

ExQ1: Tuesday 19 November 2019
Broadland District Council Responses
ID Ref. 20022881

ExQ1	Question	Response
Q1.2.2	<p>Listed buildings in Cawston Further to RRs [RR-018], [RR-019], [RR-105], Additional Submission [AS-038] and the Applicant's response to RRs [AS-024, Table 19, No.3] are you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. satisfied that construction stage effects on listed buildings in Cawston have been adequately assessed; 2. content with the findings in terms of the significance of any identified impacts upon those assets and their settings and the level of any harm and loss of heritage significance? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, the details of the proposed highway mitigation scheme through the village of Cawston remain to be finalised and have not been agreed with Norfolk County Council's highways department, Cawston Parish Council or Broadland District Council. Therefore the construction stage effects on listed buildings in Cawston have not been assessed. 2. As above, this matter remains to be resolved.
Q1.2.3	<p>Listed buildings in Cawston The Applicant has quoted part of your SoCG for Norfolk Vanguard in its response to some RRs which raise matters to do with construction traffic and listed buildings in Cawston.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the "changes" referred to in the SoCG extract include traffic impacts on historic buildings in Cawston? 2. If so, have the "work in progress" amendments arrived at a satisfactory solution? 3. If not, what are the outstanding issues for the listed buildings and conservation area in Cawston? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As above, this matter remains to be resolved. 2. No, the applicants have not submitted any further details since the close of the Norfolk Vanguard hearing. The following details are awaited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topographical survey, • New ATC speed survey, • Update of the design through Cawston based on safety audit and Norfolk County Council comments, • Vehicle traffic through Cawston based on topographical survey, • Update of the safety audit, • Update of the Cawston report, and • Street lighting proposals 3. The outstanding details are anticipated to have an effect on the appearance and character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Buildings and potentially the effects of noise, vibration and disturbance as a result of increased traffic movements during the construction phase of this project and potentially in combination with the Hornsea 3 and Norfolk Vanguard projects.
Q5.0.4	<p>Discharging Requirements and Conditions All discharging authorities are requested to check Schedules in the dDCO for accuracy and provide the</p>	Content as drafted

ExQ1: Tuesday 19 November 2019
Broadland District Council Responses
ID Ref. 20022881

ExQ1	Question	Response
	ExA with any suggested corrections and amendments.	
Q5.1.6	<p>Article 12: Access to works 12(2) confers deemed consent for means of access to works if the relevant planning authority does not notify the undertaker of its decision within 28 days. Are the local planning authorities and other Interested Parties who may be subject to this deemed consent time limit content with this arrangement? If not set out why?</p>	No objection to 28 days.
Q5.3.5	<p>Requirement 18: Provision of landscaping</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resolve the timing of approvals and implementation with the article 2 definition of 'commence', in connection with sub para (2)(d) details of trees to be removed, details of trees and hedgerows to be retained and their protection measures – which might be required prior to 'commencement'. 2. Is the intention to submit the Landscaping Management Strategy (LMS) as one complete document for approval or in parts? 3. Should para (1) refer to approval by the relevant planning authorities (in the plural) as the OLEMS refers to agreeing standards with Breckland District Council and Norfolk County Council. 4. Should sub para (2)(a) set out more planting types than trees, such that it is clear that grass and ground flora areas are also covered? 5. Should sub para (2) (d) also secure an auditable system for compliance with approved protection measures? 6. Is it correct that under scenario 1, the existing trees to be removed surveys would have been 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant to advise. 2. Applicant to advise. 3. Applicant to advise. 4. Content as drafted. 5. Content as drafted 6. Yes 7. Applicant to advise. 8. Content as drafted 9. Should set a timescale for the maintenance period for the landscaping 10. Content as drafted

ExQ1: Tuesday 19 November 2019

Broadland District Council Responses

ID Ref. 20022881

ExQ1	Question	Response
	<p>undertaken by Norfolk Vanguard [APP-698 para 141]? Or does this refer only to areas of woodland?</p> <p>7. How are hedgerow trees considered? Under R18 or under R24? How does this relate to article 35 (Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows) and Schedule 14?</p> <p>8. Should sub para (2) (f) also refer to opportunities for advance planting. If so, should a definition of 'advance planting' be provided in article 2?</p> <p>9. Does sub para (2) (h) give enough detail about the maintenance operations and duration to be included for approval by the relevant local planning authority? And should it refer to an aftercare period as set out in the OLEMS?</p> <p>10. Is it necessary to resolve discrepancies between the description of what the landscape management scheme (LMS) would include as set out in R18 and that in the OLEMS, which includes sustainable drainage design and guidance on materials and colour of the substations [APP-698, para 65]. (Also refer to comments under R16</p> <p>11. Should the agreed procedure for joint annual inspection of all planting areas set out in the OLEMS be included as a sub para of R18 (2)? Should reference be made to the adoption of all Norfolk Vanguard mitigation planting as set out in the OLEMS [APP-698, para 141] for scenario 1?</p>	<p>11. Content as drafted</p> <p>Yes, it is considered that there should be reference in the OLEMS to the adoption of all Norfolk Vanguard mitigation planting for scenario 1.</p>
Q5.3.13	<p>Requirement 31: Amendments to approved details</p> <p>1. The Applicant is requested to set out its justification for this Requirement.</p> <p>2. Are local planning authorities and others responsible for post consent approvals content</p>	<p>1. Applicant to advise</p> <p>2. Content as drafted</p> <p>3. n/a</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 19 November 2019**Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	Response
	<p>that the provisions in this Requirement for amendments and variations are justified?</p> <p>3. If not explain the need for such a requirement and/ or propose alternative wording.</p> <p>Specifically, is the wording "<i>that the subject matter of the agreement sought is unlikely to give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement.</i>" is sufficiently tightly drawn?</p>	<p>It is considered that the specified wording is sufficiently tight.</p>
Q9.0.1	<p>Methodology and its application</p> <p>Provide comments on the Applicant's landscape and visual assessment methodology, clearly distinguishing between those on the actual methodology and those on its application as described in the ES and supporting documents [APP-242, APP-484 to APP-582, APP-677 to APP-678].</p>	<p>Content as drafted</p>
Q9.1.2	<p>Study area parameters</p> <p>Do you have any comments relating to the study areas adopted for the onshore project substation/ substation extension and the landfall site, and the selection of representative viewpoints?</p>	<p>No comment as the proposed landfall site and project substation are outside of Broadland District.</p>
Q9.1.8	<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Are you content with the list of projects included in the assessment of potential cumulative landscape and visual effects [APP-242, Table 29.14]?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
Q9.3.5	<p>Hedgerows where removal assessed an adverse significant effect in Scenario 2</p> <p>1. Applicant to plot the hedgerows where significant adverse effects are located in Scenario 2 at Blickling Road, N of Aylsham; Silvergate Lane, NW of Aylsham; Aylsham Road, W of Aylsham; Elsing Road, near River Wensum; B1145, N of Reepham; and B1145, W of Reepham [APP-</p>	<p>1. Applicant to advise</p> <p>2. Applicant to advise</p> <p>It would assist the LPA if more detail was prepared by the applicant in this respect.</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 19 November 2019
Broadland District Council Responses
ID Ref. 20022881

ExQ1	Question	Response
	<p>242, Table 29.11] for 20 years. Marking up relevant sheets of the important hedgerows plans [APP-018] would be a suitable way of presenting this.</p> <p>2. Does this significant adverse effect remain for 30 years until decommissioning? The 'duration of effect' column of Table 29.11 is not clear in this regard.</p> <p>Would it assist Local Planning Authorities if more detail was prepared by the Applicant during the examination for these areas in terms of planting reinstatement?</p>	
Q12.2.1	<p>Location of noise sensitive receptors</p> <p>ES Chapter 25 [APP-238, paragraph 148] states that the study area comprises the entire onshore project area. The assessment has not identified a buffer zone within which effects would be considered, rather Noise Sensitive Receptors (NSR) have been identified, as detailed in Table 25.27 and shown on Figure 25.2. These are stated to have been agreed with relevant stakeholders (Table 25.3 and paragraph 122).</p> <p>With reference to the location of noise sensitive receptors as identified in the ES Chapter 25 [APP-238, Figure 25.2], explain why:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the majority of NSRs on Map 1 of 9 are located south of the cable route, although there are some potential receptors (e.g. Chimney Farm) to the north; 2. there are no NSRs in North Walsham close to the indicative mobilisation area (see Map 2 of 9); 3. there are no NSRs in proximity of trenchless crossing (TC) 16, although there are residential 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant to advise 2. Applicant to advise 3. Applicant to advise 4. Applicant to advise 5. Reserve the right to comment further once the location of all noise sensitive receptors are known.

ExQ1: Tuesday 19 November 2019**Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	Response
	<p>properties in proximity of this area (see map 2 of 9);</p> <p>4. there are no NSRs in proximity of TC6, although there are a number of farms in proximity of this area (see Map 6 of 9)?</p> <p>5. IPs may wish to comment.</p>	
Q14.0.6	<p>Traffic effects in Cawston and Oulton</p> <p>The RRs from Broadland District Council [RR-028], Cawston Parish Council [RR-016] and Oulton Parish Council [RR-017] raise concerns about the traffic assessment surrounding the villages of Cawston and Oulton. This includes concerns regarding the same access routes to Norfolk Vanguard, the Proposed Development and Hornsea Project Three during potentially the same time frame, and traffic impacts on the B1145 through Cawston.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to the RRs [AS-025, Table 19, row 3] refers to a 'highway intervention scheme' developed by Orsted for the objective of mitigating the construction traffic impacts of Hornsea Three and cumulative impacts with Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas through Cawston.</p> <p>1. The Applicant to confirm if it would adopt the same 'highway intervention scheme' to mitigate the construction traffic impacts through Cawston. If yes, the Applicant to provide details of the 'highway intervention scheme'.</p> <p>2. How has the impact of the proposed 'highway intervention scheme' been assessed in the ES Chapter 24 [APP-237]?</p> <p>3. In the response to the RRs [AS-025, Table 19, row 3], you refer to 'the final SoCG (REP9-047) with Norfolk County Council at the close of the</p>	<p>1. Applicant to advise</p> <p>2. Applicant to advise</p> <p>3. Applicant to submit</p> <p>4. NCC highways department to advise</p> <p>5. Yes, under Part 3 of the DCO as drafted, if a highway intervention scheme can be agreed.</p> <p><u>Cawston</u></p> <p>The details of the proposed highway mitigation scheme through the village of Cawston remain to be finalised and have not been agreed with Norfolk County Council's highways department, Cawston Parish Council or Broadland District Council. Therefore the traffic effects in Cawston have not been fully assessed and we reserve the right to comment further.</p> <p><u>Oulton</u></p> <p>In respect of the proposed cable logistics area (cla) on Heydon Road to the south of the village of Oulton, the District Council is concerned about the cumulative impacts arising from the construction traffic associated with three nationally strategic infrastructure projects in close proximity to one another and the following details are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of each type of vehicle that will require access to the cla each day (in and out),

ExQ1: Tuesday 19 November 2019

Broadland District Council Responses

ID Ref. 20022881

ExQ1	Question	Response
	<p>Norfolk Vanguard examination'. Submit the final SoCG with NCC for the Norfolk Vanguard Examination.</p> <p>4. NCC, to provide comments on the 'highway intervention scheme'. List any changes necessary for the Proposed Development, Scenario 1 and Scenario 2.</p> <p>5. Has the proposed 'highway intervention scheme' been adequately secured through mitigation set out in the ES Chapter 24 [APP-237] and in the dDCO [AS-019]?</p> <p>Broadland District Council, Cawston Parish Council, Oulton Parish Council and Corpusty and Saxthorpe Parish Council to highlight the specific areas of the Applicant's assessment that you have concerns with. Outline what else the Applicant would need to take into account when assessing the effects of traffic in Oulton and Cawston.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• the likely time of day that access to the cla will be required,• the cumulative effect in terms of vehicular movements as a result of the Hornsea Three and Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas projects, along The Street in terms of noise, vibration, air quality and traffic safety,• confirmation that the mitigation measures previously proposed by the Hornsea Three and Norfolk Vanguard projects along The Street and in proximity The Old Railway Gatehouse will be secured through the Norfolk Boreas project.