

From: [Claire Curtis](#)
To: [Hornsea Project Three](#)
Subject: Responses to the ExA questions
Date: 15 January 2019 09:54:51
Attachments: [South Norfolk Council response to ExA questions Jan 2019 _amends by JKL 14.1.19.docx](#)

Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached South Norfolk Council's responses to the ExA further questions.

Kind regards
Claire

Claire Curtis (Mrs)
Senior Planning Officer
t 01508 533788 e ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk



This email and any attachments are intended for the addressee only and may be confidential. If they come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please advise the sender by replying to this email immediately and then delete the original from your computer. Unless this email relates to Broadland District Council or South Norfolk Council business it will be regarded by the council as personal and will not be authorised by or sent on behalf of the councils. The sender will have sole responsibility for any legal actions or disputes that may arise. We have taken steps to ensure that this email and any attachments are free from known viruses but in keeping with good computing practice, you should ensure they are virus free. Emails sent from and received by members and employees of Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council may be monitored.

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

South Norfolk Council's response to the Examination Authority's further written questions and requests for information January 2019

Q2.7.3	Applicant, SNC and NNDC	<p>The design parameters of the onshore HVDC converter/HVAC substation set out in table 3.63 of the ES [APP-058] include a proposed maximum height of 25m. The maximum height of the onshore booster station set out in table 3.62 of the ES [APP-058] would be 12.5m.</p> <p>From the information provided by the Applicant, what confidence can the ExA have that the proposed woodland planting would reach a height where it would achieve the levels of mitigation required in relation to both landscape/visual impacts and the impacts upon the setting of heritage assets?</p> <p>SNC continues to maintain that the maximum height of 25m and its impacts cannot be mitigated against by planting/landscaping. Therefore, to answer the question SNC does not consider that the ExA can have confidence that the proposed woodland planting- would reach a <u>sufficient</u> height of to achieve the levels of mitigation that would be required both in terms of <u>either</u> the landscape/visual impacts or the impacts on the setting of Keswick Hall.</p> <p>Based on the minimum size of trees to be planted (set out in Appendix A of the first iteration of the Outline Landscape Management Plan [APP -181] for the HVDC converter/HVAC substation), the Applicant is requested to provide evidence of the expected rate of growth that would be achieved throughout the anticipated lifetime of the development for the woodland planting areas.</p>
Q2.13.10	Applicant, NNDC, BDC, SNC and NCC	<p>Requirement 22 (local skills and employment) states that a skills and employment plan shall be submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval.</p> <p>Given that the skills and employment plan would potentially relate to a wide area comprising the East Anglia and/or Humber regions, is it appropriate for it to be considered for approval by the relevant planning authority?</p> <p>Would it be more appropriate for it to be considered by NCC in consultation with the relevant planning authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships?</p> <p>Who would be the appropriate determining authority in the Humber region?</p>

		<p>As the determining authority in the Humber region may not be an Interested Party, has there been any consultation to establish whether the authority would wish to have a determining role?</p> <p>Are there any other means for determining an application for approval under this requirement?</p> <p>SNC is happy to defer to NCC in respect of this matter.</p>
--	--	---

Q2.15.5	NNDC, BDC, SNC, NCC, NE	<p>The Applicant has submitted a revised Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP1-142].</p> <p>Are there any further revisions or additions that you consider should be made to this document?</p> <p>If there are, please provide justification for this and suggest any new/amended wording that may be required.</p> <p>Jane under the last ExA questions we raise core working hours stating: South Norfolk Council concurs with best practice which is to undertake any potentially noisy construction and demolition activities during the following times: 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday 08:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays No work on Sundays or Bank Holidays</p> <p>and the use of 'certain circumstances' which felt covered whatever they wanted to do. We discussed this on Friday if you recall where they said they would need to be on site at 7am and did not want to agree anything other than that. Do I need to say this again or leave it alone?</p> <p>I think you could say the following – I have shown in italics</p> <p><u>South Norfolk Council is of the view that any potentially noisy activities should only take place during the following times: 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday</u></p>
---------	-------------------------	---

Formatted: Font: Not Italic, Font color: Red

		<p><u>08:00 – 13:00 Saturdays</u></p> <p><u>No work on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</u></p> <p><u>These limits should only be exceeded in an emergency or in exceptional circumstances and when exceptional circumstances apply the extension to working hours should be agreed in advance with the relevant planning authority's Environmental Health Officer.</u></p> <p><u>South Norfolk Council are aware that these working hours are more limited than those requested by the Applicant, but this project will take some years to complete and it is felt reasonable to adopt our proposed shorter working hours because they accord with best practice as set out in [here can Adrian say what doc it is] and also because residential neighbours will need to live with the construction for a number of years.</u></p>
--	--	--

<p>Q2.15.6</p>	<p>Applicant, NNDC, BDC and SNC</p>	<p>The Outline CoCP [REP1-142] includes several matters where agreement is required between the Applicant and other parties. For example, paragraph 4.1.1.6 requires that certain activities may take place on a continuous working basis subject to obtaining agreement with the relevant local authority Environmental Health Officer.</p> <p>Should details be provided within the Outline CoCP of what the procedure and timescales should be for the matters where such agreements are required?</p> <p><u>SNC agrees that details should be provided within the Outline CoCP I think we should say yes_ to give us certainty particular in terms of time scales.</u></p> <p><u>I agree Claire. If Adrian is in can he suggest a procedure/timescale that would be likely to suit all 3 districts?</u></p>
----------------	-------------------------------------	---