

From: [Vincent \(ESO\), Marc](#)
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Cc: [Greenhalgh \(ESO\), James](#)
Subject: NGESO Response to ISH2 and CAH1 Actions.
Date: 15 December 2020 17:07:47
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[NGESO Responses to ExA for EA1 & EA2 final version .pdf](#)

FAO RYND SMITH.

Please see the attached responses from NGESO to the published actions/questions from ISH2 and CAH1 in relation to the EA1 and EA2 planning application.

If you have any further questions NGESO is more than happy to help.

Kind regards
Marc Vincent

NGESO Responses to Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAHs1)

- 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 Compulsory Acquisition Hearings 1 (CAHs1) held virtually on Tuesday 1 December 2020.

NGESO Provides the following response(s) to **CAHs1**

Action 2	(i)	Please respond in writing to points raised under item 3 in relation to linked NSIP's and the justification for the applicants to be applying for the overhead line NSIP's.	NGESO refers this question to NGET
	(ii)	Please address possible circumstances in which connection proposals (over and above the currently proposed developments) may become additional and/or dominant users of the transmission system connection;	As operator of the national electricity transmission system, NGESO is the party that parties apply to when they want to connect to/use the system. Offers for connection/use have to be made by NGESO as required by its transmission licence. NGESO doesn't control in any way who and when a party can apply. In relation to connection applications for offshore wind farms the process for identifying the connection location is described in response 2d (iii) below. On the NGESO website there is a list of applicants in a signed connection position.

End of responses for CAHs1

NGESO Responses to Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs1)

NGESO Provides the following response(s) to **ISHs2**:

<p>Action 3</p>	<p>Under Agenda Item 2(d) the examining authority asked for:</p> <p>(i) the clearest position of public knowledge (not commercially confidential information) around projects proposed to connect in the Leiston Area.</p> <p>(ii) There was also discussion around whether a connection in the Leiston Area means Friston.</p> <p>(iii) Also, why Friston was chosen (including why a brownfield site was not selected).</p>	<p>(i) This question is addressed under question 9(ii) below.</p> <p>(ii) This is addressed in response to question 8(ii) below</p> <p>(iii) The Connection and Infrastructure Options Note (CION) process (a licence requirement delivered through STCP 18-1 Issue 009 Connection and Modification Applications) is used to identify a connection location following an application for a connection agreement. This industry approved procedure documents the role and responsibilities of the parties responsible for offshore grid connections, who comprise the Developer (in this case the Applicants), the Transmission Owner (TO) (in this case NGET) and NGESO (in its role as System Operator (SO)).</p> <p>The CION is a collaborative process resulting in a preferred point of connection to the transmission system to inform the connection offer and scope of the transmission works. The CION records the output of the work between the Developer, TO and NGESO to identify the overall most economic, efficient and coordinated connection option. Planning and environmental considerations are inherent in the process as the Developer must accept the connection offer and following the CION process the option identified must be feasible in terms of consenting and deliverability. All parties to the CION are mindful that the necessary consents must be subsequently obtained through the planning process to deliver the identified option.</p>
------------------------	---	---

NGESO Responses to Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs1)

		<p>Parties to the CION process are also subject to amenity duties under Schedule 9 of the Electricity Act 1989.</p> <p>In this case, the Applicants led on site selection within the Leiston area, accepted the connection offer, and are taking on responsibility to obtain consents. As such, NGESO consider that the Applicants are best placed to justify to the ExA the connection proposal from a planning perspective (both alone and in the context of the Applicants' projects as a whole), including the consideration of brownfield options within the Leiston area. NGET has a technical input in the CION process including identification of connection options, which led ultimately to the output of the CION process identifying the Leiston area for the connection</p>
	<p>3 (a) The choice to make a new onshore connection, as opposed to utilising/expanding existing connections at Bawdsey [and Sizewell or Bramford] or creating new connections elsewhere.</p>	<p>The response to Action 3, agenda item 2d part (iii) should address this question.</p>
	<p>3(b) The specific need for, and justification of, locations of landfall at Thorpeness and substations/transmission systems connections, including the proposed National Grid substation and connections to the grid at land north of Friston. To include details of the strategic decision-making process for the proposed locations and their generation</p>	<p>NGESO refers this question to NGET and the Promoter</p>

NGESO Responses to Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs1)

	capacities – why were the sites chosen, and in what order?	
	3(c) Justification for the proposed cable alignments – was this as a result of the chosen landfall and substation locations? What rationale was used in the decision-making process of routes or ways to link up the chosen locations?	NGESO refers this question to the Promoter
	4(b) Design and impact of the proposed substations/transmission systems connections, including the proposed National Grid substation and connections to the grid, specifically in terms of: a. Overarching siting and design issues b. Landscape and Visual Impact, including upon PRowS c. Historic Environment d. Achieving good design	NGESO refers this question to the Promoter
Action 8	(i) Explain why the proposed connection to transmission system at Friston was chosen and analysis of adverse effects that took place to inform the decision from the CION and related RAG (Red, Amber, Green) processes. (ii) Explain why, if there is a need for a strategic connection hub in the Leiston area accommodating multiple connections in addition to	(i) The connection point is the output of the CION process as explained in Action 3, agenda item 2d part (iii). Further explanation of the RAG status will be covered in the promoter Action 14 (ii) It is not proposed to develop a strategic connection hub at Leiston. Under the current regulatory framework system reinforcements are generally identified by NGESO and transmission owners in an incremental manner as offers are made, taking

NGESO Responses to Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs1)

	<p>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 a planning approval/development consent in their own right.</p> <p>(iii)</p> <p>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 site selection and initial development by the applicants raise any relevant implication or risks for your strategy and purpose in seeking to develop a transmission connection location for multiple uses at or around Leiston.</p>	<p>opportunity for efficiencies where practicable, rather than on an anticipatory basis of future need.</p> <p>(iii)</p> <p>NGESO does not have a strategic plan for connections around Friston. Each application to NGESO is assessed on its own merits and where applicable NGESO will aim to coordinate network development across various parties. See response to question 2(d)(iii) for explanation of the CION process which is intended to identify the connection location following an application for a connection agreement.</p>
<p>Action 9</p>	<p>(i)</p> <p>Explain the planning assumptions in relation to (a) a connection at Leiston; and (b) the development of a strategic connection hub in the Leiston area in the next 10 years.</p> <p>(ii)</p> <p>Outline potential projects requiring connection and their planning and legal status (including Nautilus, Eurolink, Five Estuaries, North falls and SCD1 and 2),</p> <p>(iii)</p> <p>Explain the information held on the NGV website appearing to commit</p>	<p>(i)</p> <p>(a) see response to 2(d)(iii) above.</p> <p>(b) There is no planned strategic connection hub at Leiston and so no planning assumptions have been made in respect of this.</p> <p>(ii)</p> <p>For details of the planning and legal status of the projects generally it may be better to approach the Applicants. From NGESO's viewpoint our understanding of the current status is as follows and the following is an extract from NGESO's website as of 09/12/2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nautilus – the connection contract is signed and the connection point is at Leiston 400kV substation. The project status is currently 'Scoping'

NGESO Responses to Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs1)

	<p>to connecting several project to a connection at Friston.</p> <p>(iv) Confirmation 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 then please make this clear.</p> <p>(v) Please identify where there is sufficient information to allow a cumulative impact assessment to be undertaken of adverse effects of projects likely to be planned to be connected at Friston. When will this assessment be carried out?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eurolink – the connection contract is signed and the connection point is at Leiston 400kV substation. The project status is currently ‘Scoping’ • Five Estuaries – the connection contract is signed and the connection point is Galloper North 132/33kV. The project status is ‘currently awaiting consents’ • North Falls – the connection contract is signed and the connection point is Greater Gabbard Extension Offshore Platform. The project status is ‘scoping’. <p>NGESO assumes the reference is to NOA reinforcement SCD1 & SCD2. In the 2019/20 Network options assessment SCD1 was given a proceed signal and SCD2 was put on hold. This decision is referencing spend between April 2020 and April 2021. The needs case is investigated annually. The ExA may wish to note the role and status of the NOA, for example as explained section 1.4 “<i>The NOA cannot [...] provide recommendations for customer connection. The NOA only recommends the most economic reinforcement to resolve wider network issues.</i>” download (nationalgrideso.com)</p> <p>(iii) NGESO cannot comment on information appearing on other party’s websites and this question should be addressed to NGV. NGV, although part of the National Grid group, is a separate legal entity and in terms of connection applications is treated in the same manner as any other applicant for connection and use of system. NGESO’s transmission licence requires it to act in a non-discrimatory manner</p> <p>(iv)</p>
--	--	--

NGESO Responses to Issue Specific Hearings 2 (ISHs1)

		<p>NGESO refers this question to NGET</p> <p>(v)</p> <p>NGESO refers to NGET and SPR.</p>
Action 12	Specification and capacity of the Existing Transmission system OHL's out of Sizewell.	NGESO refers this question to NGET
Action 15	NG ESO are asked to supply relevant references supporting the operation of the CION process.	<p>See response to Question 2(d)(iii) above.</p> <p>NGESO understands that a redacted version of the CION has been provided to the planning inspectorate</p> <p>The ExA is also referred to the following CION guidance note of 2018:</p> <p>Connection and Infrastructure Options Note (CION) Process Guidance Note - Issue 004 (nationalgrideso.com)</p>
Action 16	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 in relation to Schedule 1(1) and equivalent policies in NPS EN-5.	See response to question 2(d)(iii) above.

End of responses for ISHs1