and protected landscapes remits.</p> <p>NE is requested to review the online recordings of the hearings and respond in writing to questions raised of or relating to them at Agenda Items 2 (a) to (d) (with particular reference to cumulative and in-combination assessment, the projects to be included and implications for features of relevant European Sites – actions 4 &amp; 5 also refer), 3 (b) and (c) (with particular reference to any protected sites or landscapes matters within its remit); and all of 4 (with particular reference to any protected sites or landscapes matters within its remit).</p>	<p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>D3</p>



	<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
	<p>It should be noted that if information sought by the ExAs at hearings is not provided because an invited IP did not attend, and this results in delay or a need to repeat processes that affect the participation of other Interested Parties leading to additional costs, this can amount to unreasonable behaviour for which an award of costs can be sought<sup>1</sup>.</p>		
3.	<p><b>Information on possible transmission systems connections at Friston and the absence of NGET and NG ESO from the hearings</b></p> <p>The ExAs requested attendance at ISHs2 by NGET and NG ESO (in addition to NGV which did attend) to enable a full understanding of the site selection process for the Friston transmission connections and the degree to which National Grid group requirements had been considered by the Applicants.</p> <p>NGET and NGESO are requested to review the online recordings of the hearings and respond in writing to questions raised of or relating to them at Agenda Items 2(d), 3 (a), (b) and (c) and 4 (b) in the light of the discussion that occurred.</p> <p>It should be noted that if information sought by the ExAs at hearings is not provided because an invited IP did not attend, and this results in delay or a need to repeat processes that affect the participation of other Interested Parties leading to additional costs, this can amount to unreasonable behaviour for which an award of costs can be sought<sup>1</sup>.</p>	National Grid Electricity Systems Operator (NG ESO) and National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	D3
4.	<p><b>Updated in-combination collision risk assessments in the light of information from the Hornsea Project Three position</b></p> <p>Updated in-combination collision assessments and additional survey data have been submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS) BEIS to support the Hornsea</p>	Applicants	At any deadline up to close of Examinations

<sup>1</sup> [Awards of costs: examinations of applications for development consent orders](#), DCLG, July 2013 At Part C paragraph 3 bullet point 6.



	<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
	<p>Project Three position but in the most part have not as yet been placed into the public domain. Should that material become publicly available at the time of the SoS decision in respect of Hornsea Project Three, the Applicants are requested to submit it into these examinations and to provide an update to the in-combination collision assessments for East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO projects.</p>		
5.	<p><b>Status of HRA compensation sites for kittiwake: Lowestoft - Aldeburgh coast</b>            The hearings were informed that the Lowestoft to Aldeburgh coastline has been identified by the promoter of Hornsea Project Three as one of two areas of search for the siting of proposed kittiwake compensation measures associated with effects on the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA. Should a site/ sites within that search area be confirmed and secured as a compensation site/sites for kittiwake of the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, what are the Applicants' views and NE's views and advice as to how any compensation site should be treated in the HRA for the East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO applications?</p>	Applicants NE	D3
6.	<p><b>Additional information in relation to cumulative/in-combination impact on traffic and transport with Sizewell A, B and C</b>            The Sizewell C project has now applied for a Development Consent Order and more detailed traffic and transport data is now available. The Applicants are now working on the implications of Sizewell C following the submission of this application. Reference to the Sizewell data should be made by the Applicants and relevant cumulative/ in-combination assessment references to that data should be updated by D4.</p> <p>If opportunities to refine transport and traffic proposals further to respond better to spatial, volume and temporal effects arising then these should be taken, and the results</p>	Applicants	D3/ D4



	<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
	submitted at D4.		
7.	<p><b>List of projects for consideration in cumulative impact assessment</b></p> <p>IPs contributing to Agenda Items 2 (a) to (d) and making reference to specific projects that should be considered are requested to include a summary project table in their post-hearing written submissions. If there are no changes to the listed projects from previous written submissions, then the table should record – ‘no change’. If new projects are proposed as relevant that have not previously been raised, then the table should record – ‘change – new project’ and provide a summary reason for the inclusion.</p>	All IPs contributing to Agenda Items 2 (a) to (d)	D3
8.	<p><b>Location of connection to the transmission system at Friston</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain why the proposed connection to the transmission system at Friston was chosen and the analysis of adverse effects that took place to inform the decision through the CION<sup>2</sup> and related RAG (red-amber-green) processes.</li> <li>• Explain why, if there is a need for a strategic connection hub in the Leiston area accommodating multiple connections in addition to the connections for the proposed developments, entities in the National Grid group of companies have not taken the lead in identifying its location and seeking planning approval/ development consent in their own right?</li> <li>• In the event that the decision to connect at Friston was made solely or principally by the Applicants, explain your view of the proposal. Does leadership in site selection and initial development by the Applicants raise any relevant implications or risks for your strategy and purpose in seeking to develop a transmission connection location for multiple users at or around Leiston?</li> </ul>	NGET NG ESO and National Grid Ventures (NGV)	D3

<sup>2</sup> Connection and Infrastructure Options Note – NG ESO



Action	Party	Deadline
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Response to Agenda Items 2 (a) to (e) in the light of the discussion at the hearing</b> including, but not limited, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain the planning assumptions in relation to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) a connection at Leiston; and</li> <li>(b) the development of a strategic connection hub in the Leiston area over the next ten years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Outline potential projects requiring connection and their planning and legal status (including Nautilus, Eurolink, Five Estuaries, North Falls and SCD 1 and 2).</li> <li>• Explain the information held on the NGV website appearing to commit to connecting several projects to a connection at Friston.</li> <li>• Confirm of location of the proposed 'Leiston' connection point. Is it one and the same as the Applicants' proposed connection point at Friston? If more than one point of physical connection is envisaged or possible then please make this clear.</li> <li>• Please identify whether there is sufficient information to allow a cumulative impact assessment to be undertaken of adverse effects of the projects likely to be planned to connect at Friston. When will this assessment be carried out?</li> </ul> <p>Reference to oral contributions by NGV on Agenda Item 2 will assist.</p>	<p>NGET NG ESO</p> <p>D3</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><b>Provide a link to and transcript (Hansard) of the 5 November 2020 Adjournment Debate in the House of Commons</b></p> <p>A full record of the adjournment debate on offshore development and transmissions connections in which a response was provided on policy development by the Rt Hon Kwasi Kwarteng MP, Minister of State for Business, Energy and Clean Growth should be provided.</p>	<p>Councillor Phil North on behalf of the Rt Hon Dr Therese Coffey MP</p> <p>D3</p>



Action	Party	Deadline
<p>11.</p>	<p><b>Decision not to locate the transmission connection substation /converter stations for each project at Broom Covert</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicants are asked to explain:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>why this site (referred to as reserved for reptile mitigation) in the ownership of NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited was viewed as constrained or not available and so was not selected as the preferred location;</li> <li>what factors were taken into account in reaching the conclusion to cease consideration of this site;</li> <li>was an assessment of effects after mitigation carried out; and</li> <li>was there any attempt to locate an alternative reptile mitigation site?</li> </ol> </li> <li>NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited is asked to provide a commentary on the above questions in light of their oral response that they did not see the existing or proposed use of the Broom Covert land to have been an insuperable barrier to availability for additional substation development.</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that whilst this action point arises from ISHs2 relating to siting and design, responses should be formed having regard to the fact that they are prospectively of relevance to the ExAs consideration of the Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession requests by the Applicants.</p>	<p>Applicants and NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited</p> <p>D3</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p><b>Specification and capacity of the existing transmission system OHLs out of Sizewell</b></p> <p>NG ESO NGV and NGET are asked to explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the current specification and capacities of the existing overhead transmission lines (OHLs) at Sizewell;</li> <li>how this compares with other typical OHL transmission system alignments;</li> <li>the extent to which new generating capacity can be added to this OHL, including from the proposed Sizewell C generating</li> </ol>	<p>NG ESO NGET NGV</p> <p>D3</p>



	<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
	station, without requiring upgrade/ replacement and/or additional conductors to be added to the OHLs; and (d) the anticipated lifetime of these OHLs?		
13.	<b>East Anglia Daily Times (EADT) reportage of NGET/ Graeme Cooper's comments on community engagement</b> SEAS referred in Agenda Item 3 to EADT reportage of NGET Director Graeme Cooper's comments on community engagement on 2 December 2020. Please submit a .pdf of the article including the source and date stamp.	Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS)	
14.	<b>Weighting in relation to the CION/ RAG assessment of potential substation sites</b> At slide 16 of the Applicants' <a href="#">'Onshore Strategic Site Selection Presentation'</a> on site selection, it was stated that: 'no weighting was attached to criteria in the RAG assessment'. This implies that what amounts to a relatively minor weight factor can by the operation of a simple model outweigh or exclude what might qualitatively have been considered to be a weightier consideration. Explain how this outcome was avoided.	Applicants	D3
15.	<b>CION Process</b> SASES are asked to supply a copy of the CION <sup>3</sup> process description as held by them.  NG ESO are asked to supply relevant references supporting the operation of the CION process.	Substation Action Save East Suffolk (SASES) NG ESO	D3
16.	<b>Electricity Act duties</b> Reference was made in the hearings (by Counsel for SASES) to the duties on licensed bodies under s9 and Sch 9 of the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended). Please set out your response to these duties in terms of their applicability and (where applicable) your siting and design response to them when making siting and design decisions relating to onshore infrastructure. Specifically provide your response to Sch 1 (1) and to equivalent policies in NPS EN-5.	NGET NG ESO NGV and the Applicants	D3

<sup>3</sup> Connection and Infrastructure Options Note (CION) Process – NG ESO



	<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
17.	<b>CION/ RAG Analysis</b> The Applicants are asked to confirm who carried out those elements of the connection siting RAG assessment relevant to the siting of the NGET/ NG ESO (transmission connection) elements of the proposed development.	Applicants	D3
18.	<b>Heritage matters and advice</b> Historic England is asked to submit its letter to the Applicants written in 2018 and referred to in its oral submissions.	Historic England	D3
19.	<b>Proposed trenchless technique(s) at landfall</b> The Applicants have committed to Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) in multiple ES references (e.g. [APP-054], [APP-055], [APP-057]) and to this technique forming part of embedded mitigation. In oral submissions for the Applicants, reference was made to other possible techniques being used in circumstances assessed as being carried out by HDD. The Applicants are asked to confirm the proposed methodologies for landfall techniques including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Setting out the range of potential techniques that could be used (including but not limited to Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD));</li><li>• Providing evidence that where ES assessments refer to HDD, that any alternative techniques have been properly assessed in the ES and are within the Rochdale envelope;</li><li>• Providing evidence that:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) HDD (or another equivalent technique) is or may be limited to 2km maximum<sup>4</sup>;</li><li>(b) HDD (or another equivalent technique) can be undertaken up to 2km.</li></ul></li></ul>	Applicants	D3

<sup>4</sup> This relates to a request from the ExAs for the Applicants to provide evidence in relation to NE's comment in Appendix C3 at D1 [REP1-154] that documentation and evidence presented for other offshore wind farm developments along the east coast of the UK has identified that horizontal directional drilling (HDD) over 2km range or greater is not viable.





	<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing timelines in respect of geophysical survey work and subsequent decision-making; and</li> <li>• Recording how landfall works methods, including the selected approach, will be secured satisfactorily in the DCOs.</li> </ul>		
20.	<p><b>Use of 275kV AC export cable technology</b></p> <p>The Applicants are asked to provide evidence that the feasibility of using the 275kV AC export cable technology proposed for the projects has been assessed for other potential onshore transmission system connection points, (including Bawdsey) as part of the CION assessment. If this technology is unique then please provide a confidence assessment of its deployability.</p>	Applicants	D3
21.	<p><b>Development of approach to good design</b></p> <p>The Applicants are asked to respond to:</p> <p>(a) the in-examination work on the Design and Access Statement (DAS) for the Norfolk Boreas NSIP application;</p> <p>(b) the notion of appointing an independent design champion to oversee the project as a whole; and</p> <p>(c) whether their DAS will be a certified document and an outline of its anticipated contents;</p> <p>to be provided in outline at D3 with a detailed response at D4.</p>	Applicants	D3 and D4
22.	<p><b>National Grid substation insulation technology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGET are asked to explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the considerations that will be taken into account in determining the insulation technology to be adopted (AIS or GIS);</li> <li>(b) the implications of each technology for the provision of landscape and landform mitigation and for visual amenity to all receptors;</li> <li>(c) when a decision will be made and, if outside the examination period, why this is the case and how the uncertainty this creates can be managed; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	NGET	D3



	<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
	<p>(d) if the footprint of the proposed NG substation is reduced because GIS is adopted, will this reduce the area of land required, and if not why not?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Confirm without qualification that the proposed NG substation and all the land subject to compulsory acquisition proposals at Friston and in the Applications before the ExAs will serve only East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO.</li></ul>		
23.	<p><b>Comparative examples of NG substations</b> The Applicants are asked to provide information on the Moray East NG substation currently under construction and an explanation of how the proposal at Friston differs from it.</p>	Applicants	D3
24.	<p><b>'Suburban features' suggested as being relevant to the Friston site</b> The Applicants are asked to provide a landscape assessment clarification note identifying and where necessary providing photographic references to and locations of the suburban features of the Friston transmission system connection location on which they have relied as 'detracting' features for CION/ RAG and/ or landscape assessment purposes. (This should be sufficiently specific to support an unaccompanied site inspection of these features by the ExAs.)</p>	Applicants	D3
25.	<p><b>SASES written representations and oral comments on LVIA</b> The Applicants are asked to respond at D3 to matters where oral responses in the hearing could not be provided.</p>	Applicants	D3
26.	<p><b>Strategic siting – approach</b> The Applicants are asked to respond to a range of submissions on strategic siting made by IPs at the hearing to which a full oral reply could not be provided.</p>	Applicants	D3



<b>Action</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
27.	<b>Heritage matters</b> The Applicants are asked to respond to a range of submissions on heritage made by IPs at the hearing and in earlier written submissions to which a full oral reply could not be provided.	Applicants D3
28.	<b>Drainage and flood risk</b> SCC is asked to submit representations in relation to the proposed drainage infiltration basins in terms of capacity and health and safety.	Suffolk County Council (SCC) D3

## ISHs2, 2 and 3 December 2020 Hearing Recording: Agenda Timings<sup>5</sup>

### DAY ONE

#### Session 1 10:00am

Item 1 Procedure and introductions	00:00 <sup>6</sup> – 00:36
Item 2 Opening comments	00:36 – 00:49
Item 2(a)-(c) Applicants	00:49 – 01:13
Item 2 (a)-(c) other IPs (up to SCC)	01:13 – 01:30

#### Session 2 11:50am

Item 2 (a)-(c) other IPs (cont. from ESC)	00:00 - 00:35
Item 2(d) Applicants	00:35 – 00:40
Item 2(d) other IPs (Item paused and recommenced in Session 3)	00:40 – 01:00
Item 2(e) Ofgem	01:00 – 01:13
Item 2(e) other IPs (Item paused and recommenced in Session 3)	01:13 – 01:29

#### Session 3 2:20pm

Procedural Decision	00:03 – 00:08
Item 2(d) other IPs at (Carried forward / recommenced from Session 2)	00:08 – 00:46
Item 2(e) other IPs (Carried forward / recommenced from Session 2)	00:46 – 1:30

#### Session 4 4:05pm

Item 2(e) (nuclear industry bodies)	00:00 – 00:08
Item 3	00:08 - end of session

#### Session 5 4:55pm

Item 3 (continued)	00:00 – end of session
--------------------	------------------------

<sup>5</sup> [Agenda for ISHs2](#) (from EA1N website) (the EA2 Agenda is identical).

<sup>6</sup> Livestream/ recording times in hours and minutes from the session commencement.

**DAY TWO**Session 1 10:00am

Introductions	00:00 <sup>7</sup> – 00:08
Item 3 (continued from Day One)	00:08 – end of session

Session 2 11:45am

Item 4(a)	00:00 – end of session
-----------	------------------------

Session 3 1:40pm

Item 4 (b) [a and b]	00:00 – end of session
----------------------	------------------------

Session 4 3:35pm

Item 4(b) [a and b] continued	00:00 – 01:00
Item 4(b) [c]	01:00 – 01:48
Item 4(b) [d]	01:48 – 01:51
Item 5 (deferred to ISH early in 2021)	01:51 – 01:53
Item 6	01:53 – 01:55
Item 7	01:55 – 01:59
Item 8 (no item)	
Item 9	01:59 - end of session

Please note that the timings given are an approximate guide, taken from a review of the livestream.

---

<sup>7</sup> Livestream/ recording times in hours and minutes from the session commencement.