



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 9 – 15 April 2021

East Suffolk Council's Review of Actions Identified in the Local Impact Report

Review of Actions Identified in the Local Impact Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1. East Suffolk Council (ESC) prepared and submitted a joint Local Impact Report with Suffolk County Council (SCC) at Deadline 1 (REP1-132). At the end of each section of the Local Impact Report, a list of further work, additional mitigation or amendments required to management plans or the draft Development Consent Orders (DCOs) considered necessary were identified.
- 1.2. Prior to the grant of the three-month extension to the examinations ESC had compiled the list of actions identified within the Local Impact Report and provided commentary as to whether these matters had been addressed by the Applicants. The purpose of this was to assist the Examining Authority during their consideration of the applications after the close of the examinations.
- 1.3. The examinations have now been extended but ESC considers that this document may still be of assistance to the Examining Authority and the Applicants and therefore this has been provided. The table on page 3 details the actions identified at the end of each section of the Local Impact Report and provides comments as to whether this matter has been addressed or remains outstanding.
- 1.4. ESC continues to work closely with SCC but to avoid repetition each Council has led on specific topic areas as set out in the Local Impact Report. The table therefore focuses on the sections of the Local Impact Report which ESC are leading on.

The table below details ESC’s comments in relation to the requests for further information or commitments from the Applicants within the Local Impact Report (REP1-132).

Further work or mitigation identified in ESC and SCC Joint Local Impact Report (REP1-132)	East Suffolk Council’s Comments
Section 6 – Principle of Development - ESC Lead Authority	
<p>Exploration of infrastructure consolidation in light of BEIS Offshore Transmission Network Review.</p>	<p>The Applicants have stated that <i>‘it is not envisaged that the review will lead to opportunities or outcomes which would be relevant to the delivery of the projects’</i>, the reasons for this position have been set out in their written summary of case for Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2, REP3-085). Ofgem has also supported this view with their oral submission at ISH2 and further written submission provided at Deadline 4 (REP4-096).</p> <p>To allow the potential for the design of the projects to adapt to the changing policy and technological environments, ESC supported SCC’s suggested wording for an additional design principle which could be incorporated into the Design Principles Statement (REP5-082):</p> <p><i>The detailed design of the project and the procurement processes that support it, will both engage with, respond to, and in so far as practicable, adopt and adapt to, any new opportunities arising from emerging new technologies and changes to legislation and regulations, in order to minimise the harms to the receiving environment and maximise the benefits of the project through good design. Engagement with the opportunities that may be offered from emerging technological, regulatory, and legislative change is a fundamental principle, that will be applied at all times, during the design procurement and development process.</i></p> <p>Following further discussions with the Applicants, it has been confirmed that engagement in relation to the design of the substations and infrastructure has already started to occur and will continue to do so. ESC has been advised by the Applicants that it is not anticipated that there would be a significant delay between the consent of the projects, if the Orders are</p>

		<p>made, and their design. This is reflected within the timescales provided within the engagement set out in Appendix A of the Substation Design Principles Statement (REP8-082). Therefore although ESC would like to see this additional principle included within the Substation Design Principles Statement, it is accepted that this is not a matter upon which the Applicants and ESC are likely to agree and that if the Applicants proceed on the timeframe envisaged there is unlikely to be significant changes to available technologies, current policy or regulations. However, in the event of any project delays, the omission of the proposed principle could be potentially important, particularly given the rapidly changing policy and regulatory environment. It for this reason that the position that the proposed principle should be included is maintained.</p>
<p>Commitment to simultaneous construction of EA1N and EA2 or as a minimum commitment to greater coordination in construction – first project installing ducting for the second.</p>		<p>The Applicants have not committed to the simultaneous construction of the projects but they have provided a commitment within their Project Update Note submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-007) that should both projects be consented and then built sequentially, when the first project goes into construction, the ducting for the second project will be installed along the whole onshore cable route in parallel with the installation of the onshore cables for the first project. This commitment has also been secured through Requirement 42 of the draft DCOs (REP8-003).</p>
<p>Permitted development rights should be removed as part of the DCOs to prevent the ability of National Grid, the Applicants or future site operators to extend the substations without the need for planning permission from the local planning authority.</p>		<p>ESC and the Applicants disagree regarding the need to remove permitted development rights. ESC maintains the view and has set its position out at Deadline 8 (REP8-148) in response to the hearing action points from ISH15.</p>
<p>The design of the National Grid substation should reflect its intended purpose as a strategic connection hub. The Councils consider that as a minimum, the CIA in the ESs should be updated to consider the known</p>		<p>The Applicants have stated that the National Grid substation is only designed to accommodate the connections necessary for EA1N and EA2. National Grid has confirmed this. At Deadline 8, the Applicants provided EA1N and EA2 Extension of National Grid Substation Appraisal (REP8-074). This document provides some useful information but does not comprise a cumulative impact assessment. Further comments have been provided by ESC at</p>

<p>requirements in relation to the National Grid substation necessary to accommodate the connection offers that have been granted by NG-ESO.</p>		<p>Deadline 9 within the ESC’s response to the information that the Applicants submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>ESC considers there is sufficient time available before the end of the examinations, given the three-month extension granted, should the Examining Authority determine that further assessment is necessary, for this to be provided.</p>
<p>Section 7 – Air Quality – Emissions and Dust - ESC Lead Authority</p>		
<p>Justification for the decision to screen out re-routed traffic due to the road improvements at the A12/A1094 junction, A1094/B1069 junction and Marlesford Bridge from the air quality assessment.</p>		<p>Satisfactory justification has been provided in relation to A12/A1094 junction, and A1094/B1069 junction.</p> <p>ESC understands that there is currently no confirmation of the works anticipated at Marlesford Bridge (Work No.37). As a result, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP, REP8-021) does not provide confirmation that risk of air quality impacts due to works in Work No.37 can be ruled out. ESC is still seeking confirmation of the nature of construction works in this area and the potential effects on traffic congestion/diversionary routes to enable a decision to be taken on whether there is a risk of significant adverse impacts on air quality. Alternatively, if this information cannot be provided, the OCTMP could be updated to provide a commitment that once further information is known the Applicants will consider the effects on air quality at this stage and if further assessment is necessary, this will be provided.</p>
<p>Screening model calculation in relation to NRMM and the impact of emissions on ecological receptors. This should include a sensitivity test to investigate the potential effects of higher background levels on the study conclusions in relation to acid deposition.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided an Air Quality Clarification Note at Deadline 3 (REP3-061) which provided a quantitative assessment of Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM). The assessment demonstrated that there is a risk of significant contributions to air pollution levels at designated habitat sites with Stage IV NRMM being utilised. This occurs in an area where Horizontal Direction Drilling (HDD) drilling is essential.</p> <p>The Applicants also provided an Onshore Ecology Clarification Note at Deadline 6 (REP6-025) which addresses this matter in Section 2.6. At the present time, Natural England has not provided a response to this further information. Whilst ESC defers to Natural England on</p>

		<p>matters relating to air quality impacts on statutory designated sites, ESC remains concerned that landfall construction could result in an adverse impact on part of the Leiston-Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). ESC refers to comments that it provided at Deadline 7 (REP7-063, paragraph 3.9 and 3.13) which provides further detail on this matter. Subject to any further advice from Natural England, ESC considers the detailed design of the projects should commit to all available mitigation measures to minimise this impact and appropriate monitoring should be carried during the construction phase to ensure that the conclusion presented by the Applicants is the outcome that occurs.</p>
<p>Assessment of emissions from re-routed traffic, particular areas of concern for effects are Leiston, Saxmundham and Yoxford.</p>		<p>The main area of risk with regard to the potential air quality effects of re-routed traffic is related to works which could affect traffic using the A12. These risks have been satisfactorily addressed in further clarification, with the exception of planned risks at Marlesford Bridge (Work No.37). ESC is still seeking confirmation of the nature of construction works in this area and the potential effects on traffic congestion/diversionary routes to enable a decision to be taken on whether there is a risk of significant adverse impacts on air quality or a commitment to undertake this work when more information is known within the OCTMP as stated previously.</p>
<p>Assessment of the effects of emissions from haul road construction traffic on ecological receptors and human health.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided an Air Quality Clarification Note at Deadline 1 (REP1-021) within which it was demonstrated that the additional light commercial vehicles and heavy goods vehicles along the haul roads would result in an insignificant impact upon air quality following Natural England’s guidance. ESC advised that no further information was therefore required in relation to ecological receptors (REP2-029). Effective control of dust emissions from construction traffic using haul roads will remain an important component of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), as envisaged in Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) Section 10.1.2 and 10.1.5.</p> <p>ESC also requests that the OCoCP should contain the following commitment which can be expanded on when finalising the CoCP post-consent: <i>“In view of the magnitude of earthworks, potentially dusty nature of materials, and coastal setting of construction activities, consideration will be given to specifying dust mitigation measures which go beyond those specified in the relevant IAQM guidance used in the Environmental Statement.”</i></p>

<p>Quantitative assessment of the cumulative impacts of EA1N and EA2 with Sizewell C.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided a Clarification Note for Sizewell Projects Cumulative Impact Assessment (Traffic and Transport) (REP2-009) which ESC provided a response to in REP4-059. The Applicants’ commitment to ensuring that 70% of HGVs for the projects will comply with Euro VI standards in the event that the construction of the projects overlaps with Sizewell C construction has addressed this matter. This commitment is secured within the OCTMP (REP8-021) and OCoCP (REP8-017). ESC’s evaluation indicates that this will be sufficient to ensure that there is no significant risk of adverse effects on health due to emissions to air from HGV traffic as a result of the proposed developments in combination with the proposed Sizewell C development, even at the most vulnerable locations close to the A12. Compliance with this requirement will be monitored as the construction programmes progress and details of the monitoring are secured within the OCTMP.</p>
<p>Submission of Outline Port Travel Plan detailing commitment that this will include an air quality assessment of port related traffic.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided an updated Outline Port Construction Traffic Management and Travel Plan (OCTMP&TP) at Deadline 8 (REP8-091). Within this document (paragraph 30) the Applicants commit to undertaking a screening exercise. Should this determine that an air quality assessment is required, the scope would be agreed with the highway authority and planning authorities and any assessment carried out in accordance with Institute of Air Quality Management Guidance Land-Use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (2017), or any update to this guidance.</p>
<p>Commitment to funding monitoring and mitigation measures, if required, in the Stratford St Andrew AQMA, including consideration of a construction action group.</p>		<p>The Applicants have committed to ensuring that 70% of HGVs for the projects will comply with Euro VI standards in the event that the construction of the projects overlaps with Sizewell C construction. This commitment is secured within the OCTMP (REP8-021) and OCoCP (REP8-017). ESC’s evaluation indicates that this will be sufficient to ensure that there is no significant risk of adverse effects on health due to emissions to air from HGV traffic as a result of the proposed developments in combination with the proposed Sizewell C development, even at the most vulnerable locations close to the A12. Compliance with this requirement will be monitored as the construction programmes progress and details of the monitoring are secured within the OCTMP.</p> <p>The Applicants commitment to 70% of HGVs for the projects complying with Euro VI standards means that no further funding or mitigation measures are considered necessary.</p>

<p>Update the Outline CoCP in relation to measures to address dust nuisance and provide a commitment to and compliance monitoring of Euro VI Standards for construction vehicles and Stage V for NRMM.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OCoCP (REP8-017) has been updated and now provides a specific commitment to identify areas within the CoCP which are sensitive to dust impacts and provide comprehensive measures to address this. In addition, to reflect ESC’s concerns about the risk of dust impacts, ESC is requesting that the OCoCP should contain the following commitment which can be expanded on when finalising the CoCP post-consent: <i>“In view of the magnitude of earthworks, potentially dusty nature of materials, and coastal setting of construction activities, consideration will be given to specifying dust mitigation measures which go beyond those specified in the relevant IAQM guidance used in the Environmental Statement.”</i> • The Applicants have committed to ensuring that 70% of HGVs for the projects will comply with Euro VI standards in the event that the construction of the projects overlaps with Sizewell C construction. This commitment is secured within the OCTMP (REP8-021) and OCoCP (REP8-017). ESC’s evaluation indicates that this will be sufficient to ensure that there is no significant risk of adverse effects on health due to emissions to air from HGV traffic as a result of the proposed developments in combination with the proposed Sizewell C development, even at the most vulnerable locations close to the A12. Compliance with this requirement will be monitored as the construction programmes progress and details of the monitoring are secured within the OCTMP. • The Applicants have confirmed within Section 10.1.6 of the OCoCP (REP8-017) that where possible all NRMM will comply with Stage IV emissions standards under EU Directive 97/68/EC or later. ESC is requesting an additional measure to ensure that any impacts from higher emitting plant are avoided, as follows: <i>“If Stage IV plant is not possible, ESC requests that the reasons for this should be provided to ESC, and any such plant should be deployed in locations as far away from sensitive receptors as practicable.”</i>
<p>Section 8 – External Lighting - ESC Lead Authority</p>		
<p>No actions identified</p>		

Section 9 - Ecology and Ornithology - ESC Lead Authority		
<p>Screening model calculation in relation to NRMM and the impact of emissions on ecological receptors. This should include a sensitivity test to investigate the potential effects of higher background levels on the study conclusions in relation to acid deposition.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided an Air Quality Clarification Note at Deadline 3 (REP3-061) which provided a quantitative assessment of NRMM. The assessment demonstrated that there is a risk of significant contributions to air pollution levels at designated habitat sites with Stage IV NRMM being utilised. This occurs in an area where HDD drilling is essential.</p> <p>The Applicants also provided an Onshore Ecology Clarification Note at Deadline 6 (REP6-025) which addresses this matter in Section 2.6. At the present time, Natural England has not provided a response to this further information. Whilst ESC defers to Natural England on matters relating to air quality impacts on statutory designated sites, ESC remains concerned that landfall construction could result in an adverse impact on part of the Leiston-Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). ESC refers to comments that it provided at Deadline 7 (REP7-063, paragraph 3.9 and 3.13) which provides further detail on this matter. Subject to any further advice from Natural England, ESC considers the detailed design of the projects should commit to all available mitigation measures to minimise this impact and appropriate monitoring should be carried during the construction phase to ensure that the conclusion presented by the Applicants is the outcome that occurs.</p>
<p>Assessment of the effects of emissions from haul road construction traffic on ecological receptors.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided an Air Quality Clarification Note at Deadline 1 (REP1-021) within which it was demonstrated that the additional light commercial vehicles and heavy goods vehicles along the haul roads would result in an insignificant impact upon air quality following Natural England’s guidance. ESC advised that no further information was therefore required in relation to ecological receptors (REP2-029).</p>
<p>Assessment of cumulative effects of the construction works of EA1N and EA2 with Sizewell C on bats.</p>		<p>The Applicants did not undertake a cumulative assessment in relation to the effects of the projects and Sizewell C on bats. However, as part of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS, REP8-019) the Applicants have committed to additional construction and early operation measures to mitigate the impact of temporary hedgerow removal on foraging and commuting bats along the cable route. With the successful implementation of these additional measures ESC considers that cable route works will not result in a significant adverse impact on foraging and commuting bats and therefore there is</p>

		<p>unlikely to be any significant cumulative impact in association with Sizewell C construction works.</p>
<p>Greater commitment to and assessment of the ecological enhancements provided by the projects.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided an Ecological Enhancements Clarification Note at Deadline 1 (REP1-035) and an addendum to the clarification note at Deadline 8 (REP8-041). ESC did not consider that the information provided at Deadline 1 adequately demonstrated that the projects could deliver ecological enhancement.</p> <p>The updated information provided in the Deadline 8 Addendum demonstrated the increases in habitat units that could be achieved, particularly at the substations site. Whilst delivery of genuine ecological enhancement will be reliant on good implementation and long-term management of the created habitats, it is acknowledged that the landscape planting at the substations site has the potential to also deliver some ecological enhancement when compared with the baseline condition. However, the degree to which these habitats will be used by more disturbance sensitive species (such as bats) is unknown and will depend on the final operational noise and light levels.</p>
<p>Requirement 15 of the draft DCOs to commit to a ten-year replacement planting period for replacement woodland rather than the five-year period currently proposed and provide for the maintenance period for the woodland and substation mitigation planting to the suspended or extended if the agreed objectives set out as part of the adaptive planting maintenance are not met.</p>		<p>The OLEMS states in Section 4.2 that the Applicants will prepare and implement a Landscape Management Plan based upon an adaptive planting management scheme for trees and shrubs planted within Works No.s 19, 24, 29 and 33. A ten year period for the replacement of failed planting on a one-for-one basis has also been set out (paragraph 161, REP8-019).</p> <p>Requirement 15 of the draft DCOs secures the commitment for a ten year replacement period for failed planting within Work No.s 19, 24, 33 and 29.</p>
<p>Requirement 21 of the draft DCOs should be updated to remove the reference to the survey results from the ES and updated to identify that the EMP will be</p>		<p>Requirement 21(1) has been updated within the draft DCOs (REP8-003) to refer to the need for the EMP to take into consideration pre-commencement surveys.</p>

<p>based on up-to-date ecological survey work through the use of pre-construction surveys.</p>		
<p>OLEMS Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commitment to provide hurdles or similar links during construction to help maintain the commuting routes bats use for navigating through and across the site. • Commitment to provide measures to help maintain foraging areas bats use during construction. • Commitment to a ten-year maintenance period for the replacement woodland and provision of a management plan detailing how the woodland will be managed for the life of the infrastructure. • Commitment to adaptive planting maintenance and aftercare for the replacement woodland and substation mitigation planting. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OLEMS (REP8-019) has been updated by the Applicants to include a commitment to provide hurdles during construction works (6.7.3.2) and retain the hurdles during the post construction phase (6.7.3.3) until the replacement hedgerow planting becomes established to maintain connectivity for commuting and foraging bats. • A ten-year period for the replacement of failed woodland planting on a one-for-one basis has been set out in the OLEMS (paragraph 161). Requirement 15 of the draft DCOs secures this commitment. The OLEMS (paragraph 169) also commits to the provision and agreement of a scheme with ESC regarding the precise measures to be implemented during the longer-term maintenance period. • The OLEMS states in Section 4.2 that the Applicants will prepare and implement a Landscape Management Plan based upon an adaptive planting management scheme for trees and shrubs planted within Works No.s 19, 24, 29 and 33.
Section 10 – Coastal Change – ESC Lead Authority		
<p>Inclusion of Outline Landfall Construction Method Statement (OLCMS) in the list of certified documents</p>		<p>The draft DCOs (REP8-003) identify the OLCMS a certified document within Part 2 of Schedule 17.</p>

Update wording of Requirement 13 to reflect that the LCMS should be in accordance with the Outline LCMS.		The wording of Requirement 13(1)(a) of the draft DCOs (REP8-003) was updated to reflect the need for the Landfall Construction Method Statement to accord with the OLCMS.
Requirement 37 to be updated to include infrastructure associated with work no.6 up to the point of the mean low water mark.		The wording of Requirement 13(1) and 13(1)(a) of the draft DCOs (REP8-003) was updated to reference Work No. 6 in addition to Work No.8.
Section 12 – Built Heritage – ESC Lead Authority		
Notwithstanding the Councils concerns regarding the significance of the impact on a number of the listed buildings at Friston, the Councils recognise that this is a difference of professional opinion which there is not likely to be further agreement on. The Councils however request that further work be undertaken by the Applicants in relation to the historic character of the landscape at Friston specifically considering the historic parish/Hundred boundary.		The Applicants provided an Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Clarification Note (REP1-021) which sought to address the contribution the historic parish/Hundred boundary makes to the setting of Little Moor Farm and the Church in response to the concerns raised within the Local Impact Report (REP1-132). ESC responded in REP2-029 and confirmed that although professional disagreement remains regarding the extent to which the Hundred boundary contributes to the significance of Little Moor Farm, the document provided sufficient additional information and no further information was therefore considered necessary.
The Councils also request that the Applicants provide appropriate compensation in acknowledgement of the residual impacts caused by the projects on the heritage assets.		The Applicants have committed to providing a sum of £200,000 per project within the signed s111 Agreements submitted at Deadline 8 (REP8-079) which will be used to contribute towards compensatory measures relating to the preservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings in Friston and its vicinity.
Section 14 – Design and Masterplan - ESC Lead Authority		
Update Outline Onshore Substation Design Principles Statement:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicants have provided a Substation Design Principles Statement (REP8-082) which includes the National Grid substation and infrastructure. Requirement 12(3) and (4) of

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To include a Design Principles Statement for National Grid infrastructure • Commitment to make every effort to reduce the size and scale of the substations during post consent design refinement process. • Inclusion of details regarding the design process and engagement measures. 		<p>the draft DCOs (REP8-003) prevents works on Work No. 38 or 41 commencing until details of the layout, scale and external appearance of the National Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds have been submitted to and approved by ESC. 12(5) states that the details provided in relation to 12(3) and (4) must accord with the Design Principles Statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Design Principles Statement was updated at Deadline 8 to include a new principle: “Reduction of visual impact of onshore substations, National Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds”. <p>This new principle is considered to address ESC’s request for a commitment in relation to making every effort to reduce the size and scale of the substations during the post consent design refinement work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix A of the Design Principles Statement relates to the engagement strategy the Applicants will adopt in relation to the design of the substations and cable sealing end compounds.
<p>Amendment to the wording of Requirement 12(6) in the draft DCOs to include the need for the design details of the National Grid infrastructure to comply with the Outline Onshore Substation Design Principles Statement relevant to this infrastructure.</p>		<p>Requirement 12(3) and (4) of the draft DCOs (REP8-003) prevents works on Work No. 38 or 41 commencing until details of the layout, scale and external appearance of the National Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds have been submitted to and approved by ESC. 12(5) states that the details provided in relation to 12(3) and (4) must accord with the Substations Design Principles Statement. These revisions to the draft DCOs address the comments made within the Local Impact Report.</p>
<p>Provision of an assessment of the use of a GIS National Grid substation.</p>		<p>The Applicants have not provided this assessment, which should also include the consideration of alternatives to the use of sulphur hexafluoride (SF6). The Environmental Statements are based on the use of an Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) National Grid substation. They have however shown what a Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) National Grid substation would look like visually within the submitted photomontages. The submission of these</p>

		<p>visualisations is useful and welcomed but without full assessment of the GIS option for the National Grid substation, it is not possible for ESC to fully compare the impacts of the two technologies and assess the degree to which one technology is beneficial over the other. The lack of a full assessment of the GIS option also limits the Examining Authority’s ability to recommend to the Secretary of State that one technology should be favoured over another and prevents the ability for only the GIS option to be consented by the DCOs. The matter therefore remains outstanding.</p>
<p>Exploration of the opportunity to consolidate and share infrastructure in association with the BEIS OTNR.</p>		<p>The Applicants have stated that <i>‘it is not envisaged that the review will lead to opportunities or outcomes which would be relevant to the delivery of the projects’</i>, the reasons for this position have been set out in their written summary of case for Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2, REP3-085). Ofgem has also supported this view with their oral submission at ISH2 and further written submission provided at Deadline 4 (REP4-096).</p> <p>To allow the potential for the design of the projects to adapt to the changing policy and technological environments, ESC supported SCC’s suggested wording for an additional design principle which could be incorporated into the Design Principles Statement (REP5-082)</p> <p><i>The detailed design of the project and the procurement processes that support it, will both engage with, respond to, and in so far as practicable, adopt and adapt to, any new opportunities arising from emerging new technologies and changes to legislation and regulations, in order to minimise the harms to the receiving environment and maximise the benefits of the project through good design. Engagement with the opportunities that may be offered from emerging technological, regulatory, and legislative change is a fundamental principle, that will be applied at all times, during the design procurement and development process.</i></p> <p>Following further discussions with the Applicants, it has been confirmed that engagement in relation to the design of the substations and infrastructure has already started to occur and will continue. ESC has been advised by the Applicants that it is not anticipated that there would be a significant delay between the consent of the projects and their design, this is</p>

		<p>reflected within the timescales provided within the engagement set out in Appendix A of the Substation Design Principles Statement (REP8-082). Therefore although ESC would like to see this additional principle included within the Substation Design Principles Statement, it is accepted that this is not a matter upon which the Applicants and ESC are likely to agree and that if the Applicants proceed on the timeframe envisaged there is unlikely to be significant changes to available technologies, current policy or regulations. However, in the event of any project delays, the omission of the proposed principle could be potentially important, particularly given the rapidly changing policy and regulatory environment. It for this reason that the position that the proposed principle should be included is maintained.</p>
<p>Acknowledgement of the known future projects with agreement from NG-ESO to connect to the grid at Friston, in the CIAs. These connections should be taken into account within the siting and design considerations of the proposed substations.</p>		<p>The Applicants have stated that the National Grid substation is only designed to accommodate the connections necessary for EA1N and EA2. National Grid has confirmed this. At Deadline 8, the Applicants provided EA1N and EA2 Extension of National Grid Substation Appraisal (REP8-074). This document provides some useful information but does not comprise a cumulative impact assessment. Further comments have been provided by ESC at Deadline 9 within the Council’s response to the information the Applicants information submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>ESC considers there is sufficient time available before the end of the examinations, given the three-month extension granted, should the Examining Authority determine that further assessment is necessary for this to be provided.</p>
<p>Section 15 – Landscape and Visual Effects – ESC Lead Authority</p>		
<p>Provision of a clarification note on the historic landscape character and features taking into account the interplay between the different disciplines.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided an Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Clarification Note at Deadline 1 (REP1-021) in order to address this point which ESC provided a joint response to with SCC at Deadline 2 (REP2-029). Although the clarification note was welcomed, the extent and significance of the harm to the site was not considered to be fully addressed as the assessment of landscape impacts only went as far as the landscape character type level as opposed to the site level. ESC and SCC suggested a way to address this, but this was not pursued by the Applicants. Further details are contained within the ESC’s Deadline 2 response (REP2-029).</p>

<p>Submission of updated visualisations illustrating a more realistic depiction of 15 years of planting growth.</p>		<p>Updated visualisations were provided at Deadline 3 in addition to a clarification note (REP3-062, REP3-063, REP3-064, REP3-065, REP3-066, REP3-067 & REP3-068). ESC provided a response at Deadline 4 (REP4-059). In summary, ESC considered the depiction of 15 years planting was generally accepted as a more realistic portrayal of the mitigation planting. There remained some issues with the depiction of hedgerow standard trees, but these are minor and make little to no difference to the overall representation of the Applicants' claimed screening effects. The removal of advanced planting from the photomontages and the clarification note in this regard was noted and welcomed.</p>
<p>Commitment to the use of adaptive maintenance and aftercare in relation to the substations' mitigation planting and replacement woodland planting.</p>		<p>The OLEMS states in Section 4.2 (REP8-019) that the Applicants will prepare and implement a Landscape Management Plan based upon an adaptive planting management scheme for trees and shrubs planted within Works No.s 19, 24, 29 and 33.</p>
<p>Commitment to the provision of strategic offsite planting and a fund to provide private planting to offset and compensate for the significant residual impacts identified in the ESs.</p>		<p>The Applicants have committed to providing a sum of £355,000 within the signed s111 Agreements submitted at Deadline 8 (REP8-079) which will be used to contribute towards providing further landscape, environmental access and amenity improvements and enhancements to Friston and its vicinity. This compensatory fund can be utilised to provide strategic offsite planting as ESC requested within the Local Impact Report.</p>
<p>Commitment to provide details regarding the long-term management of the site which would be secured through the DCOs. This would involve the commitment to produce a long-term management plan and the commitment to establish of a community liaison group.</p>		<p>The OLEMS (paragraph 169, REP8-019) commits to the provision and agreement of a scheme with ESC regarding the precise measures to be implemented during the longer-term maintenance period.</p> <p>The creation of a community liaison group for the operational phase of the development was discussed with the Applicants and an initial draft Terms of Reference for the group was jointly prepared by ESC and SCC and provided to the Applicants. A copy of this document has been provided in Appendix 1. This matter remains outstanding.</p>
<p>Section 16 – Seascape and Visual Effects</p>		
<p>Update SLVIAs to consider impact of reduction of the maximum tip height</p>		<p>The Applicants have not updated the Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (SLVIAs) following their design refinement and commitment to a turbine height no greater</p>

		than 282m and therefore the extent of the reduction in impact as a result of this revision has not been identified.
Engage with Natural England regarding further modifications necessary		Although engagement has taken place there remains professional disagreement between the parties.
The Councils will continue to engage with the Applicant for EA2 to seek appropriate compensation for the significant impacts identified as a result of the EA2 project.		The Applicants have committed to providing a sum of £465,000 within the EA2 signed s111 Agreements submitted at Deadline 8 (REP8-079) which will be used for measures to support access, environmental and ecological enhancements to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). ESC has requested that this fund be provided to compensate for the significant impacts identified on the AONB as a result of the offshore turbines of EA2.
Section 17 – Land Use - ESC Lead Authority		
Explore opportunities for great consolidation of infrastructure		<p>The Applicants have stated that <i>'it is not envisaged that the review will lead to opportunities or outcomes which would be relevant to the delivery of the projects'</i>, the reasons for this position have been set out in their written summary of case for Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2, REP3-085). Ofgem has also supported this view with their oral submission at ISH2 and further written submission provided at Deadline 4 (REP4-096).</p> <p>To allow the potential for the design of the projects to adapt to the changing policy and technological environments, ESC supported SCC's suggested wording for an additional design principle which could be incorporated into the Design Principles Statement (REP5-082)</p> <p><i>The detailed design of the project and the procurement processes that support it, will both engage with, respond to, and in so far as practicable, adopt and adapt to, any new opportunities arising from emerging new technologies and changes to legislation and regulations, in order to minimise the harms to the receiving environment and maximise the benefits of the project through good design. Engagement with the opportunities that may be offered from emerging technological, regulatory, and legislative change is a fundamental principle, that will be applied at all times, during the design procurement and development process.</i></p>

		<p>Following further discussions with the Applicants, it has been confirmed that engagement in relation to the design of the substations and infrastructure has already started to occur and will continue to do so. ESC has been advised by the Applicants that it is not anticipated that there would be a significant delay between the consent of the projects, if the Orders are made, and their design. This is reflected within the timescales provided within the engagement set out in Appendix A of the Substation Design Principles Statement (REP8-082). Therefore although ESC would like to see this additional principle included within the Substation Design Principles Statement, it is accepted that this is not a matter upon which the Applicants and ESC are likely to agree and that if the Applicants proceed on the timeframe envisaged there is unlikely to be significant changes to available technologies, current policy or regulations. However, in the event of any project delays, the omission of the proposed principle could be potentially important, particularly given the rapidly changing policy and regulatory environment. It for this reason that the position that the proposed principle should be included is maintained.</p>
<p>Reduce the size and scale of the substations including a commitment to the use of a National Grid GIS</p>		<p>The Applicants committed to a reduction in the footprint of the project substations from 190m by 190m to 170m by 190m. The Applicants also committed to reductions in the maximum heights of the EA1N and EA2 substation infrastructure. The reductions in the project substations have been reflected in updated maximum dimensions set out in Requirement 12 of the draft DCOs (REP8-003).</p> <p>ESC welcomes these reductions and requested that similar work was also undertaken pre-consent in relation to the National Grid substation. Although this was not undertaken, The Design Principles Statement (REP8-082) was updated at Deadline 8 to include a new principle:</p> <p>“Reduction of visual impact of onshore substations, National Grid substation and cable sealing end compounds”.</p> <p>This new principle is considered to address ESC’s request for a commitment in relation to making every effort to reduce the size and scale of the substations during the post consent design refinement work.</p>

		<p>The Applicants have not provided a commitment to utilise GIS technology for the National Grid substation, at present both options are available within the draft DCOs. ESC considers that a full assessment of the GIS National Grid substation impacts remains necessary. This would also include the consideration of alternatives to the use of SF6. This would therefore provide the ability for ESC, Interested Parties and the Examining Authority to compare the impacts of the AIS and GIS technological options and recommend that one technology proceeds over another.</p>
<p>Provide greater coordination within the delivery of the projects</p>		<p>The Applicants have not committed to the simultaneous construction of the projects but they have provided a commitment within their Project Update Note submitted at Deadline 2 (REP2-007) that should both projects be consented and then built sequentially, when the first project goes into construction, the ducting for the second project will be installed along the whole onshore cable route in parallel with the installation of the onshore cables for the first project. This commitment has also been secured through Requirement 42 of the draft DCOs (REP8-003).</p>
<p>Section 19 – Noise and Vibration - ESC Lead Authority</p>		
<p><i>Construction Noise and Vibration</i></p>		
<p>Commitment that the “Construction Phase Noise Management Plan” described in the outline CoCP will be informed by an updated assessment of construction noise based on finalised construction proposals as and when they are available.</p>		<p>The Applicants have committed within Section 9.1 of the OCoCP (REP8-017) for their contractors to seek and obtain consent(s) from ESC for the onshore works, as defined under Section 60 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974. The contractors will use Best Practicable Means to minimise construction noise as far as reasonable and practical to do so. The OCoCP (paragraph 100) also contains a commitment for the s61 applications to assess the noise impact from the construction noise using the ABC assessment method. The further assessment that ESC requested within the Local Impact Report will be part of the s61 application process.</p>
<p>Commitment to providing specific mitigation measures for the areas where the onshore Order Limits and hence construction works are in close proximity</p>		<p>Sections 9.1.2 to 9.1.5 of the OCoCP (REP8-017) include specific commitments in relation to mitigation measures to be adopted at the locations identified within the joint Local Impact Report (REP1-132). Section 9.1.1 also includes some additional clarification regarding the core working hours and the activities which can occur within the shoulder hours either side of</p>

<p>to residential properties. Locations include properties south of Sizewell Gap Road, Gypsy and Fitches Lane and immediately around the substations site in Friston.</p>		<p>these hours. The Council welcomes the efforts to address specific concerns relating to particularly sensitive receptors and construction locations and are satisfied that the final CoCP will provide an opportunity to ensure the final proposals are suitably robust.</p>
<p>Commitment that proposals for construction noise monitoring will be included in the CoCP and would be agreed with the local planning authority.</p>		<p>Section 9.2. of the OCoCP (REP8-017) presents the initial proposals for noise and/or vibration monitoring during construction. The Applicants have stated (paragraph 121) that a decision as to whether construction noise monitoring is required will be deferred to ESC. The s61 applications will include a detailed description of the monitoring and monitoring locations for particular works (paragraph 122).</p>
<p>Commitment that prior to undertaking any essential night-time working, the timing and duration of such works will be approved by ESC through an agreed process to be included in the CoCP, including consideration of the noise and vibration impact where appropriate.</p>		<p>Requirements 23 and 24 of the draft DCOs supported by the contents of the OCoCP (REP8-017) clearly set out the permitted hours of working. Requirements 23 and 24 identify that the Applicants will be required to seek the ESC’s prior approval in relation to the duration and timing of any essential works which need to be undertaken outside the hours specified. In addition to this, Requirements 23 and 24 have also been updated to reflect the need for the Applicants to also obtain ESC’s approval as to whether “<i>essential activities</i>” outside categories (a) to (d) are essential. ESC welcomes this revision.</p>
<p><i>Operational Noise</i></p>		
<p>Details of the layout and sizes of the difference noise sources modelled on both substations sites.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided some additional information on the size and locations of the modelled noise sources at Deadline 4 in in a Clarification Note on Noise Modelling (REP4-043). ESC understands that this information will be refined and developed during the detailed design process, and the operational noise models re-run accordingly.</p>
<p>A break-down of the relative level of noise generated by the different sources at each receptor location.</p>		<p>The Applicants provided a Clarification Note on Noise Modelling (REP4-043) which provided a short commentary on the dominant noise sources at each receptor but no break-down of predicted noise levels as requested. This information will presumably be provided within the pre-commencement Operational Noise Design Report for formal discharge by ESC.</p>
<p>Clarification on whether the reported A-weighted or Octave band source data reported for operational noise sources have been used in the noise model.</p>		<p>The Applicants Deadline 6 (REP6-026) submissions stated that: “The Applicants confirm that the linear (unweighted) spectral data presented within Table 5 of the Noise Modelling Clarification Note</p>

		<p>(REP4-043) were input into the noise model software before applying an A-weighting prior to modelling being undertaken.”</p> <p>The data in Table 5 are reported in octave bands as pre A-weighted octave band levels (dB(A)) as opposed to linear unweighted octave band levels (dB). It is not clear if this is a typographical error. It is expected that this issue will need to be addressed in the pre-commencement Operational Noise Design Report for formal discharge by ESC.</p>
Results of noise modelling of National Grid substation		<p>The Applicants provided a Clarification Note on Noise Modelling (REP4-043) which included revised operational noise models, but the cumulative models did not include any contribution from the equipment on the National Grid substation. ESC provided comments in response in their Deadline 5 submission (REP5-048). Notwithstanding this disagreement between the Council and Applicants, Requirement 27 of the draft DCOs has been updated to include a combined rating level for the site incorporating the National Grid infrastructure.</p>
1/3 Octave measurement data from existing substations to substantiate the position that operational noise is not expected to contain tonal elements.		<p>ESC maintains that the magnetostriction effects inherently associated with the proposed equipment mean that the operational noise limits should be subject to a +6 dB feature correction for tonality unless there is 1/3 Octave tonality analysis to confirm otherwise. The Applicants have not provided the 1/3 Octave measurement data. This remains an area of disagreement between the Applicants and ESC. However, Requirement 12(2) of the draft DCOs and the commitments provided within the Substation Design Principles Statement (REP8-082) will ensure that the detailed substation design requires formal approval from ESC and therefore this matter will be addressed.</p>
Confirmation of whether the effect of air humidity on corona discharge noise from existing power transmission lines was considered during the noise survey data analysis process.		<p>The Applicants confirmed within Section 3.2 of the Noise Modelling Clarification Note provided at Deadline 4 (REP4-043) that humidity was not considered within the Environmental Statements. It therefore remains unclear to what extent noise from existing power lines affected the noise levels measured by the Applicants and whether the noise survey data collected by the Applicants is representative of normal conditions. This is one of the reasons that ESC does not agree with the representative noise levels presented by the Applicants.</p>
Reconsideration of the identified background level for the site.		<p>The Applicants and ESC maintain a professional disagreement in relation to the background sound levels identified for the site. Notwithstanding this, the Applicants and ESC have reached</p>

		agreement in relation to Requirement 27 which controls the combined rating level for the site.
Assessment of the effect of operational noises on the amenity and character of the areas that these sounds would be introduced into.		The Applicants provided a Clarification Note on Noise Modelling at Deadline 4 (REP4-043) which included within Section 5 an assessment of non-residential amenity. ESC welcomed the assessment of the impact of noise on public rights of way around the substation site (REP5-048).
Assessment of the impact of operational noise on ecological receptors.		<p>The Applicants provided an Onshore Ecology Clarification Note (REP4-005) which considered the impact of the operational noise on ecological receptors. ESC provided a response at Deadline 5 (REP5-048). The Council raised a number of concerns including the conclusion that Brown long-eared bats are absent from the substation area, the lack of demonstration that there is an ultra-sonic component to the noise generated by the substations in the operational phase and the exclusion of the National Grid substation from the assessment.</p> <p>ESC considers that given the uncertainties with the assessment provided, there is potential that the operational noise from the substations could have an adverse impact on bat species given that there are habitats suitable for them around the substations site and that further suitable habitats are to be created as part of the development. This matter remains outstanding.</p>
Further consideration should be given to noise mitigation options which could be utilised.		Although details of noise mitigation measures have not been provided to ESC, it is acknowledged that the Applicants have given consideration to such measures by virtue of the reduction of the operational noise rating level. Further information in relation to this matter would be welcomed, this will however be a matter of ongoing engagement during the post consent design refinement phase.
Amendment to the wording of Requirements 26 and 27 to set the noise limit at or below background levels and to include an additional monitoring receptor to the north of the site.		<p>Since the drafting of the Local Impact Report, Requirement 26 has been removed and Requirement 27 of the draft DCOs has been amended to provide an operational noise rating limit for the site which includes the project substations and National Grid substations and infrastructure. The cumulative operational rating level has also been reduced from 34dB LAeq to:</p> <p>(a) 32dB LAeq (15 min) at any time at a free field location immediately adjacent to the</p>

		<p>following noise sensitive locations—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 1 Woodside Cottages, Grove Road (641837, 261172); (ii) Woodside Barn Cottages, Church Road (641237, 260645); <p>(b) 31dB LAeq (15 min) at any time at a free field location immediately adjacent to the following noise sensitive location—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Little Moor Farm, Knodishall (641228, 261676) <p>The Applicants have confirmed to ESC that the rating level provided within Requirement 27 is the lowest possible at present based on their engagement with the supply chain. A commitment within Requirement 12(2) of the draft DCOs to provide details of the plant and any noise mitigation proposed for Work No.30 including any updated modelling for approval by ESC. Requirement 12(5) also states that any details pursuant to 12(2) must accord with the Substations Design Principles Statement (REP8-082) which has been updated to include a new principle. This new principle commits the Applicants to seek to minimise the operational noise rating level below the limits set in Requirement 27 and avoid perceptible tones and other acoustic features at any residential receptors in so far these measures do no add unreasonable costs or delays, to the projects or otherwise result in adverse impact on other aspects of the environment.</p> <p>Requirement 27 has therefore been updated to include the additional noise monitoring location and although the rating levels proposed are not currently set at background levels, the Council will work with the Applicants, if the projects are consented, to seek to minimise the operational noise rating level further.</p>
<p>Section 20 – Socio-Economics – ESC Lead Authority for Tourism</p>		
<p>Provision of a tourism fund</p>		<p>The Applicants have committed to providing £150,000 to be paid to Suffolk Community Foundation. The sum will be used to market the locality during the construction period to address the concerns raised by ESC regarding the negative impact on visitor perceptions which would result from the projects, in addition to cumulatively with the construction of Sizewell C.</p>



Appendix 1 - Draft Community Liaison Group Terms of Reference

1. Objective

A Community Liaison Group (CLG) shall be convened to provide a forum for communication between the site operators and interested local parties, including local residents, and the relevant local authorities, regarding the management and operation of the National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) and ScottishPower Renewables (SPR) (or their successors in title) substations and any changes modifications or additions to the infrastructure and operation of that site.

2. Remit

The CLG will provide a forum for two-way dialogue between the operators and representatives of the local community regarding the operation of the site and the management and maintenance of the associated landscape works, drainage and access arrangements. Meetings will provide CLG members with an opportunity to raise matters with the operators. In turn, the community representatives will be able to feedback the operators' responses to the wider community in addition to any direct communication that the operators may send out.

The CLG will seek to provide the following:

- A mechanism for local communities' views to be provided to and understood by the operators of in a structured way;
- A mechanism for the operators to address comments or concerns relevant to the operations raised by the CLG;
- A mechanism for community representatives to feedback a summary of the CLG's discussions and conclusions to the local community.
- The CLG will have no decision-making function, its purpose is to facilitate the flow of information between the operators and the local community and to allow questions and issues to be addressed. CLG members are encouraged to discuss any matters raised at the meetings with other members of the local community and bring their views to the meeting.

3. Membership and recruitment

Membership of the CLG for community representatives is voluntary and places will be allocated as follows:

Organisation Representatives

- East Suffolk Councillor
- County Councillor
- East Suffolk Council Officer

- Suffolk County Council Officer
- Parish Councillors (Friston)
- Parish Councillors Knodishall
- Representatives of the local community
- Operators

Numbers to be determined. Other representatives to be decided by East Suffolk Council (ESC) and the parish councils in accordance with section 7 and section 8.

4. Other attendees

The Operators may, with the approval of the Chair, provide additional attendees with technical expertise relevant to the CLG agenda. The operators will provide secretariat support to the CLG, including arranging the scheduling of meetings.

5. Arrangements for the Chairing of the CLG

The role of Chair will be filled by xxxxx.

6. The Role of the Chair

The role of the Chair shall be to:

- chair the meeting impartially and without favour to any member or invited representative;
- ensure that the meeting runs to the allotted 2-hour limit per meeting in accordance with Section 11;
- to ensure that each member of the committee is provided an equal opportunity to address the meeting;
- to ensure that all members of the CLG and members of the operators or other bodies attending the CLG are afforded normal standards of respectful behaviour in accordance with Section 9
- Agreeing an agenda with all Members for circulation in accordance with Section 11.

7. Recruitment of community representatives

The operators will invite the Parish Councils to nominate xxxx representatives each based on application by people who are residing within the Parishes of both Knodishall and Friston. Persons who wish to be represented on the Liaison Committee should contact Friston and Knodishall Parish Council respectively.

8. Waiting list

Should membership of the CLG become oversubscribed, the contact details of interested parties will be held on a waiting list held by ESC until space becomes available.

9. Repeated non-attendance and standards of conduct

In the event of a member failing to attend two consecutive meetings, their place will be offered to a person on the waiting list or advertised as appropriate. Exceptional circumstances will be given consideration at the Chair's discretion. All participants in the CLG are entitled to normal standards of respectful behaviour from all other CLG members. Any serious or repeated breaches of basic standards of behaviour will result in the termination of CLG membership.

10. Time keeping

In order to facilitate the involvement of members of the community with family and other commitments, the duration of each meeting shall be limited to a maximum of two hours.

11. Organisation

Meetings will be held quarterly during the operation of the substations. The frequency of meetings can be amended by agreement with ESC and the operators. Meetings will cease one month after the completion of operations or within such a period agreed by ESC and the operators.

An agenda will be circulated before each meeting and Group members should submit any additional items for discussion to the secretariat at least two working days before the meeting.

Minutes shall be kept as a record of the meeting by the operators. Meeting minutes will be circulated to CLG members within five working days and will be checked for accuracy by members at the next meeting before being approved.

The venue for the meetings would either be at Friston Village Hall, Knodishall Village Hall or East Suffolk House. The operators will be responsible for the costs of administering the meetings.

The meetings shall be closed to members only and those parties listed in section 4. The meetings shall not be open to the media but all documentation in relation to CLG meetings, including meeting minutes, will be made available online (location to be agreed).

12. Terms of Reference

Any changes to these terms of reference must be agreed in writing by ESC and the site operators.