

From: [Faulkner, Stephen](#)
To: [Hornsea Project Three](#)
Cc: [Geoff Lyon, external user](#); [Matthew Rooke](#); [Claire Curtis](#); [Sarah Drljaca](#); [Tracey, Matt](#); [Morris, Phil](#); [Johnson, Nick](#)
Subject: Response to Question 2.1.11 - Second Tier Decision Making
Date: 09 January 2019 15:10:25
Attachments: [2_1_11_Second_Tier.docx](#)

FAO Examining Authority

Please find attached Norfolk County Council's response to question 2.1.11 relating to the potential for a second tier of in principle decision making.

Should you have any queries please call or email me.

Stephen Faulkner MRTPI
Principal Planner
Community and Environmental Services
Telephone: 01603 222752



Campaign Logo



--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Norfolk County Council (NCC) Response to Examining Authority – Question 2.1.11

January 2019

Identification Number 20010350

Norfolk County Council's comments in red below:

In NNDC's submission for Deadline 3 [REP3-103] a requirement is suggested to the effect that the method of electrical transmission within each phase of the authorised development shall be via HVDC unless there are clear and compelling technological reasons as to why HVDC transmission cannot be provided.

Please can NNDC clarify whether it is proposing a decision-making role under this requirement or the provision of information about a choice that has been made by the developer.

This a matter for NNDC.

If NNDC is seeking a decision-making role, given the linear nature of the project how would NNDC intend to cooperate with other affected local planning authorities?

This is matter for NNDC.

Given the linear nature of the project it appears that the appropriate determining body may be NCC. What is NCC's view on taking on such a role?

The County Council accept that there could potentially be some merit in the County Council having a role in the decision-making in the event that Secretary of State delegating decisions on the transmission options to a local level.

However, given the national significance of this application, which has impacts well beyond the boundaries of any single District Council or County Council area, it is felt that any decision relating to the transmission network ultimately needs to be assessed through the DCO process and the final decision ought to rest with the Secretary of State.

If the Secretary of State finds that the degree of design flexibility sought by the Applicant is justified, would it then be reasonable to impose a second tier of in-principle decision making in relation to a major element of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the terms of a requirement?

The aim of the NSIP process is to facilitate the timely delivery of nationally significant infrastructure projects, therefore delegating any "in principle" decisions to the Local Planning Authorities at whatever level could seriously undermine the delivery timetables and result in local issues being given disproportionately more weight than national matters.

The DCO application and the supporting EIA has been taken forward based on either technology (HVDC or HVAC) being applied. The County Council's Local Impact Report (LIR) sets its preference for a HVDC option as this would overcome the need for a HVAC Booster station in North Norfolk. However, it is recognised that this transmission option would have a greater impact on Swardeston as it would require a HVDC Converter Station, which would be larger in size than a HVAC equivalent sub-station.

It is felt that these local matters/issues need to be assessed against the wider strategic implications, such as delivering a sustainable and secure energy supply.

Therefore, the County Council would not wish to take any determining role on the component parts of this development, which by its very nature is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and all parts should be determined by the Secretary of State.

It appears to the ExA that the underlying concern being expressed by NNDC may be that there should be a clear and transparent explanation and justification for the ultimate choice of transmission system. If the Secretary of State were to conclude that this is a legitimate concern, does the Applicant have any alternative suggestions as to how to address this matter?

This is a matter for the applicant.