

Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm

Appendix 36 to Deadline 5 Submission:
Statement of Common Ground – Kent County
Council

Relevant Examination Deadline: 5

Submitted by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Date: April 2019

Revision B

Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
14/11/18	01	Draft sent to KCC	GoBe	GoBe	VWPL
12/12/19	02	Revised document returned by KCC	KCC	KCC	VWPL
15/01/19	03	Document revised as per discussions with KCC	GoBe	GoBe	VWPL
15/01/19	A	Original document submitted to the ExA	GoBe	GoBe	VWPL
15/03/19	04	Revised document returned by KCC	KCC	KCC	VWPL
12/04/19	05	Document revised provided to KCC	GoBe	GoBe	VWPL
24/04/10	06	Revised document returned by KCC	KCC	KCC	VWPL
25/04/19	07	Revised document by all parties during telecon	GoBe	GoBe	VWPL
29/04/19	08	Revised document returned by KCC	KCC	KCC	VWPL
29/04/19	B	Revised document submitted to the ExA	GoBe	GoBe	VWPL

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Overview	5
1.2	Approach to SoCG	5
1.3	The Development.....	6
2	Kent County Council’s Remit.....	8
3	Consultation	9
3.1	Application elements under Kent County Council’s remit.....	9
3.2	Consultation Summary.....	10
3.3	Post-application Consultation.....	11
4	Agreements Log	13
4.1	Site Selection and Alternatives	13
4.2	Tourism and Recreation	16
4.3	Onshore Biodiversity	20
4.4	Onshore Historic Environment.....	23
4.5	Traffic and Access.....	26
4.6	Ground Conditions	29
4.7	Air Quality, Noise and Vibration.....	33
4.8	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan	36
5	Matters under further discussion	38

Table 1: Consultation undertaken with the KCC pre-application11
Table 2: Consultation undertaken with KCC post-application.....12
Table 3: Status of discussions relating to Site Selection and Alternatives.14
Table 4: Status of discussions relating to Tourism and Recreation.....17
Table 5: Status of discussions relating to Onshore Biodiversity on land managed by KCC....21
Table 6: Status of discussions relating to Onshore Historic Environment.....24
Table 7: Status of discussions relating to Traffic and Access.....27
Table 8: Status of discussions relating to Ground Conditions.30
Table 9: Status of discussions relating to Air Quality, Noise and Vibration.34
Table 10: Status of discussions relating to the OLEMP.....37

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) relates to the proposed development of the Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm (Thanet Extension). It has been prepared with respect to the application made by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd (VWPL) (the Applicant) for a development consent order (DCO) to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) under the Planning Act 2008 (the Application).
- 2 This SoCG with Kent County Council (KCC) is a means of clearly stating any areas of agreement and disagreement between the two parties in relation to the Application. The SoCG has been structured to reflect the topics of interest to KCC in the Application, and in line with the request made by the Planning Inspectorate within the 'Rule 6' letter published on the 6th November 2018.
- 3 It is the intention that this document will help facilitate post application discussions between both parties and also give the Examining Authority (Ex. A) an early sight of the level of common ground between both parties from the outset of the examination process.

1.2 Approach to SoCG

- 4 This SoCG has been developed during the pre-examination phase of the Thanet Extension. In accordance with discussions between the Applicant and KCC, the SoCG is focused on those issues raised by KCC within its response to Scoping, Section 42 consultation and as raised through the Evidence Plan process that has underpinned the pre-application consultation between the parties.
- 5 The structure of the SoCG is as follows:
 - Section 1: Introduction;
 - Section 2: Kent County Council's remit;
 - Section 3: Consultation;
 - Section 4: Agreements Log; and
 - Section5: Matters under discussion.

1.3 The Development

- 6 The Application is for development consent for VWPL to construct and operate the Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm (Thanet Extension) under the Planning Act 2008.
- 7 Thanet Extension will comprise of wind turbine generators (WTGs) and all the infrastructure required to transmit the power generated to the national grid. A maximum of 34 WTGs will be installed with a power output of 340 MW. The project will install up to four offshore export cables and may require the installation of one Offshore Substation (OSS) and up to one Meteorological Mast. The key offshore components of Thanet Extension are likely to include:
 - Up to 34 Offshore WTGs;
 - One OSS (if required);
 - One Meteorological Mast (if required);
 - Foundations;
 - Subsea inter-array cables linking individual WTGs;
 - Subsea export cables from the OWF to shore; and
 - Scour protection around foundations and on inter-array and export cables (if required).
- 8 The array area will have a maximum size of 70 km² and surrounds the existing Thanet Offshore Wind Farm (TOWF). It is located approximately 8 km Northeast of the Isle of Thanet, situated in the County of Kent. Each WTG will have a maximum blade tip height of 250 m above Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) a maximum diameter of 220 m and a minimum 22 m clearance between the Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) and the lowest point of the rotor.
- 9 Electricity generated will be carried via a maximum of four high voltage subsea cables to the landfall site, situated at Pegwell Bay. Offshore cables will be connected to the onshore cables and ultimately the national grid network at Richborough Energy Park. The onshore cable corridor is 2.6 km in length at its fullest extent.

- 10 More details on the proposed development are described in the Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2, Chapter 1: Project Description (Offshore) (PINS Ref APP-042/ Application Ref 6.2.1) and Volume 3, Chapter 1: Project Description (Onshore) (PINS Ref APP-057/ Application Ref 6.3.1) of the ES.

2 Kent County Council's Remit

- 11 Kent County Council is a prescribed consultee for the proposed development under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.
- 12 Kent County Council is the only relevant County planning authority in which the project is located. In relation to Thanet Extension the Council's responsibilities include engagement in the preapplication process, production of a local impact report (LIR) during the Examination phase and being consulted on the discharge of onshore requirements for some onshore elements of the works, including traffic and access, historic environment and Mitigation Planning.

3 Consultation

3.1 Application elements under Kent County Council's remit

- 13 Work Nos. 3A - 16, detailed in Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the draft DCO describe the elements of Thanet Extension which may affect the interests of KCC.
- 14 Kent County Council is the County Council that governs most of the County of Kent. The authority oversees district councils within Kent, including Thanet and Dover.
- 15 The technical components of the DCO application of relevance to KCC (and therefore considered within this SoCG) comprise:
- Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives (PINS Ref APP-040/ Application Ref 6.1.4);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 1: Project Description (Onshore) (PINS Ref APP-057/ Application Ref 6.3.1);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 4: Tourism and Recreation (PINS Ref APP-060/ Application Ref 6.3.4);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 5: Onshore Biodiversity (PINS Ref APP-061/ Application Ref 6.3.5);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 7: Historic Environment (PINS Ref APP-063/ Application Ref 6.3.7); and
 - Volume 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Access (PINS Ref APP-064/ Application Ref 6.3.8);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 6: Ground Conditions, Flood Risk and Land Use (PINS Ref APP-062/ Application Ref: 6.3.6);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air Quality (PINS Ref APP-065/ Application Ref 6.3.9);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration (PINS Ref APP-066/ Application Ref 6.3.10);
 - Volume 3, Chapter 2: Onshore Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (PINS Ref APP-058/ Application Ref: 6.3.2);
 - Application document 3.1: draft Development Consent Order; and

- Offshore Volume 2, Chapters 4 to 7 with regards offshore biodiversity (PINS Refs APP-045- 048/ Application Refs 6.2.4-6.2.7); and
- Report to inform Appropriate Assessment (REP2-018 and REP2-019 which supersede Application Ref 5.2)

3.2 Consultation Summary

16 This section briefly summarises the consultation that VWPL has undertaken with KCC. Engagement during the pre-application phase, both statutory and non-statutory, is summarised in Table 1 below, this includes any meetings and correspondence held as part of the Evidence Plan process and Section 42 consultation.

Table 1: Consultation undertaken with the KCC pre-application

Date & Type:	Detail:
Scoping	Scoping Response provided by KCC
SoCC	KCC engaged in consultation on the SoCC
March 2017 Evidence Plan	Landscape and Visual Panel Technical Panel Meeting
June 2017 Evidence Plan	Landscape and Visual Panel Technical Panel Meeting
June 2017 Evidence Plan	Onshore Historic Environment Technical Panel Meeting
July 2017 Evidence Plan	Offshore General Technical Panel Meeting
October 2017 Evidence Plan	Onshore General Technical Panel Meeting
November 2017 Evidence Plan	Onshore Historic Environment Technical Panel Meeting (received correspondence)
December 2017 Evidence Plan	Ground Conditions, Land use and Hydrology Technical Panel Meeting
January 2018, S42 Consultation	Comments relating to the Preliminary Environmental Information Report
February 2018 Evidence Plan	Terrestrial Ecology Technical Panel Meeting
April 2018 Evidence Plan	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Meeting

3.3 Post-application Consultation

- 17 VWPL has engaged with KCC since the Thanet Extension development was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate on 23rd July 2018. A summary of the post-application consultation with KCC is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2: Consultation undertaken with KCC post-application

Date/ Type:	Detail:
28 th August 2018	Update on application documentation and outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
January 2019	Email correspondence to discuss the development of the SoCG
February 2019	Email correspondence to discuss the development of the SoCG
March 2019	Email correspondence to discuss the development of the SoCG
April 2019	Teleconference to discuss the development of the SoCG

4 Agreements Log

- 18 The following section of this SoCG identifies the level of agreement between the parties for each relevant component of the application material (as identified in Section 3.1). In order to easily identify whether a matter is “agreed”, “under discussion” or indeed “not agreed” a colour coding system of green, yellow and orange is used in the “final position” column to represent the respective status of discussions.

4.1 Site Selection and Alternatives

- 19 The Project has analysed and evaluated a range of options regarding the location of infrastructure. The reasons for the selection of the proposed site are duly considered within Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives (PINS Ref APP-040/ Application Ref 6.1.4). A full project description of the onshore works is provided within Volume 3, Chapter1: Project Description (Onshore) (PINS Ref APP-057/ Application Ref 6.3.1). Table 3 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 3: Status of discussions relating to Site Selection and Alternatives.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position (It is agreed that...)	KCC Position	Final Position
Adequacy of information provision	Application Ref 6.1.4 provides a full and detailed account of the considerations and decision-making process undertaken to develop the proposed Order Limits.	Application Ref 6.1.4 provides a detailed account of the considerations and decision-making process undertaken to develop the proposed Order Limits.	Agreed
Project optionality	The applicant requires flexibility in the methodology for making landfall as the contents of the landfill, although assumed to be municipal, are unknown.	KCC understands that the applicant requires flexibility in the methodology for making landfall as the contents of the landfill are unknown, although assumed to be PREDOMINANTLY municipal waste (with a chance of other waste also being present).	Agreed
Option 2	As outlined in REP1-014 and REP2-036 the Applicant has reduced the design envelope to remove Option 2 and associated seawall extension and over ground berm as a response to consultation response, including from KCC.	This has been noted by Kent County Council	Agreed
Consultation	Following S42 and the consultation concerns raised the design envelope has been changed appropriately and has had due regard to S42 responses.	Following S42 and the consultation concerns raised the design envelope has been changed appropriately and has had due regard to S42 responses.	Agreed
Consultation	Following S42 and the consultation concerns raised the chapter has been expanded adequately with additional information with	Following S42 and the consultation concerns raised the chapter has been expanded adequately with additional information with	Agreed

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position (It is agreed that...)	KCC Position	Final Position
	regards to the development of the proposed Order Limits and has had due regard to S42 responses.	regards to the development of the proposed Order Limits and has had due regard to S42 responses.	

4.2 Tourism and Recreation

- 20 The Project has the potential to impact upon tourism and recreation. These interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the Thanet Extension ES (PINS Ref APP-060/ Application Ref 6.3.4). Table 4 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 4: Status of discussions relating to Tourism and Recreation.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
Adequacy of characterisation data	The receiving environment has been adequately characterised and appropriately described.	The receiving environment has been adequately characterised and appropriately described.	Agree
Adequacy of assessment methodology	The methods of assessment for tourism and recreation are appropriate.	The methods of assessment for tourism and recreation are appropriate.	Agree
Outcomes of assessment/conclusions	The outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	The outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	Agree
Outcomes of assessment/conclusions	The outcomes of the assessment of Pegwell Bay Country Park are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	Consultation has taken place between KCC and the applicant to ensure that any impact of the development is appropriately managed and mitigated. Ongoing consultation throughout the SI and construction period is requested.	Agreed
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The proposed management and mitigation as identified within the ES chapter are appropriate. The revised OLEMP (PINS Ref REP1-069) was submitted by the Applicant. The revised document appropriately addresses the consultation requests made by KCC.	The proposed management and mitigation as identified within the ES chapter are currently appropriate but discussions are ongoing between KCC and Vattenfall. KCC has a number of queries relating to the tourism and recreation elements which have been passed on to the applicant.	Under discussion.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
<p>English Coast Path</p>	<p>The outcomes of the assessment on the English Coast Path is appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts. Sufficient information and appropriate mitigation for these impacts has been provided within the ES chapter and in the Access Management Strategy (PINS Ref APP-136/ Application Ref 8.4).</p> <p>The Access Management Strategy provides management and mitigation for all works including the site investigation works (noting that this is a separate planning application).</p>	<p>KCC agrees that the assessment on the ECP is appropriate and well described.</p> <p>KCC would like to note that any changes, diversions of closures to the ECP need to be agreed by Natural England.</p> <p>KCC does not agree that the appropriate mitigation is provided within the ES Chapter 6.3.4, as this would need to include planned and mapped diversions in the park and details on signage and warning to the public. Table 4.14 labels the ECP as a medium sensitivity but is not 'insignificant' to followers of the national trail if it is closed.</p> <p>KCC are currently in discussions with the applicant on the planned SI works, which would see the ECP and Sustrans route closed for a long period of time, with no suggest diversion route at present.</p> <p>KCC has a number of queries from a Country Park perspective on the Access Management</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
		Strategy. These comments have been passed onto the applicant.	
Public Rights of Way	The Access Management Strategy (PINS Ref APP-136/ Application Ref 8.4) provides sufficient information and appropriately mitigates the impacts of the works on PRow throughout the lifetime of the project.	The Access Management Strategy (Application Ref 8.4) provides sufficient information and appropriately mitigates the impacts of the works on PRow throughout the lifetime of the project.	Agreed

4.3 Onshore Biodiversity

- 21 The Project has the potential to impact upon biodiversity. These interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 5 of the Thanet Extension ES (PINS Ref APP-061/ Application Ref 6.3.5), and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (PINS Ref REP2-108 and REP2-019 which supersede Application Ref 5.2). Table 5 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.
- 22 KCC has agreed with the Applicant that the scope of this SOCG will be limited to the onshore biodiversity elements within the land which KCC managed (i.e. Pegwell Bay Country Park).

Table 5: Status of discussions relating to Onshore Biodiversity on land managed by KCC.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
Adequacy of characterisation data	The receiving environment has been adequately characterised and appropriately described for the purposes of EIA.	KCC is not clear on what is meant by the adequacy of characterisation data. But KCC are satisfied with the range of surveys carried out within our land holdings.	Agreed
Adequacy of range of surveys.	The ecological surveys undertaken were appropriate to characterise the receiving environment for the purposes of EIA.	We are satisfied with the range of surveys carried out within our land holdings.	Agreed
Adequacy of assessment methodology	The methods of assessment for onshore biodiversity are appropriate.	The County Council is generally content with the assessment methodology within Pegwell Bay Country Park.	Agreed
Outcomes of assessment/conclusions	The outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	Discussions have occurred between KCC and the applicant which have addressed concerns.	Agreed
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The proposed management and mitigation as identified within the ES chapter(s) and RIAA (REP2-018 and REP2-019 which supersede Application Ref 5.2) are appropriate.	For REP2-018/REP2-019, Natural England are the statutory consultees on appropriate assessments so we will defer to them on this document.	Noted
Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	The OLEMP (PINS ref REP1-069 which supersedes Application Ref 8.7) provides sufficient detail of in-principle management measures.	KCC agrees that the OLEMP currently provides sufficient detail in-principle of management measures. KCC will continue to work with the applicant to ensure the	Agreed

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
		management measures are adequate for the Country Park.	
Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	The OLEMP provides sufficient information on outline details of proposed biodiversity enhancements and proposed monitoring.	KCC agrees that the OLEMP currently provides sufficient detail in-principle of management measures. KCC will continue to work with the applicant to ensure the management measures are adequate for the Country Park.	Agreed

4.4 Onshore Historic Environment

- 23 The Project has the potential to impact upon the onshore historic environment. These interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 7 of the Thanet Extension ES (PINS Ref APP-063/ Application Ref 6.3.7). Table 6 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 6: Status of discussions relating to Onshore Historic Environment.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
Adequacy of characterisation data	The receiving environment has been adequately characterised and appropriately described for the purposes of EIA.	The receiving environment has been adequately characterised and appropriately described. There is some residual uncertainty on the presence of anti-invasion defences which will need to be established and where appropriate impacts avoided during the scheme.	Agreed
Adequacy of assessment methodology	The methods of assessment for onshore historic environment are appropriate	The methods of assessment for onshore historic environment are appropriate	Agreed
Outcomes of assessment/conclusions	The outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	The outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	Agreed
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The proposed management and mitigation as identified within the ES chapter and onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (PINS Ref REP4-008) are appropriate.	KCC agrees with the general approach to mitigation set out in paragraph 7.16.1 however we disagree with the mitigation proposed for the effects of the excavation of the cable route on potential (presently unidentified) buried anti-invasion heritage assets. KCC remains of the view that should non-designated assets of the defences be encountered in the cable route then it may be appropriate depending on their	Under discussion

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
		form and preservation that consideration is given to avoidance of physical impact on these through design of the cable route rather than a programme of recording.	
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The onshore Written Scheme of Investigation is adequately secured in the DCO.	KCC agrees that the mitigation measures can be secured through an agreed WSI in the DCO. The WSI is presently under discussion and has not yet taken into account the need to protect as appropriate additional anti-invasion defences if found. RQ 22 relates to investigation and recording and does not reference where there may be a need to preserve heritage assets.	Written Scheme is under discussion

4.5 Traffic and Access

- 24 The Project has the potential to impact upon traffic and access routes (including Public Rights of Way). These interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the Thanet Extension ES (PINS Ref APP-064/ Application Ref 6.3.8). Table 7 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 7: Status of discussions relating to Traffic and Access.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
Adequacy of characterisation data	The receiving environment has been adequately characterised and appropriately described.	KCC Highways and Transportation have agreed that no further capacity assessment of the highway network is required beyond that already included in the ES.	Agreed
Adequacy of assessment methodology	The methods of assessment for Traffic and Access are appropriate	The proposed site access points have been agreed in principle but will require the submission of full details to be agreed with the Highway Authority. The principles of traffic management and mitigation during construction are acceptable but details will need to be agreed through submission of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	Agreed
Outcomes of assessment/conclusions	The outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	KCC Highways and Transportation have agreed that no further capacity assessment of the highway network is required beyond that already included in the ES.	Agreed

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The proposed management and mitigation as identified within the ES chapter are appropriate	The proposed site access points have been agreed in principle but will require the submission of full details to be agreed with the Highway Authority. The principles of traffic management and mitigation during construction are acceptable but details will need to be agreed through submission of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	Agreed
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	Construction Traffic Management Plan will be agreed with KCC post-consent (if granted).	Construction Traffic Management Plan will be agreed with Vattenfall post-consent (if granted).	Agreed
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The principles for traffic management are adequately outlined in the Code of Construction Practice (PINS Ref APP-133/ Application Ref 8.1) and are adequately secured within the DCO.	The principles for traffic management are adequately outlined in the Code of Construction Practice (Application Ref 8.1) and are adequately secured within the DCO.	Agreed

4.6 Ground Conditions

- 25 The Project has the potential to impact upon Ground Conditions, Flood Risk and Land Use. These interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 6 of the Thanet Extension ES (PINS Ref APP-062/ Application Ref 6.3.6). Table 8 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 8: Status of discussions relating to Ground Conditions.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
Adequacy of characterisation data	The receiving environment has been adequately characterised and appropriately described.	KCC agrees that the receiving environment has been adequately characterised and described in document 6.3.6. The applicant has also engaged with KCC on the details of Pegwell Bay Country Park and the landfill site.	Agreed
Adequacy of assessment methodology	The methods of assessment for ground conditions are appropriate	KCC agrees that the methods of assessment for ground conditions are appropriate in document 6.3.6.	Agreed
Outcomes of assessment/conclusions	The outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	KCC agrees the outcomes of the assessment are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	Agreed
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The proposed management and mitigation as identified within the ES chapter are appropriate.	The applicant and KCC have discussed the management and mitigation defined in the ES are appropriate. KCC and the applicant are still working on the SI works and mitigation of Pegwell Bay Country Park. KCC's primary objective with regard to the Closed Landfill element is to ensure, as far as is reasonably practical, that there is no construction or in-situ testing which is likely	Agreed

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position
		<p>to open up pathways for landfill gas, leachate (ground water contamination) or surface water sources to escape the site. One method of achieving this, where practical, is to employ horizontal drilling. The other main area of interest remains with the detail around the cable landfall, and to be satisfied that the arrangements will not permit “sea-water” to enter the substructure of the site, or to allow any leachates contained in the body of the landfill to escape to sea.</p> <p>An updated Environmental Monitoring Report has been shared by KCC with the applicant.</p>	
<p>Securing the mitigation within the DCO</p>	<p>The mitigation proposed (Construction Environmental Management Plan, Contaminated Land and Groundwater Management Plan and Code of Construction Practice) is adequately secured in the DCO.</p>	<p>KCC are satisfied that the mitigation proposed is adequately secured with the DCO.</p> <p>KCC and the applicant are still working on the SI works and mitigation of Pegwell Bay Country Park.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position	KCC Position	Final Position

4.7 Air Quality, Noise and Vibration

- 26 The Project has the potential to impact upon the air quality, and noise and vibration. These interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 9 and 10 of the Thanet Extension ES respectively (PINS Ref APP-065 and APP-066/ Application Refs 6.3.9 and 6.3.10 respectively). Table 9 identifies the status of discussions relating to this topic area between the parties.

Table 9: Status of discussions relating to Air Quality, Noise and Vibration.

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position (it is agreed that)	KCC Position	Final Position
Policy and plans	The relevant plans, policy and legislation have been referred to when considering potential effects on air quality, noise and vibration.	KCC has no relevant comments on the Air Quality, Noise and Vibration issues due to not responding to previous consultations on these topics.	Noted
Adequacy of characterisation data	The receiving environments have been adequately characterised and appropriately described.	KCC has no relevant comments on the Air Quality, Noise and Vibration issues due to not responding to previous consultations on these topics.	Noted
Adequacy of assessment methodology	The assessment methodologies for consideration of effects is considered appropriate.	KCC has no relevant comments on the Air Quality, Noise and Vibration issues due to not responding to previous consultations on these topics.	Noted
Outcomes of assessment/conclusions	The outcomes of the assessments are appropriate and accurately describe the likely impacts.	KCC has no relevant comments on the Air Quality, Noise and Vibration issues due to not responding to previous consultations on these topics.	Noted
Adequacy of management and/or mitigation measures where appropriate	The proposed management and mitigation as identified within the ES chapters are appropriate and the relevant Construction Environmental Management Plan principles have been provided within the Code of	KCC has no relevant comments on the Air Quality, Noise and Vibration issues due to not responding to previous consultations on these topics.	Noted

	Construction Practice (PINS Ref APP-133/ Application Ref 8.1).		
--	---	--	--

4.8 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan

- 27 The Project has the potential to impact upon the onshore landscape. These interactions are duly considered within Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the Thanet Extension ES (Application Refs 6.3.2). Table 10 identifies the status of discussions relating to the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (PINS Ref REP1-069) between the parties.

Table 10: Status of discussions relating to the OLEMP

Discussion Point	Thanet Extension Position (It is agreed that)	KCC Position	Final Position
Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	The OLEMP (PINS Ref REP1-069 which supersedes Application Ref 8.7) provides sufficient detail of in-principle management measures.	KCC agrees that the OLEMP currently provides sufficient detail in-principle of management measures. KCC will continue to work with the applicant to ensure the management measures are adequate for the Country Park.	Agreed
Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan	The OLEMP provides sufficient information on outline details of proposed landscape enhancements.	KCC agrees that the OLEMP currently provides sufficient detail in-principle of management measures. KCC will continue to work with the applicant to ensure the management measures are adequate for the Country Park.	Agreed

5 Matters under further discussion

- 28 This section identifies those matters raised by KCC during the pre-application consultation that have yet to be resolved and are subject to ongoing discussion as of the last consultation meeting held with KCC.
- 29 The matters remaining under discussion with KCC include:
- The applicant has provided a sufficient detailed Written Scheme of Investigation for onshore works.
 - KCC has a number of queries relating to the Access Management Strategy and OLEMP which have been provided to the Applicant.