

Response of Breckland Council to The Examining Authority's further written questions and requests for information issued on 12th February 2020.

Question Number	Response of Breckland Council
Q2.5.0.2	<p>Based on DCO (Version 4 – Jan 2020) and a review of Schedule 1 Part 3 (Requirements) relating to onshore matters, Breckland Council considers the following outstanding matters need to be addressed:</p> <p>Provision of Landscaping – Regulation 18 (2)</p> <p>Breckland Council considers that the scheme should not rule out the possibility of bunding around the Station at Necton, details of which, if it is considered necessary and appropriate, will be agreed between the District Council and the developer at the appropriate stage.</p>
Q2.5.0.3	<p>This matter was addressed in the Local Impact Statement provided at Deadline 2. BDC have no further comments to make at this stage.</p>
Q2.5.1.1	<p>1: BDC accepts the point that the Environmental Statement is produced at a moment in time. It is understood that this is based on a worst case scenario. This would only be changed where there is a material change to the base conditions or the project specifications.</p> <p>2: For Applicant</p> <p>3: An ES can only really assess the position at the time of the submission and make an assessment of impacts of the scheme based upon the information available at that time. If that baseline or specification materially changes then there may well be a requirement for the assessment to be updated. That initially will be a view to be taken by the decision maker and, it is assumed, by the authorities ultimately discharging post-consent conditions and requirements.</p>
Q2.5.1.5	<p>1: BDC would agree with the proposal to secure a brief description of the matters set out at REP4-019 within the OCoCP.</p> <p>2: No comments to make</p> <p>3: No comments to make</p>

	<p>4: BDC would like to see schemes agreed with each of the post-consent discharging authorities to agree timescales for all individual discharges having regard to the level of complexity for each of the separate discharge matters. It is considered that a one-stage approval (if that means a blanket scheme covering all the discharge authorities) would not be helpful.</p> <p>5: Whilst in principle BDC would have no objection to this, these partial approvals should not be seen in isolation and a disjointed approach should be avoided.</p>
Q2.5.1.9	<p>1-3: For Applicant</p> <p>4: The document numbering used by PINs for this and other NSIP projects is accepted. It will fall to each discharging authority to utilise an appropriate document managing system for post-consent discharges. The applicant, at submission stage, will need to ensure that all relevant documents are referenced and accessible for the relevant authority and other interested parties as part of each submission.</p>
Q2.5.7.1	<p>Breckland Council would support the idea of PPAs' being put in place with each individual authority to enable appropriate and sufficient resource to be available to deal with potentially complex post-consent discharge applications.</p> <p>Whilst Breckland Council can see some merit in a co-ordinating body for the discharge of post-consent matters, e.g. it would allow for a single point of contact, each authority will have its own costs and requirements for discharging applications and therefore PPAs' should be agreed with each individual authority.</p> <p>There are due to be discussions between the applicant and the relevant authorities on this matter.</p>
Q2.9.5.1	BDC have no further comments to make on this point.
Q2.12.1.3	In relation to Temporary Construction Facilities, Breckland Council considers that this should be a post-consent requirement for each relevant authority to agree having regard to specific locational characteristics. Any one size fits all approach would not be appropriate. It may not be appropriate to define overly prescriptive parameters and mitigation which may be overly onerous for some sites and not onerous enough for others.
Q2.12.2.4	Breckland Council notes the comments made in REP4-052 in relation to noise. It has agreed within the Statement of Common Ground a position in relation to these matters and does not demur from that. It would ask the applicant to work with the writer of the representation to seek a mutually acceptable position.
Q2.12.2.5	Breckland Council has not had an opportunity to consider this issue but refers to the response to Q2.12.2.4

Q2.13.4.2	Breckland Council has no comments to make in respect of this question.
Q2.15.0.1	Breckland Council would support the position that the parties normally involved in a secondary consent process should be part of the discharge process. There should be clarity around the relevant bodies and how they will be involved in PPAs' and each discharging authority's consultation process with them when discharging post-consent applications.
Q2.16.0.2	Both the Statement of COmmo0n Ground and the Local Impact Statement submitted by Breckland Council on Deadline Day 2 reflect the adoption of the Breckland Local Plan on 28 th November 2019.