

# Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Round of Written Questions

Applicant: Norfolk Boreas Limited  
Document Reference: ExA.WQ-3.D7.V1  
Deadline 7

Date: March 2020  
Revision: Version 1  
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

*Photo: Ormonde Offshore Wind Farm*

Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
24/03/2020	01D	First draft for internal review	CD/DT/JT/EV	VR	JL
31/03/2020	01F	Final for submission at Deadline 7	CD/DT/JT/EV	VR	JL



## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Archaeology and Heritage Assets .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Offshore and intertidal archaeology .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Onshore archaeology .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Onshore heritage assets.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Biodiversity, Biological Environment and Ecology .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Offshore benthic and marine mammals.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Offshore ornithology .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Compulsory Acquisition .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Compulsory Acquisition .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Cumulative effects of other proposals .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>General cumulative effects, including phasing .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Onshore cumulative effects of other proposals (construction).....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Development Consent Order and Deemed Marine Licences.....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>General .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Articles.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>SCHEDULE 1 PART 1: Authorised Development .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>SCHEDULE 1 PART 3: Requirements .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>OTHER REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>5.5</b>	<b>SCHEDULES 9 to 13: Deemed Marine Licences .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>5.6</b>	<b>SCHEDULE 15: ARBITRATION RULES.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>5.7</b>	<b>SCHEDULE 16: PROCEDURE FOR DISCHARGE OF REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>5.8</b>	<b>SCHEDULE 17: PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS .....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>5.9</b>	<b>CONSENTS, LICENCES AND OTHER AGREEMENTS .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Fishing and fisheries .....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Fishing and fisheries .....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Grid connection .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Grid connection .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Habitats Regulation Assessment .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>River Wensum SAC .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Norfolk Valley Fens SAC .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Southern North Sea SAC.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Hasiborough, Hammond and Winterton SAC .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Offshore ornithology .....</b>	<b>103</b>

8.5	Greater Wash SPA .....	103
8.6	Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Haisborough Hammond and Winterton SAC .....	104
8.7	Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA .....	105
9	Landscape and Visual Effects.....	107
9.0	The Applicant’s landscape and visual assessment .....	107
9.1	The Applicant’s visual assessment.....	107
9.2	Alternatives considered .....	110
9.3	Landscape effects .....	112
9.4	Visual effects .....	113
9.5	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS).....	113
9.6	Good Design .....	113
9.7	Matters arising from the accompanied site inspection (ASI) on Thursday 23 <sup>rd</sup> January .....	117
10	Marine and Coastal processes .....	118
10.0	Marine and Coastal processes .....	118
11	Navigation.....	118
11.0	Navigation.....	118
12	Onshore construction effects .....	118
12.0	Cable corridor and ducting .....	118
12.1	Mobilisation areas .....	124
12.2	Noise and Vibration .....	125
12.3	Construction Hours .....	131
13	Socio-economic effects .....	131
13.0	Skills and Employment Strategy .....	131
13.1	Jobs.....	132
13.2	Tourism .....	132
13.3	Land use and Agriculture .....	137
13.4	Public Health .....	138
13.5	Other offshore industries and activities.....	139
14	Traffic and transportation.....	140
14.0	Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) .....	140
14.1	Highway Intervention Scheme for Link 34 (B1145 through Cawston) .....	140
14.2	Cable Logistics Area (CLA) along Link 89 in Outlon .....	148
14.3	Link 69 Little London Road in North Walsham from the B1145 Lyngate Road to an access point 210m east .....	148
14.4	Outline Access Management Plan and Access to Works Plan.....	149

<b>15</b>	<b>Water Resources and Flood Risk .....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>15.0</b>	<b>Water Resources and Flood Risk .....</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>General .....</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>16.0</b>	<b>General .....</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>16.1</b>	<b>Environmental Statement (ES) .....</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>16.2</b>	<b>Ground conditions and contamination .....</b>	<b>161</b>

## Glossary of Acronyms

AEol	Adverse Effect on Integrity
AEZ	Archaeological Exclusion Zone
AIS	Air Insulated Switchgear
ALO	Agricultural Liaison Officer
AOE	Alde Ore Estuary
AONB	Area of Natural Beauty
BAT	Best Available Technique
BDC	Broadland District Council
BPM	Best Practical Means
BoR	Book of Reference
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CGR	Counterfactual Growth Rate
CNMP	Construction Noise Management Plan
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
CPS	Counterfactual Population Size
CRM	Collision Risk Modelling
CSIMP	Cable Specification Installation and Monitoring Plan
CWS	County Wildlife Site
DAS	Design and Access Statement
dBA	A-weighted Decibels
DCO	Development Consent Order
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DML	Deemed Marine Licence
EA	Environment Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIFCA	Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Association
EMF	Electromagnetic Field
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
FFC	Flamborough and Filey Coast
FID	Final Investment Decision
FLCP	Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan
FLO	Fisheries Liaison Officer
FLOWW	Fishing Liaison with Offshore Wind and Wet Renewables Group
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GB	Great Britain
GIS	Gas Insulated Switchgear
GW	Gigawatts
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
HHW	Haisborough Hammond and Winterton
HIS	Highway Intervention Scheme
HoTs	Heads of Terms
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current

HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
IPMP	In Principle Monitoring Plan
IROPI	Imperative Reason of Overriding Public Interest
km	Kilometres
Kv	Kilovolts
LIR	Local Impact Report
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
M	Metres
MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Agency
MCZ	Marine Coastal Zone
MGN	Marine Guidance Note
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MSFD	Marine Strategy Framework Directive
MW	Megawatts
NCC	Norfolk County Council
NE	Natural England
NFFO	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
NFU	National Farmers Union
NG	National Grid
NNDC	North Norfolk District Council
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OAMP	Outline Access Management Plan
OCoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
OLEMS	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
OODP	Outline Operational Drainage Plan
OREI	Offshore Renewable Energy Installations
ORM	Offshore Ring Main
OS	Ordnance Survey
OSPAR	The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic
OTMP	Outline Traffic Management Plan
OWF	Offshore Wind Farm
OWIC	Offshore Wind Industry Council
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PPA	Performance Planning Agreement
PSA	Particle Size Analysis
PVA	Population Viability Analysis
RFI	Request for Information Forms
RPA	Relevant Planning Authorities
RPM	Revolutions Per Minute
RSA	Road Safety Audit
RSPB	Royal Society for The Protection of Birds
SAC	Special Area of Conservation

SIP	Site Integrity Plan
SNCB	Statutory Nature Conservation Body
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoR	Statement of Reasons
SoS	Secretary of State
SoV	Service Operation Vehicle
SPA	Special Protection Area
TH	Trinity House
UK	United Kingdom
WCS	Worst Case Scenario
WQ	Written Question
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation



## Glossary of Terminology

Array cables	Cables which link wind turbine to wind turbine, and wind turbine to offshore electrical platforms.
Cable logistics area	Existing hardstanding area to allow the storage of cable drums and associated materials and to accommodate a site office, welfare facilities and associated temporary infrastructure to support the cable pulling works.
Cable pulling	Installation of cables within pre-installed ducts from jointing pits located along the onshore cable route.
Ducts	A duct is a length of underground piping, which is used to house electrical and communications cables.
Evidence Plan Process	A voluntary consultation process with specialist stakeholders to agree the approach to the EIA and information to support the HRA.
Interconnector cables	Offshore cables which link offshore electrical platforms within the Norfolk Boreas site.
Jointing pit	Underground structures constructed at regular intervals along the onshore cable route to join sections of cable and facilitate installation of the cables into the buried ducts.
Landfall	Where the offshore cables come ashore at Happisburgh South.
Landfall compound	Compound at landfall within which HDD drilling would take place.
Landfall compound zone	Area within which the landfall compounds would be located.
Link boxes	Underground chambers or above ground cabinets next to the cable trench housing low voltage electrical earthing links.
Mobilisation area	Areas approx. 100 x 100m used as access points to the running track for duct installation. Required to store equipment and provide welfare facilities. Located adjacent to the onshore cable route, accessible from local highways network suitable for the delivery of heavy and oversized materials and equipment.
Mobilisation zone	Area within which a mobilisation area would be located.
National Grid new / replacement overhead line tower	New overhead line towers to be installed at the National Grid substation.
National Grid overhead line modifications	The works to be undertaken to complete the necessary modification to the existing 400kV overhead lines.
National Grid overhead line temporary works	Area within which the work will be undertaken to complete the necessary modification to the existing 400kV overhead lines.
National Grid substation extension	The permanent footprint of the National Grid substation extension.
National Grid temporary works area	Land adjacent to the Necton National Grid substation which would be temporarily required during construction of the National Grid substation extension.
Necton National Grid substation	The grid connection location for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard.
Norfolk Boreas site	The Norfolk Boreas wind farm boundary. Located offshore, this will contain all the wind farm array.
Norfolk Vanguard	Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm, sister project of Norfolk Boreas.
Offshore service platform	A platform to house workers offshore and/or provide helicopter refuelling facilities. An accommodation vessel may be used as an alternative for housing workers.
Offshore cable corridor	The corridor of seabed from the Norfolk Boreas site to the landfall site within which the offshore export cables will be located.

Offshore electrical platform	A fixed structure located within the Norfolk Boreas site, containing electrical equipment to aggregate the power from the wind turbines and convert it into a suitable form for export to shore.
Offshore export cables	The cables which transmit power from the offshore electrical platform to the landfall.
Offshore project area	The area including the Norfolk Boreas site, project interconnector search area and offshore cable corridor.
Onshore cable route	The up to 35m working width within a 45m wide corridor which will contain the buried export cables as well as the temporary running track, topsoil storage and excavated material during construction.
Onshore 400kV cable route	Buried high-voltage cables linking the onshore project substation to the Necton National Grid substation.
Onshore cables	The cables which take power and communications from landfall to the onshore project substation.
Onshore infrastructure	The combined name for all onshore infrastructure associated with the project from landfall to grid connection.
Onshore project area	The area of the onshore infrastructure (landfall, onshore cable route, accesses, trenchless crossing zones and mobilisation areas; onshore project substation and extension to the Necton National Grid substation and overhead line modifications).
Onshore project substation	A compound containing electrical equipment to enable connection to the National Grid. The substation will convert the exported power from HVDC to HVAC, to 400kV (grid voltage). This also contains equipment to help maintain stable grid voltage.
Onshore project substation temporary construction compound	Land adjacent to the onshore project substation which would be temporarily required during construction of the onshore project substation.
Overhead Line	An existing 400kV power line suspended by towers.
Pre sweeping	The practice of dredging the seabed to prepare it for foundation or cable installation. It is either used to provide a level surface on which to place foundations or to allow cables to be installed at a sufficient depth to minimise the chance of them becoming exposed.
Project interconnector cable	Offshore cables which would link either turbines or an offshore electrical platform in the Norfolk Boreas site with an offshore electrical platform in one of the Norfolk Vanguard sites.
Project interconnector search area	The area within which the project interconnector cables would be installed.
Running track	The track along the onshore cable route which the construction traffic would use to access workfronts.
Safety zones	An area around a vessel which should be avoided during offshore construction.
Scour protection	Protective materials to avoid sediment being eroded away from the base of the foundations as a result of the flow of water.
The Applicant	Norfolk Boreas Limited
The Norfolk Vanguard OWF sites	Term used exclusively to refer to the two distinct offshore wind farm areas, Norfolk Vanguard East and Norfolk Vanguard West (also termed NV East and NV West) which will contain the Norfolk Vanguard arrays.
The project	Norfolk Boreas Wind Farm including the onshore and offshore infrastructure.
Transition pit	Underground structures that house the joints between the offshore export cables and the onshore cables
Trenchless crossing compound	Pairs of compounds at each trenchless crossing zone to allow boring to take place from either side of the crossing.

Trenchless crossing zone	Areas within the onshore cable route which will house trenchless crossing entry and exit points.
Workfront	A length of onshore cable route within which duct installation works will occur, approximately 150m.

## **The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Third Round of Written Questions in regard to the Norfolk Boreas Application.**

Following the decision taken to postpone all future hearings and Accompanied Site Inspections by the Examining Authority (ExA), a third round of Written Questions (WQs) was published on 23 March 2020.

The Applicant has responded to each of their relevant questions, detailed in numerical order in Sections 1 to 16 of this document.

## 1 Archaeology and Heritage Assets

### 1.0 Offshore and intertidal archaeology

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

### 1.1 Onshore archaeology

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

### 1.2 Onshore heritage assets

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.1.2.1	The Applicant	<b>Cawston Conservation Area and listed buildings</b> What if anything is being undertaken to address Broadland District Council's ongoing concerns regarding vibration effects which could affect the Cawston Conservation Area and listed buildings fronting High Street [REP5-053, Table 1] and [REP6-026, Table 6 and Appendix 2]?	The Applicant is undertaking an assessment of potential noise, vibration and air quality effects of the Cawston Revised Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS), which is part of a package of mitigation measures that would serve to reduce traffic impacts through Cawston (Link 34, B1145). In this assessment consideration will be given to the presence of listed building fronting High Street. This will be submitted at Deadline 8.
Q3.1.2.2	The Applicant, Broadland District Council	<b>Noise and vibration effects on the Cawston Conservation Area and listed buildings</b> Parties to provide any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.	The Applicant will provide further information in the Clarification Note on the potential noise, vibration and air quality effects of the Cawston Revised Highway Intervention Scheme to be submitted at Deadline 8.

## 2 Biodiversity, Biological Environment and Ecology

### 2.0 Offshore benthic and marine mammals

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.2.0.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Marine Mammal Monitoring:</b> The Applicant to comment on NE's wording in [REP6-050] to be included in the Generation DMLs Schedules 9 and 10, which would link with the marine mammal monitoring requirements within the IPMP.</p>	<p>As stated in the IPMP's Guiding principles [document 8.12, REP5-031] <i>"All consent conditions, which would include those for monitoring, should be <u>"necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the permitted development, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects"</u> as set out in Paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and referred to as the 'six tests' (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2018)."</i></p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that the conditions which Natural England have suggested are precise and reasonable, relevant to planning, or indeed necessary. For the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conditions are not precise and reasonable, in particular the following wording: <i>"required to test predictions in the environmental statement"</i>. There are many predictions made within the ES and therefore the Applicant is unclear to which predictions this statement refers. In addition, compliance with this wording could be used to place an unreasonable burden on the Applicant to undertake very extensive monitoring without a clear need to do so.</li> <li>• The wording of the two conditions does not focus on any specific aspect of marine mammal monitoring and therefore its open-ended nature would mean that it is not enforceable.</li> <li>• Most importantly the proposed conditions are not necessary. The guiding principles within the IPMP state that: <i>"monitoring should be targeted to address significant evidence gaps or uncertainty, where there is potential for a significant environmental impact."</i> Chapter 12 of the Environmental</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Statement Marine Mammals [APP-212] concluded <b>no significant impacts</b> on marine mammals and Natural England, through the Statement of Common Ground [AS-028] has agreed with these conclusions. As recognised by Natural England in their Relevant Representation [RR-099] marine mammal assessment issues are likely to be very similar across projects and it may be that monitoring is best undertaken at or between several projects to address these issues and find answers to the original questions. The Applicant agrees with this statement and therefore considers that a contribution to strategic monitoring is likely to be more beneficial than anything undertaken at a project level. The inclusion of monitoring at a strategic level would be best enforced through agreement, with the MMO and Natural England, of the final, Southern North Sea Site Integrity Plan.</p> <p>In summary, the Applicant considers that the conditions proposed by Natural England are not necessary and furthermore, in their current form, they are not sufficiently precise to ensure that relevant data gaps are filled and would not be enforceable. As stated in the Applicant's response to further written questions [REP5-045] the Applicant's position is that given the low contribution of the project to marine mammal impacts any marine mammal monitoring should be undertaken at a strategic level. The wording provided within the IPMP allows for the participation of Norfolk Boreas in any strategic monitoring as required at the time of agreement of the final plans and therefore it is not necessary to include a specific condition within the DCO to commit the Applicant to marine mammal monitoring. Furthermore, due to the fact that the Norfolk Boreas project would make a relatively low contribution to any marine mammal impacts, it is not appropriate to include a condition within the DCO given similar conditions have not been included in DCOs for other wind farms to be constructed in the same area.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.2.0.2	The Applicant, Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Sandeel:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Applicant to state its position regarding MMO's request for a further update to the IPMP for sediment sampling for particle size analysis in respect of habitat suitability for sandeel.</li> <li>2. The Applicant and MMO to provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation regarding sediment sampling to the SoS.</li> </ol>	<p>1. As outlined in Version 3 of the Statement of Common Ground with the MMO [REP6-029] the Applicant has included text within the IPMP which would ensure that, if sediment sampling were to be undertaken, this would then be analysed for sandeel habitat suitability.</p> <p>In their comments on responses to written questions [REP6-045] the MMO proposes a slight addition to the text, which the Applicant has agreed to include. Therefore, an updated version of the IPMP (document reference 8.12), containing the proposed amendment has been submitted at Deadline 7. The wording now states (the Additional text is underlined):</p> <p><i>"As explained in section 4.3.2, if at the time of completion of the final detailed plan there is good, evidence based, justification for increasing the scope of the benthic surveys this will be agreed with the MMO and included within the final plans. If a scope increase for the benthic surveys included sediment sampling within the wind farm site <u>for the purpose of Particle Size Analysis (PSA)</u>, the data from that survey could be used to better understand any changes in habitat suitability for sandeels. This would be agreed with the MMO though the final plan."</i></p> <p>Both parties consider this preferable to using geophysical data to determine sediment characteristics and therefore habitat suitability for sandeels.</p> <p>2. As the Applicant and the MMO both consider that this issue is now resolved the Applicant has no additional information to provide.</p>



## 2.1 Offshore ornithology

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.2.1.1	The Applicant, IPs	<p><b>PVA Modelling:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant and IPs to state their final position on PVA modelling, and whether agreement is possible within the Examination.</li> </ol>	<p>1. The Applicant does not consider this to be an area of disagreement with Natural England. The Applicant provided PVA outputs in REP2-035 obtained using the Natural England PVA tool for those species that Natural England advised was required, and with reference to existing PVA results for other species.</p> <p>The Applicant considers there were two aspects of the PVA modelling, submitted in REP2-035 which Natural England highlighted in their comments (REP4-040) as being areas to be resolved. These were: (1) the fact that the PVA models conducted by the Applicant used the original version of the NE PVA tool (as this was the only one available at that time) with the consequence that the PVA would potentially need to be re-run following an update to the tool; and (2) that, for two of the species (kittiwake at the North Sea scale and guillemot at the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA scale), the results provided were obtained from a smaller number of simulations (500) than the recommended minimum (1,000). This was due to errors encountered when attempting to run the model for larger numbers of simulations (although it was not clear why these errors occurred as the online tool did not provide a detailed error message).</p> <p>Natural England initially advised (REP4-040) that as the PVA tool was due to be updated the Applicant should re-run the models when the revised version became available. However, in response to the Examiners' second written questions (REP5-077, WQ 2.2.2.1) Natural England stated that, having checked the revised model (prior to it being made publicly available):</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p><i>'we are not aware that the updates will make a significant difference to the counterfactual metric outputs of models run using the previous/currently available version of the tool'</i></p> <p>And that as a consequence;</p> <p><i>'Therefore, we will use the counterfactual of population size (CPS) and counterfactual of growth rate (CGR) metric outputs from models run by the Applicant using the previous version of the tool as presented in the Deadline 2 updated assessments [REP2-035].'</i></p> <p>Therefore, with respect to the first issue above (the requirement to re-run the PVA models following the update), the Applicant considers that Natural England is satisfied this is not required and the current outputs (REP2-035) are agreed to be robust and appropriate by both the Applicant and Natural England.</p> <p>With respect to Natural England's second concern (regarding the potential unreliability of PVA outputs derived from 500 simulations), the Applicant has successfully undertaken comparative simulations using the updated PVA tool for the two species in question (kittiwake at the EIA cumulative scale and guillemot at the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA scale) with model runs of 1,000 and 5,000 simulations. The counterfactual outputs obtained from these model runs have been compared with those for 500 runs presented in REP2-035 and this has been submitted at Deadline 7 (ExA;AS-7.D7.V1). This comparison has demonstrated that the results obtained from larger numbers of simulations are virtually indistinguishable from those for 500 simulations. For example, the largest difference in the counterfactual of growth rate, between that for 500 simulations and that for 5,000 simulations, was 0.004%. For the counterfactual of</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p><b>PVA Modelling:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant and IPs to provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the SoS.</li> </ol>	<p>population size the largest differences were 0.14% (also for 500 compared with 5,000 simulations). Furthermore, the differences between the 500 and larger run estimates (obtained for different mortality scenarios) were found to be both positive and negative (i.e. in some cases the outputs for 500 simulations were slightly higher and in other cases the outputs for 1,000 or 5,000 were slightly higher). Thus there is no indication of bias in the results.</p> <p>In summary the Applicant considers that both of Natural England's concerns with the PVA results have been addressed and there are no further outstanding issues.</p> <p>2. The Applicant considers that the PVA results reported in REP2-035 are robust and appropriate for impact assessment purposes. This position has been supported by Natural England's review (REP4-040) and their response to WQ2.2.2.1 (REP5-077), with the exception of the points discussed above, which have now been demonstrated to have no effect on the outputs (ExA.AS-7.D7.V1).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that, on the basis of the PVA counterfactual measures discussed in REP2-035, it has been demonstrated that there will be no significant effects due to Norfolk Boreas alone and cumulatively with other plans and projects for any species and there is no risk of an adverse effect on the integrity (AEoI) of any designated SPA feature due to Norfolk Boreas alone and in-combination with other plans and projects.</p>
Q3.2.1.2	The Applicant, IPs	<p><b>Headroom:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant and Ips to state their final position on headroom, and whether agreement is possible within the Examination.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant set out its position on Headroom in REP6-021. In summary, the Applicant considers there to be a considerable difference in the collision risk estimates for a number of wind farms due to the reduced risks posed by the built designs compared with the assessed or consented designs. Illustration of this headroom was provided for two wind farms in REP6-021 and the same considerations also apply to</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>2. The Applicant and IPs to provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	<p>other wind farms included in the cumulative and in-combination collision assessments. The Applicant welcomes that Natural England has agreed that this is an issue which requires attention, and that there is likely to be headroom (for the above reasons), although the extent of it is currently uncertain (REP6-049). Therefore the Applicant considers that the principles of precaution in headroom are agreed with Natural England, albeit that the precise details relating to how this affects collision risk modelling is not yet agreed. Whilst it is unlikely that agreement on the extent of available headroom will be reached during the examination, the Applicant's assessment of no AEoI is in no way reliant on available headroom. Available headroom has been presented by the Applicant as just one example of the inherent over precaution in Natural England's requirements for collision risk assessment, which gives further confidence to the reliability of the Applicant's predictions and conclusions that there is no AEoI.</p> <p>2. The Applicant notes the following from '<i>Natural England's comments on Norfolk Boreas approach to as-built vs consented turbine numbers and headroom in cumulative/ in-combination collision assessments</i>' [REP6-049] dated 5 March 2020 and submitted at Deadline 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst Natural England '<i>recognise that there is likely to be some headroom for the general reasons set out by the Applicant, the exact extent of any potential headroom is not agreed</i>' (section 1). Therefore, the principle that headroom exists is accepted by Natural England;</li> <li>• Natural England agree that '<i>the use of collision risk estimates calculated based on WCS may lead to a potential over-estimate of the total cumulative or in-combination assessments in terms of both EIA and HRA</i>' (section 2). Therefore it is accepted by Natural England that headroom may lead to over-estimates in cumulative and in-combination totals;</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England also make the point in section 2 that <i>'it is also possible that the predicted impacts from 'as-built' designs are greater than those predicted in the ES e.g. the collision mortalities at Lincs OWF increased after application of the correction factor used when calculating the impacts of 'as-built' development.'</i> The Applicant acknowledges this point, however in The Crown Estate wind farm headroom database<sup>1</sup>, using kittiwake as an example, this situation only applies to five wind farms (Greater Gabbard, Kentish Flats, Lincs, Lynn and Inner Dowsing and Ormonde) all of which had low existing collision risks (30 in total for all five), which overall were increased by two, to a total of 32, following adjustment. This contrasts with more than 20 wind farms for which collision risks are reduced, by an average of 37%. Thus, while Natural England's statement is correct, in reality the effect of this is very small and is far outweighed by the reductions for other sites.</li> <li>• <i>'Natural England agrees in principle that if a non-material change or section 36 variation has indeed reduced the parameters which are consented within/ under the DCO or under the DCO as changed/varied, in such instances this could be considered "legally secured"'</i> (section 4.1). This principle would therefore apply to the Applicant's submission in relation to Triton Knoll. Similarly, the MMO has also agreed the principle that consented (as opposed to assessed) parameters are legally secured.</li> <li>• Whilst Natural England state that it remains <i>'too ambiguous to definitively state the 'as-built' projects are legally secured'</i> (section 4.2), this does not address the point where the project has been fully built out to the maximum installed capacity consented – as is clearly the case with Hornsea One, to which</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.marinedataexchange.co.uk/ItemDetails.aspx?id=6717>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>the Applicant has specifically referred. Neither Natural England or the MMO has submitted any evidence as to why specifically Hornsea One's as-built parameters should not be considered as legally secured. There is no need for a condition that specifies the project becomes fixed for its lifetime because any changes to the as-built parameters would require a variation to the consent. Phased builds would be irrelevant where the project has been fully built out (as in the case of Hornsea One); and the provision of as-built information goes to the question of the extent of the headroom, not whether there is headroom which is legally secured. In fact, Natural England notes (Section 6) that <i>'consultation with the MMO may be required to obtain the parameters from the construction management plan of each project'</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England has also misunderstood the Applicant's comments in relation to 'age of the data'. The Applicant is not questioning the approach to cumulative or in-combination assessment, which relies on the use of data previously agreed with Natural England for individual projects. The Applicant's point is that new environmental information may be required, to support a variation of a consent, if an undertaker sought to change its as-built or WCS parameters beyond those which were originally consented.</li> <li>• Natural England state that <i>'if the Applicant successfully identifies headroom this does not necessarily mean that headroom is the project's to utilise, as there are currently multiple projects ahead of Norfolk Boreas in the Examination process that are not yet consented'</i>. The only projects to which headroom could be applied before Norfolk Boreas are Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three. The Applicant has demonstrated that Triton Knoll and Hornsea One alone create sufficient headroom for both Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Boreas. In any event, Triton Knoll and Hornsea One are not the only projects where headroom exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England appear to accept that the calculation method used for Hornsea One is valid and has demonstrated the available headroom. Section 6 states, '<i>..in principle Natural England is of the view that the calculation method is valid</i>', and goes on to state, '<i>Whilst the Applicant may have demonstrated in Appendix 4 of REP4-014 that taking the approach developed in Trinder (2017) produces the same predicted collision figure as that obtained through recalculation from the original dataset (using the Band spreadsheets) for HOW01, we note that this has only been demonstrated for one project and given the issues noted above, it is likely that this would be the case for every project.</i> The Applicant has only sought to demonstrate that there is available headroom taking two specific projects into account – Triton Knoll and Hornsea One, and only Triton Knoll relies on the Trinder (2017) approach. Therefore, it appears from Natural England's recent submission (as quoted above) that Natural England accept that both these projects create headroom to the extent demonstrated by the Applicant, i.e. which is sufficient headroom to account for impacts from both Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas.</li> <li>Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant's assessment of no AEoI is in no way reliant on available headroom. Available headroom has been presented by the Applicant as just one example of the inherent over precaution in Natural England's requirements for collision risk assessment, which gives further confidence to the reliability of the Applicant's predictions and conclusions that there is no AEoI.</li> </ul>
Q3.2.1.3	The Applicant, Marine Management	<p><b>Turbine Parameters:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In [REP6-024] the Applicant bases its CRM assessment on either 158 x 11.55 MW turbines or 124 x 14.7MW</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important to state that whichever turbine model is installed, the maximum number of turbines is 158 and the number of turbines is constrained by the total generating capacity of 1,800MW. The two</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
	Organisation, Natural England	<p>turbines. There is no explicit commitment to a minimum turbine size in the DCO [REP5-003], which states "Up to and including 14.6 MW". In theory, the Applicant could implement the maximum number of smaller turbines. The Applicant to confirm whether this would invalidate the CRM.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Should the DCO refer to a minimum turbine size of 11.55MW as this is the design basis?</li> <li>3. Similarly, the Applicant could currently, in theory, implement a lower number of higher output turbines, if technology allows it. The Applicant states 14.7MW option results in a higher collision mortality than the 11.5MW option. Without stipulating a maximum turbine output in the DCO, is there a risk of higher mortality than has been predicted? Can the Applicant provide assurance that this is not the case?</li> <li>4. Given the rate at which technology advances - is it sensible to apply a given draught height to a given WTG generating capacity? On what assumptions are these draught heights and capacities made?</li> </ol>	<p>design options which have been modelled for collision risk, 158 x 11.55MW and 124 x 14.7MW (REP5-059 and REP6-024) represent the highest collision risks for turbines with generating capacities of up to 14.6MW and more than 14.7MW, respectively. In other words, if turbines with a capacity up to 14.6MW are installed, the collision risks will be lower than those for the 11.55MW model (but note that the number of turbines (with a higher capacity than 11.55MW) will be less than 158 as the number of turbines is constrained by the total generating capacity of 1,800MW). And if turbine models with a higher capacity than 14.7MW are installed these will also result in lower collision risks than the 14.7MW turbine (again noting that the number of turbines installed is constrained by the total generating capacity of 1,800MW). The two design options (up to 14.6MW and 14.7MW and higher) have been defined by the minimum draught heights for these two options, 35m from Mean High Water Springs (MHWS), and 30m from MHWS, respectively. Within these two draught heights, the 11.55MW and 14.7MW are the worst case design options, and the 14.7MW option is the worst of the two. Hence the 14.7MW is the overall worst case and the model on which the revised assessment has been based. If the wind farm is built with turbines with a lower capacity than 14.6MW then the collision risk will be lower than those for the 14.7MW and therefore the collision risk modelling in REP5-059 and REP6-024 will not be invalidated.</p> <p>2. For the purpose of collision risk modelling, the Applicant has modelled turbines of 11.55MW and above. However, it is not necessary to restrict the project to the precise turbine capacities modelled. The purpose of the Rochdale envelope is to assess and secure relevant parameters (of a particular turbine model in this case) which allow flexibility for the final design, provided that those parameters can still be observed. A minimum turbine capacity has never been included as a parameter in the dDCO for the project, and to the Applicant's knowledge has never been included in any other</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>offshore wind farm DCO. This is because the relevant parameters for the project, and which form part of the Rochdale envelope, do not include individual turbine capacity. All relevant parameters are already secured in the dDCO as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maximum export capacity of 1,800MW is referred to in the dDCO at Schedule 1, Part 1, 1(a); Paragraph 2(1)(a) of Part 3 of the Generation DMLs (Schedule 9-10), and Condition 8(1)(a) of the Generation DMLs (Schedule 9-10, Part 4). As the Explanatory Memorandum explains, all other parameters are in effect subordinate to this description.</li> <li>• The maximum number of turbines (158) is referred to in the dDCO at Schedule 1, Part 1, 1(a), Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 3(1), Paragraph 2(1)(a) of Part 3 of the Generation DMLs (Schedule 9-10), and Condition 8(1)(b) of the Generation DMLs (Schedule 9-10, Part 4). If the maximum export capacity is divided by the maximum number of turbines, it can be seen that in order to reach full export capacity, each individual turbine would need to have an installed capacity which exceeds 11MW (hence the 11.55MW turbine has been modelled). This parameter was changed in the dDCO at Deadline 5 to reflect the change in the turbine modelled.</li> <li>• The spacing of turbines are referred to in the dDCO at Condition 1(1)(g) of the Generation DMLs (Schedule 9-10, Part 4). This requires spacing of at least 800m (increased from the previous spacing of 760m) to reflect the reduction in the maximum number of turbines referred to above. As with the maximum number of turbines, this parameter was changed in the dDCO at Deadline 5 to reflect the change in the turbine modelled.</li> <li>• The maximum wind turbine generator parameters, on which the collision risk modelling is based, are referred to in the</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>dDCO at Schedule 1, Part 3 Requirement 2(1) and in Condition 1(1) of the Generation DMLs (Schedule 9-10, Part 4). For example, the maximum height and rotor diameter for the turbines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The minimum draught heights referred to in the dDCO at Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirement 2(1)(e), and Condition 1(1)(e) of the Generation DMLs (Schedule 9-10). This was introduced as further mitigation at Deadline 5, and specifically avoids referring to a minimum or maximum individual turbine capacity because this is not a parameter which is otherwise secured.</li> </ul> <p>Provided that all of these parameters are observed, collision risk will not exceed the worst case modelled in the collision risk assessment. If, for commercial reasons, the Applicant chooses to rely on the flexibility of the Rochdale envelope to construct less than 1,800MW, potentially using turbines of less than 11.55MW (or a mix of turbine sizes) then the Applicant should be entitled to do so, as this would not invalidate the collision risk assessment.</p> <p>3. At the scale of a single turbine, models with larger dimensions (e.g. rotor radius) typically have higher collision risks, although because collision risk is also related to RPM (revolutions per minute); which is slower for larger diameter rotors) the increases are usually small. Furthermore, the small increase in risk for each individual turbine, with larger dimensions, is more than offset by the reduction in overall numbers of turbines as they also have higher generating capacity and therefore fewer are required to meet the total generating capacity. Therefore the Applicant is confident based on currently available information that a design based on a smaller number (than 124) of turbines with individual generating capacity of more than 14.7MW would not result in higher collision risks. Indeed, in this respect the collision risk modelling in REP5-059 and REP6-024 has been conducted</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>along the same lines as that in previous offshore wind farm impact assessments, which present the collision risks for the worst case design, which results in the highest mortality estimates.</p> <p>4. The draught heights secured in the dDCO (as noted above) relate to ranges of turbine capacity, rather than a specific turbine model (i.e. 35m from MHWS for up to 14.6MW and 30m for the 14.7MW or above, REP5-003). Furthermore, these are the minimum values (i.e. the actual draught heights will be these values or greater). The basis for these draught heights is the maximum operating height of the vessels which are currently available for construction, the maximum height to which the hub and length of rotor blades which can both be installed. The Applicant acknowledges that there may be technology developments which change the turbine models available by the time construction commences and it is likely that vessel capacity will increase to meet demands associated with larger turbines. However, it is also necessary for the Applicant to commit to certain design parameters in order to reach agreement on potential impact magnitudes on which a consent decision can be based. Hence, the Applicant has committed in the DCO to these worst case minimum draught heights and the wind farm will be constructed within these defined limits</p>

### 3 Compulsory Acquisition

#### 3.0 Compulsory Acquisition

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.3.0.1	The Applicant	<p>Summarise the case for Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession (referring to relevant references in the Examination Library) indicating how the following matters are addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. whether the purposes for which the compulsory acquisition powers are sought comply with statutory and policy tests under s122 of PA 2008 and DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land;</li> <li>b. how Article 1 and Article 8 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights has been considered; and</li> <li>c. Having regard to section 122(3) of the PA 2008, whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition in relation to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The need in the public interest for the project to be carried out.</li> <li>ii. The private loss to those affected by compulsory acquisition.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>a. The Applicant considers the inclusion of powers of compulsory acquisition in the dDCO for the purposes of the Project meets the conditions of section 122 of the PA 2008 and the Guidance (Statement of Reasons (SoR), paragraph 11.1 [REP5-006]).</p> <p>The interests sought are no more than are reasonably required. Other land required to facilitate or land incidental to the Project is no more than is reasonably necessary for that purpose and is proportionate (SoR, paragraph 11.2).</p> <p>The Applicant has a clear need for the powers of compulsory acquisition it seeks and has a clear purpose in its proposed acquisition powers. The Works Plan (Onshore) (Document 2.4) [REP1-004 – REP1-007] and description of the authorised development in the dDCO demonstrate that the Applicant has a clear idea of what the relevant Order lands are required for. All of the Order land is required for the Project to be constructed and used for the purpose of supporting the conveyance of electricity (SoR, paragraph 6.6).</p> <p>The Applicant has been in discussions with the landowners with a view to agreeing terms for the sale of the necessary rights in land and is hopeful of concluding Heads of Terms (HoT) with all landowners prior to the close of examination. There are currently agreed HoT with 83 out of 100 landowners.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>The need for the Project and the support for such projects in the relevant NPSs demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest for the required interests to be acquired compulsorily (s122(3) PA 2008) (SoR, paragraph 11.3).</p> <p>The Applicant considers the project to be (i) in accordance with established and emerging national policy in relation to NSIPs contained in NPS EN-1, NPS EN-3 and NPS EN-5, (ii) required to meet a pressing national need for electricity generating capacity and (iii) necessary and proportionate to the extent that interference with private rights is required (SoR, paragraph 7.34).</p> <p>Additionally, the Applicant has a well worked up scheme, and funding that is sufficient to take the Project forward (SoR, paragraph 7.33).</p> <p>All reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition have been explored. Given the national and local need for the Project and the support for it found in policy, the land identified by the Applicant for the Project is the only land available for those purposes (SoR, paragraph 11.4).</p> <p>The Applicant has sought, and continues to seek a negotiated solution to each of the identified required interests. In each case the Applicant has chosen to secure land, rights or temporary possession in a way that minimises disruption to the relevant owners (SoR, paragraph 7.22).</p> <p>The selection of the landfall, onshore cable corridor and substation location is set out in detail in the</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Environmental Statement (document reference 6.1), in particular in Chapter 4 [APP-217]. The land scheduled in the Book of Reference is necessary and appropriate; there are no other suitable alternatives (SoR, paragraph 7.23).</p> <p>Where land is in unknown ownership and so scheduled in the Book of Reference as such, the Applicant has not been able to identify the relevant holder of that interest. All identified owners of interests have been approached and where possible agreement has been reached. Negotiations will continue, but the Applicant considers compulsory acquisition powers can be justified to ensure that the Project can be developed within a reasonably commercial timescale (SoR, paragraph 7.24).</p> <p>The proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the Order land is for a legitimate purpose and is necessary and proportionate to that purpose (SoR, paragraph 11.5).</p> <p>The Applicant has set out clear and specific proposals of how the Order land will be used (SoR, paragraph 11.6).</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons [REP5-006] and Book of Reference [REP1-010] set out clearly how the Order land will be used.</p> <p>The requisite funds are available to meet any costs of land acquisition or amount of compensation payable as a result of the use of powers of compulsory acquisition (SoR, paragraph 11.7).</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-025] submitted by the Applicant clearly sets out the availability of funds</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>required to meet any costs of land acquisition, or compensation payable as a result of the utilisation of compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <p>The Applicant will have the ability to procure the financial resources necessary to fund the works, subject to final board authority. The Applicant is a wholly owned subsidiary of Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd who, together with Vattenfall AB (the ultimate parent company), have substantial net assets as well as positive track records in the field of renewable energy development. The Applicant and Vattenfall AB will therefore be able to procure the required funding for the Project, including all likely compensation liabilities resulting from the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers (Funding Statement, paragraph 3.9).</p> <p>b. The Applicant has given consideration to human rights issues both before and after the Application was submitted. Paragraph 8 of the SoR sets out that consideration.</p> <p>The purpose of powers of compulsory acquisition to be included in the Order justifies interfering with the human rights of those persons with an interest in the land proposed to be acquired (SoR, paragraph 11.8).</p> <p>The Applicant has weighed the potential infringement of rights contained in the European Convention on Human Rights (in consequence of the inclusion of compulsory powers within the Order) with the potential public benefits if the Order is made (SoR, paragraph 8.68).</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>The Applicant considers that there would be significant public benefit arising from the grant of development consent. That benefit is only likely to be realised if the Order includes powers of compulsory acquisition. The significant public benefits on balance outweigh the effects upon persons who own property and rights within the Order land (SoR, paragraph 6.68).</p> <p>Those affected by compulsory acquisition may claim compensation in accordance with the Statutory Compensation Code. Through its ultimate parent company, the Applicant has the resources to provide such compensation (SoR, 8.58).</p> <p>Should the Order be made, a person aggrieved may also challenge the Order in the High Court if they consider that the grounds for doing so are made out pursuant to section 118 of the 2008 Act. Affected persons have the right to apply to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), if compensation is disputed (SoR, 8.61).</p> <p>The requirements of compensation being payable for the acquisition of any interest are met. Therefore Article 1 of Protocol 1 is not contravened (SoR, 8.62).</p> <p>In considering article 8 of Protocol 1, the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the Order land is for a legitimate purpose and is necessary and proportionate to that purpose (SoR, paragraph 11.5). The Applicant has weighed the potential infringement of Convention Rights in consequence of the inclusion of compulsory powers within the dDCO with the potential public benefits if the dDCO is made. The Applicant considers that there would be significant public benefit from the grant of</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>development consent, and that benefit is only likely to be realised if the dDCO includes powers of compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>c. The Applicant considers the compelling case and proportionate tests in section 7 of the SoR (sections 7.30-7.34). The need for the Project and the support for such projects in the relevant NPS' demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest for the required interests to be acquired compulsorily (s122(3) Planning Act 2008) (SoR, paragraph 11.3).</p> <p>As outlined above, the Applicant considers the project to be (i) in accordance with established and emerging national policy in relation to NSIPs contained in NPS EN-1, NPS EN-3 and NPS EN-5, (ii) required to meet a pressing national need for electricity generating capacity and (iii) necessary and proportionate to the extent that interference with private rights is required (SoR, 7.34).</p>
Q3.3.0.2	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	Provide a detailed, track change update of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] in relation to the status of negotiations.	<p>An updated tracked changed version of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] has been submitted by the Applicant.</p> <p>This includes updates to landowner negotiations where applicable and the addition to the Schedule of those parties requested in the questions below.</p>
Q3.3.0.3	The Applicant	Explain in detail the approach taken to identify Category 3 Parties [REP5-007] including the steps taken to keep this information up to date during the course of the Examination.	As set out in paragraph 8.59 of the Statement of Reasons [REP5-007], the Applicant has consulted persons set out in the categories contained in section 44 of the 2008 Act, which include owners of the Order land and those who may be able to make claims either under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 or Part 1 of the Land

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Compensation Act 1973. No persons were identified in the latter category.</p> <p>As set out in the Consultation Report [APP – 027], paragraph 505, based on the environmental information available at the point of the Applicant's sister project's (Norfolk Vanguard – Sharing the same cable corridor and with the onshore project substations being located on land adjacent to one another) statutory consultation (in October 2017), and the further review of the position of the Order limits of the Applicant's application, the Applicant concluded that there would be no Part 1 claims substantiated. Therefore, the Applicant did not include any parties in the scope for land referencing in this regard and in the formal section 42/44 consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant has not identified any persons who may potentially be eligible to substantiate a Part 1 claim under Category 3.</p> <p>In relation to potential claimants under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, the Applicant has conducted diligent enquiries to identify those persons who may be able to satisfy a claim for compensation under this section.</p> <p>As set out in the Consultation Report [APP – 027], the Applicant issued multiple rounds of Request for Information Forms (RFIs) to interested parties and landowners identified from the land registry, requesting information relating to other parties who may have private rights across the Order land. Discussions were also held with landowners by the Applicant's Land</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Agents to identify other third party rights across the land. All land registry documentation was interrogated and rights identified and documented in the Book of Reference (BoR) [REP1-011] Part 2.</p> <p>Prior to and during the course of the examination, the Applicant has continued to liaise with affected landowners in regards to the presence of third party rights holders on their land through the ongoing discussions regarding agreements and survey access. The Applicant has also conducted regular checks with the land registry to ensure that any further interests, should they arise, are identified and included in the final version of the Book of Reference.</p>
Q3.3.0.4	The Applicant	<p>The NFU [REP5-074] indicates that landowner Dillington is identified on the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] at Row 32 and that discussions are ongoing over access matters. The Applicant states at Deadline 6 [REP6-014] that it considers a way forward has been agreed in relation to access and that Heads of Terms have been signed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm whether Dillington is included in the Schedule and if not, please add a new row with all relevant details.</li> <li>By reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm which access is the subject of ongoing discussion and for what reason.</li> <li>Confirm whether or not agreement has been reached in relation to outstanding matters and if not, what the matters are that are preventing agreement</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Row 32 refers to 'Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Mr G Anderson'. Mr Anderson runs the Dillington Estate as it is more commonly referred to by the NFU and land agents. As a point of clarity we understand the Dillington Estate is now represented by Strutt &amp; Parker.</li> <li>The Applicant is not aware of any ongoing discussions regarding an access for Mr Anderson or the Dillington Estate and requests that the NFU confirm which access is considered to be the reason of ongoing discussion. The Applicant will also address this matter directly with the NFU along with the landowner's agent and solicitor through Option Agreement negotiation.</li> <li>c) Heads of Terms (HoTs) for an option agreement have been agreed with Mr Anderson and the Applicant is proceeding to negotiate an Option Agreement for the required rights.</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.3.0.5	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The NFU [REP5-074] indicates that landowner James Keith is not identified on the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] and that discussions are ongoing over access matters. The Applicant states at Deadline 6 [REP6-014] that it considers a way forward has been agreed in relation to access and that Heads of Terms have been signed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add James Keith to the Schedule.</li> <li>By reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm which access is the subject of ongoing discussion and for what reason.</li> <li>Confirm whether or not agreement has been reached in relation to outstanding matters and if not, what the matters are that are preventing agreement.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>James Keith has been added to the updated Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule submitted at deadline7.</li> <li>Accesses under discussion are AC141, AC142 and AC143. The reason for the previous discussions is that Mr Keith would prefer alternative accesses are used from the south of the cable corridor.</li> <li>Mr Keith has signed HoTs for an Option Agreement. To minimise the extent of access use for cable pulling activities, the Applicant has undertaken with the landowner, through the private agreement and discussions, to not utilise the middle of the three northern accesses (AC142). Also, where possible, the Applicant has undertaken to use the preferred accesses from the south through discussions with the Landowner for operational access purposes. Where the Applicant has agreed not to use certain accesses and utilise alternatives, these will remain in the DCO in case negotiations break down or the landowner defaults on the agreements.</li> </ol>
Q3.3.0.6	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The NFU [REP5-074] indicates that landowner Bawdeswell is not identified on the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] and that discussions are ongoing over access matters. The Applicant states at Deadline 6 [REP6-014] that it considers a way forward has been agreed in relation to access but Heads of Terms have not been signed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add Bawdeswell to the Schedule.</li> <li>By reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm which access is the subject of ongoing discussion and for what reason.</li> <li>Are Heads of Terms likely to be signed before the end of the Examination and what steps are being taken to achieve this?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has now added the Bawdeswell Estate to the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule. There are two rows that have been added as the Bawdeswell Estate ownership is split into two sets of trustees.</li> <li>Access AC120 is the operational access of concern, shown on sheet 26 of the Access to Works plans [APP-011]. This access provides a number of routes around the estate to the north, shown on Sheet 26. The Applicant understands that the Estate considers that a simpler access is possible from the north from Jordan Green off Jordan Lane. Furthermore, the Applicant understands that the Estate considers that</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>the access should route through the yard at Manor Farm rather than via the field boundary.</p> <p>c. The Applicant has on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March received the two sets of HoTs signed from the Estate after agreeing that the access from the north (through Jordan Green off Jordan Lane) is acceptable and will be utilised where possible. Where the Applicant has agreed not to use certain accesses and utilise alternatives, these will remain in the DCO in case negotiations break down or the landowner defaults on the agreements.</p>
Q3.3.0.7	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The NFU [REP5-074] indicates that discussions are ongoing over access matters with landowner Padulli (Row 27 of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6- 023]. The Applicant states at Deadline 6 [REP6-014] that Heads of Terms for an option agreement have been agreed but not yet signed and that it is anticipated that these will be signed in the near future, following which discussions will commence to negotiate the form of Option and Deed documentation.</p> <p>a. By reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm which access is the subject of ongoing discussion and for what reason.</p> <p>b. Are Heads of Terms now signed and if not, what are the factors that are preventing this?</p>	<p>a. The access under discussion is AC50. The Landowner would prefer access was taken from the north at the T-Junction seen on Sheet 11, north of AC50. The Applicant is not able to incorporate this preferred access due to a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced visibility for both users of the existing Brick Kiln Lane/ Felmingham Road junction and for a new construction access.</li> <li>• Increased likelihood of confusion related to traffic movements at the Brick Kiln Lane/ Felmingham Road junction and interaction with the construction access.</li> <li>• Typical construction vehicles using an alternative field access would not be able to carry out the detailed 180 degree manoeuvre approaching from the south on Felmingham Road into the alternative access.</li> <li>• The existing proposed access AC50 provides benefits (including visibility and safety) at its current location compared to the access to the north.</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>However in recent discussions, the Applicant has agreed to not use AC50 and utilise access directly from the highway at the easement corridor crossing point, directly south of AC50, at AC49. This will be reflected in the final agreed form Option Agreement between the parties; however, in the meantime, the Applicant requires the power to keep AC50 within the dDCO.</p> <p>b. HoTs are still not signed with this party and the Applicant is in discussions with the land agent to conclude matters swiftly. The Applicant believes there are no further outstanding points.</p>
Q3.3.0.8	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The NFU [REP5-074] indicates that discussions are ongoing over access matters with landowner Siely (Row 14 of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023]. The Applicant states at Deadline 6 [REP6-014] that Heads of Terms have been agreed and signed.</p> <p>a. By reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm which access is the subject of ongoing discussion and for what reason.</p> <p>b. Confirm the position.</p>	<p>a. The access under discussion is AC1. The Landowner and land agent were asking why the farm track heading east from this access was not utilised at this location, instead of the field as shown on the plans. The Applicant has since explained the reasoning, being to avoid conflicting access with other users and to ensure a suitable width is possible at all times along the access. The existing track is too narrow in places.</p> <p>b. HoTs for an Option Agreement have been signed with the Applicant and the Applicant understands that the land agent and Landowner are satisfied with the response provided.</p>
Q3.3.0.9	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The NFU [REP5-074] indicates that discussions are ongoing over access matters with landowner Mutimer (Row 38 of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6- 023]. The Applicant states at Deadline 6 [REP6-014] that agreement has been reached and Heads of Terms signed.</p>	<p>a. Access AC53 is under discussion. This is due to the landowner preferring a more direct access from the highway rather than the current route as shown around the field boundaries.</p> <p>b. Whilst the Applicant needs to retain AC53 in the dDCO, the Applicant has agreed to use an alternative access directly from the highway into the</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. By reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm which access is the subject of ongoing discussion and for what reason.</li> <li>b. Confirm the position.</li> </ul>	<p>easement corridor where reasonably possible. This will be reflected in the final form Option Agreement</p>
Q3.3.0.10	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The Applicant states at Deadline 5 [REP5-045] that Carrick (Row 34 of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] that Heads of Terms for an option agreement have been issued by the Applicant and negotiations are ongoing and that the Applicant considers that it will be possible to reach agreement in due course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. By reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm what access is the subject of ongoing discussion.</li> <li>b. What are the detailed arrangements that would enable the land subject to temporary possession for access purposes, where this land is used by others for access purposes, to be used by others during the period of temporary possession? How would this be secured?</li> <li>c. Are Heads of Terms likely to be signed before the end of the Examination, what are the matters of dispute and what steps are being taken to achieve this?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The access under discussion is AC131.</li> <li>b. All accesses identified on the Land Plans and Access to Works Plans are for permanent rights of access during operation. A subset of the accesses will be potentially required for specific aspects of construction also and these are fully detailed in Table 2.1 of the Outline Access Management Plan (OAMP) [APP-701].</li> </ul> <p>All accesses are occupied and utilised by Landowners and other third parties. Where possible the Applicant will minimise the impact on other users of the accesses when travelling from the highway to the works.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP), secured under Requirement 21 of the dDCO and subject to approval by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highway authority, includes a range of delivery management measures including co-ordinating HGV delivery demand with local businesses.</p> <p>In relation to field access across the cable corridor, the Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCocP) [REP5-011] includes the provision that temporary means of access will be provided to severed fields for vehicles and machinery in order to ensure access is</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>maintained wherever practicable and further that wherever practicable, appropriate planning and timing of works will be agreed with landowners and occupiers, subject to individual agreements, to reduce conflicts.</p> <p>In addition, the role of the Agricultural Liaison Officer (ALO) will include ensuring that landowners and occupiers are consulted in respect of requirements relating to field entrances, accesses and access across the construction strip to land-locked or severed land parcels. The OCoCP is secured under dDCO Requirement 20.</p> <p>c. The Applicant is hopeful that HoTs can be signed before the close of Examination and is keen to hold further discussions with the affected landowner and occupier.</p> <p>The landowner is concerned with the impact the use of the access may have on the wedding business which operates from the premises close to the access track. The Applicant has reviewed a potential alternative access proposed by the Landowners, however the Applicant has responded to state that the alternative cannot be used for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing access contained in the dDCO is shorter, limiting the time and materials required to establish the temporary access improvements if required. The longer</li> </ul>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>alternative route proposed by the Landowner will require more time and materials to be put in place suitable for the cable jointing works and subsequently reinstatement which will result in additional traffic to the location and for a longer period of time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing access is direct to the cable route with the exception of one 90 degree bend. The alternative access introduces at least four 90 degree bends which will likely require additional land take and materials to allow for vehicle turning.</li> <li>• The existing access provides a safer existing entry/exit point onto the public highway through an existing bellmouth suitable for construction traffic. The alternative access would likely require potential improvements to the junction with the public highway to make it safe which may include a bellmouth and or tree removal for improved visibility. Again, these works would also extend the time required to establish and reinstatement the access.</li> <li>• The existing access avoids interaction with a non-designated historic monument (ref 1273) which the alternative access would impact as part of any track improvements.</li> <li>• The existing access is further away from Woodgate Meadow County Wildlife Site (CWS) whilst the alternative access would border alongside the western and southern boundary of the CWS. The proximity to the CWS has the potential to impact ecologically sensitive</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>features, including, but not limited to, bat roosts and 3 ponds which have not been assessed for Great Crested Newt habitat suitability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided undertakings to reduce work at weekends so far as possible, which, the Applicant would assume, would be the busiest time for both the wedding venue and campsite. These can be captured in the private agreements.</li> <li>• Access routes will be constructed according to site conditions to minimise damage by the use of trackway, bog mats etc.</li> <li>• The actual joint bay worksites will be at least 450 metres from the venues, so impact is limited to traffic movements only.</li> </ul>
Q3.3.0.11	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The plots identified for Albanwise Ltd, Row 39 of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] appears not to include 12/03 &amp; 12/05- Acquisition of Permanent New Rights.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By reference to the Land Plans, please confirm the position.</li> <li>Update the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule as necessary.</li> </ol>	<p>The two parcels identified are adopted highway parcels. There is a rebuttable presumption that the neighbouring landowner owns the subsoil of the half width of the highway, as included in the Book of Reference, and therefore the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule has been updated accordingly.</p>
Q3.3.0.12	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The plots identified for Christopher S Wright, Row 49 of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] appears not to include 24/05, 24/10, 24/16 &amp; 25/04 - Acquisition of Permanent New Rights.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By reference to the Land Plans, please confirm the</li> </ol>	<p>The two parcels identified are adopted highway parcels. There is a rebuttable presumption that the neighbouring landowner owns the subsoil of the half width of the highway, as included in the Book of Reference, and therefore the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule has been updated accordingly.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>position.</p> <p>b. Update the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule as necessary.</p>	
Q3.3.0.13	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	<p>The Trustees of Stinton Hall Trust, Row 42 of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] do not seem to be included in the Book of Reference [REP1-011].</p> <p>a. By reference to the Book of Reference, please confirm the position.</p> <p>b. Update the Book of Reference and Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule as necessary.</p>	<p>a. The land included in the Book of Reference known as the Salle estate is owned in title by 4 trustees, being Sir David Robert Macgowan Chapman Baronet, Grant Stanley Pilcher, Michael Alan Dewing, William Robert Bartle Edwards. However through discussions with the representing Land Agent in relation to this land, they requested that the land was split into two separate trusts referred to as the Salle Park Trust and Stinton Hall Trust. This approach is for the purposes of the private agreements and the correct landownership remains as documented in the Book of Reference.</p> <p>b. On this basis the Applicant considers the Book of Reference and Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule do not require updating.</p>
Q3.3.0.14	NFU/LIG Affected Persons	In addition to the accesses referred to in Questions Q3.2.0.4 - Q3.2.0.10, are there any other accesses that are of particular concern and if so, what are the specific details of that concern? Indicate by reference to the Access to Works Plan [APP-011].	
Q3.3.0.15	The Applicant, NFU/LIG Affected Persons	With reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] confirm what arrangements would be in place that would enable temporary possession for access purposes as well as enable the land to be used by others during the period of temporary possession? How would these arrangements be secured?	<p>Where possible the Applicant will minimise the impact on other users of the accesses when travelling from the highway to the works.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP), secured under Requirement 21 of the dDCO and subject to approval by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highway authority, includes a range of delivery management measures including co-ordinating HGV delivery demand with local businesses.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>In relation to field access across the cable corridor, the OCoCP [REP5-011] includes the provision that temporary means of access will be provided to severed fields for vehicles and machinery in order to ensure access is maintained wherever practicable and further that wherever practicable, appropriate planning and timing of works will be agreed with landowners and occupiers, subject to individual agreements, to reduce conflicts.</p> <p>In addition, the role of the ALO (as referred to in Appendix B of the OCoCP) will include ensuring that landowners and occupiers are consulted in respect of requirements relating to field entrances, accesses and accesses across the construction strip to land-locked or severed land parcels. The OCoCP is secured under dDCO Requirement 20.</p>
Q3.3.0.16	The Applicant, The Crown Estate	Update progress in securing written consent under s135(2) from the Crown Estate for inclusion of the Crown plots in the dDCO [REP5-045, Q2.3.0.9].	The Applicant and the Crown Estate Commissioners (the <b>Commissioners</b> ) are continuing to work together to agree a position which would provide the Commissioners with sufficient assurance as to the way in which compulsory acquisition powers of any third party interests in Crown land forming part of the Crown Estate may be exercised. This would permit the Commissioners to provide their consent to the compulsory acquisition of the third party interests in the relevant plots for the purpose of section 135(1) of the Planning Act 2008 and their consent to the provisions of the dDCO for the purpose of section 135(2) of the 2008 Act. The Applicant and the Commissioners are mindful of the date for the closing of the Examination and both parties intend to write to the Planning Inspectorate as soon as possible to confirm the final position. This response has been agreed with the Commissioners.

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.3.0.17	The Applicant	<p>Indicate with reference to the Access to Works plans [APP-011] all other locations within the application where land subject to temporary possession for access purposes, is used by others for access purposes. What are the detailed arrangements that would enable the land to be used by others during the period of temporary possession? How would this be secured?</p>	<p>All accesses identified on the Land Plans and Access to Works Plans are for permanent rights of access during operation. A subset of the accesses will be potentially required for specific aspects of construction also and these are fully detailed in Table 2.1 of the Outline Access Management Plan (OAMP) [APP-701].</p> <p>All accesses are occupied and utilised by Landowners and other third parties. Where possible the Applicant will minimise the impact on other users of the accesses when travelling from the highway to the works.</p> <p>The Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP), secured under Requirement 21 of the dDCO and subject to approval by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highway authority, includes a range of delivery management measures including co-ordinating HGV delivery demand with local businesses.</p> <p>In relation to field access across the cable corridor, the OCoCP [REP5-011] includes the provision that temporary means of access will be provided to severed fields for vehicles and machinery in order to ensure access is maintained wherever practicable and further that wherever practicable, appropriate planning and timing of works will be agreed with landowners and occupiers, subject to individual agreements, to reduce conflicts.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>In addition, the role of the ALO (as referred to in Appendix B of the OCoCP) will include ensuring that landowners and occupiers are consulted in respect of requirements relating to field entrances, accesses and access across the construction strip to land-locked or severed land parcels. The OCoCP is secured under dDCO Requirement 20.</p>
Q3.3.0.18	The Applicant	<p>What is the latest position regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. progress in reaching agreement with the Statutory Undertakers identified in the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule;</li> <li>b. whether protective provisions are in a satisfactory form that is agreed with relevant parties and if not, what steps are required to avoid serious detriment to the carrying on of their undertakings;</li> <li>c. the position of Highways England in relation to property agreements as per Question 2.3.0.12 [REP6-014 Applicant's Comments on Responses to the ExA's Further Written Questions].</li> </ol>	<p>a.</p> <p><b>National Grid</b>        Agreement has been reached with National Grid Gas, and discussions with National Grid Electricity are at an advanced stage. The Applicant considers that agreement will be reached by the close of the Examination.</p> <p><b>Network Rail</b>        The Option Agreement/Deed of Grant have not yet been agreed between the parties but there are only a couple of points outstanding remaining to be agreed. The Applicant therefore expects Network Rail to be in a position to write to the Planning Inspectorate shortly to confirm its acceptance to the protective provisions.</p> <p><b>Cadent Gas</b>        Agreement has been reached with Cadent which the Applicant expects will shortly be signed to allow removal of Cadent's representation.</p> <p><b>UK Power Networks</b>        Agreement has been reached with UK Power Networks which sets out the interaction between the Project and the assets of UK Power Networks. UK Power Networks did not submit a representation to the dDCO.</p> <p><b>Eni UK Limited</b>        As the Applicant outlined in response to Further WQ 2.3.0.28 [REP5-045] Eni UK Limited has confirmed that it</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>no longer holds an interest in the land affected by the project.</p> <p>b.</p> <p><b>National Grid</b> Protective provisions are in an agreed form between the parties and on completion of the agreements, these will be incorporated in the dDCO.</p> <p><b>Network Rail</b> As the Applicant outlines above, the Option Agreement/Deed of Grant have not yet been agreed between the parties but there are only a couple of points outstanding remaining to be agreed. The Applicant therefore expects Network Rail to be in a position to write to the Planning Inspectorate shortly to confirm its acceptance to the protective provisions; the Applicant will then include the agreed form protective provisions within the dDCO.</p> <p><b>Cadent</b> Protective provisions are in an agreed form between the parties and on completion of the agreement, these will be incorporated in the dDCO.</p> <p><b>UK Power Networks</b> Protective provisions are in an agreed form between the parties.</p> <p>Other relevant undertakers will be dealt with by the general protective provisions in the dDCO (Schedule 17, Part 1).</p> <p>c. The Applicant is continuing to engage with Highways England with regards to their requirements prior to detailed design. The Applicant is currently awaiting a</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			response from Highways England. The Applicant remains confident that they will satisfy the requirements of Highways England prior to the close of Examination.
Q3.3.0.19	The Applicant	What would be the implications for compulsory acquisition if the SoS decided that trenchless installation techniques should be used to pass under either the B1149 and/ or Church Road, Colby?	<p>If the Applicant were to retain flexibility in the trenchless crossing method that could be most appropriately employed for the location (e.g. HDD, micro-tunnelling, or auger boring) then additional temporary land, outside the current Order limits, would be required to support the range of trenchless crossing methods. This temporary land requirement would be the same as included for all committed trenchless crossings along the cable route, as secured in Requirement 16(15) of the dDCO as up to 7,500m<sup>2</sup> on the drilling entry side and 5,000m<sup>2</sup> on the drill exit side.</p> <p>However, as the Applicant also explains in response to Q3.5.3.7 below, Norfolk Vanguard, in response to the letter from the Secretary of State has developed a bespoke design whereby, in the event the Secretary of State decides that a trenchless crossing of the B1149 is necessary, a single compound could be included within the existing order limits. The assessment for this bespoke design (which is directly applicable to Norfolk Boreas under scenario 2) was submitted at Deadline 7 of the Norfolk Boreas examination (ExA.AS-3.D7.V1). This bespoke design only accommodates the HDD trenchless crossing method (and no other trenchless crossing method) in order to minimise supporting construction compound requirements, such that the compound could be wholly contained within the current Order limits. At all other trenchless crossing locations flexibility is retained for all trenchless crossing methods so that the most appropriate solution can be employed following</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>ground investigation, cable design (sizing) and detailed design of the trenchless crossing.</p> <p>To accommodate a HDD at this location within the Order limits would be constraining the Project design prior to detailed design and investigations being conducted. In this bespoke trenchless design, a temporary works compound of 100m x 45m (4,500m<sup>2</sup>) would be required to support the works within the existing Order limits.</p> <p>At Church Road, Colby, an equivalent constrained HDD compound within the Order limits could be implemented if the Secretary of State was minded to require a trenchless crossing at this location. NNDC have recently [REP6-043] proposed the potential extension of the running track to the north to avoid the current crossing location of Church Road if a trenchless crossing was employed at this location. It is the Applicant's position that this is not a suitable alternative and if such an approach was taken, this would result in approximately 400m of running track length with 6m width (2,400m<sup>2</sup>) outside of the current Order limits. Further details are provided in the Position Statement Church Road, submitted at Deadline 7 [ExA.as-1.D7.V1].</p> <p>It is the Applicant's position that an open cut crossing method is shown to be most appropriate at both of these locations to minimise overall impacts and such a method would be fully retained within the Order limits without undue project design constraints.</p>
Q3.3.0.20	Statutory Undertakers	Are there any matters that you wish to raise in relation to an objection or issue that is relevant to the effects of the Proposed Development on your undertaking, apparatus or land?	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.3.0.21	The Applicant	Whilst the ExA acknowledges that in relation to National Trust land, the National Trust has withdrawn its objection [REP2-078], the ExA still needs to decide whether what is applied for, is necessary. Provide a summary of the case in relation to s130 – National Trust land including references to the Examination Library as appropriate.	<p>Under section 130 of the Planning Act 2008 (the Act), an order granting development consent is subject to special parliamentary procedure to the extent that it authorises compulsory acquisition of land belonging to National Trust which is held by the Trust inalienably where the conditions in subsection (3) are met. These conditions are that a representation or objection to the compulsory acquisition of land has been made by the National Trust and that objection has not been withdrawn.</p> <p>The Applicant requires land belonging to the National Trust, or in which the National Trust has an interest in order to deliver work No.6 forming part of the cable corridor.</p> <p>As a result, the Applicant has scheduled land interests belonging to the National Trust in its application Book of Reference at Plots 15/06, 15/07, 15/08, 15/09, 15/10, 15/11, 15/12, 15/13, 15/14, 15/15, 16/02, 16/03, 16/04, 16/05, 16/07, 16/08, 16/09, 16/10, 16/11, 16/12, 16/13, 16/14, 17/01, 17/02, 17/04, 17/05, 17/06, 17/07 18/01 and 18/02, and the National Trust is an occupier of Plot 17/03.</p> <p>However heads of terms and an Option Agreement have been agreed with the National Trust. As a result the National Trust has withdrawn its objection to the project [REP2-078], and the Applicant therefore submits that section 130 of the Act is no longer engaged.</p>
Q3.3.0.22	The Applicant	Summarise the case in relation to s132 – Open Space with reference to documents in the Examination Library.	The Applicant confirms that there are 2 areas where section 132 of the PA 2008 is engaged. Paragraph 8.5 of the Statement of Reasons sets out the position in relation to landfall, and the crossing of the Marriot's Way

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>(the Open Space Land). There is no surface work in relation to the Open Space Land as the Applicant has committed to trenchless crossing.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.18 of the Statement of Reasons sets out the Applicant's position in relation to the Open Space Land – the Open Space Land, when burdened with the rights to install, inspect and maintain the cables, fibre optic cables and ducts, will not be any less advantageous to persons in whom it is vested, other persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights, and to the public. There will be no impact on public access to this land and there will be no less advantageous beneficial use of the Open Space Land for any party currently interested in that land. The Applicant therefore submits that section 132(3) of the Planning Act 2008 is therefore engaged.</p>
Q3.3.0.23	The Applicant	What is the latest position regarding progress with securing final, signed copies of the Funding Agreement [APP-025] between the Applicant, (Norfolk Boreas Limited), the Company (Vattenfall Wind Power Limited) and the Parent Company (Vattenfall AB) and submitting these into the Examination and timescale for submitting signed agreement into the Examination?	The funding agreement between Vattenfall AB and the Applicant was completed on 10 March 2020. A copy of the completed agreement has been submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference ExA.AS-6.D7.V1).
Q3.3.0.24	The Applicant	Confirm whether the funding agreement covers the costs of implementing the project and the funding required for Compulsory Acquisition and temporary possession. If not, how would the funding be secured?	<p>As the application for the Order includes a request for powers of compulsory acquisition for the Applicant, a Funding Statement was required to be submitted with the application as per Regulation 5(2)(h) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (the APFP Regulations) (Funding Statement, paragraph 1.9).</p> <p>The Funding Statement explains how the Applicant proposes to fund the land and rights to be acquired and also the implementation of the Project. It is part of a</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>suite of DCO application documents and should be read alongside those documents, in particular the Statement of Reasons (Funding Statement, paragraph 1.10). The Funding Statement is unchanged since its submission at Application.</p> <p><b>Information on funding the project</b></p> <p>The Applicant and Vattenfall AB (the <b>Parent Company</b>) have substantial net assets as well as a positive track record in the field of renewable energy development. The Applicant and the Parent Company have agreed collectively that they are able to procure the required funding for the Project, including all likely compensation liabilities resulting from the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers (Funding Statement, paragraph 3.9). The last published accounts of the Applicant for the year ended December 2018 show a total fixed assets of £2,673,000 (ExA.FWQR.D5.VA).</p> <p>The Applicant will have the ability to procure the financial resources necessary to fund the works to be authorised by the Order, subject to final Board authority. The Applicant and the Parent Company have the experience and reputation to enable funds to be procured (Funding Statement, paragraph 3.2).</p> <p>The Applicant intends to secure funding for construction of the Project after certainty is obtained on the development consent, the tender process is complete for the major construction contracts and the investment case has been satisfied. Once these criteria are met the Applicant will take a final investment decision (FID) which will irrevocably commit funding (Funding Statement, paragraph 3.3).</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>The Applicant has been at the forefront of financing renewable energy projects for more than 10 years. In that time, it has been involved in many significant renewable energy transactions and construction projects in the UK. The Applicant has considerable experience and expertise in constructing renewable energy projects (Funding Statement, paragraph 3.5).</p> <p>Vattenfall is the second largest developer in the global offshore wind sector, and has invested over £3 billion in the UK, mainly in onshore and offshore wind. Vattenfall now operates more than 1GW of wind and solar power capacity in the UK and plans to invest over €5billion in renewables, mainly offshore wind, in Northern Europe by the end of 2020. The UK will continue to be a growth market for Vattenfall, with Norfolk Boreas (as well as Norfolk Vanguard) providing a very significant next step.</p> <p><b>Information on funding claims for compensation</b></p> <p>The Applicant has been advised that the total property cost estimates for the acquisition of the required interests in land should not exceed £1.7 million in the event of scenario 1, or £6.8 million in the event of scenario 2 (Funding Statement paragraph 4.1).</p> <p>The Applicant has sufficient committed funds and resources available to meet (i) the compensation arising from all compulsory acquisition of land and rights pursuant to the DCO and (ii) any statutory blight claims that may arise (Funding Statement, paragraph 4.7).</p> <p>It is not anticipated that claims for statutory blight will arise as a result of the promotion of the Order. Should claims for blight arise as a consequence of the application for the Order being made, and before it is known whether the Project will proceed, the costs of</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>meeting blight claims that are upheld will be met from the capital reserves of the Applicant or the Parent Company (Funding Statement, paragraph 4.8). The Applicant's responses to the ExA's Further Written Questions at Deadline 5 (REP5-045) (at 2.3.0.5 and 2.3.0.6) confirms a breakdown of the estimated costs for the likely levels of compensation that would be required if no voluntary agreements were concluded and compulsory acquisition powers (including temporary possession) were required to acquire all land and interests, as well as the estimated cost of construction of the project.</p> <p>The Funding Agreement is designed to cover the costs of acquisition of the required interests in land, and not the funding of the construction of the project with the decision on the funding for the project, as set out above, being taken after there is certainty on the development consent.</p>
Q3.3.0.25	The Applicant	Confirm how security of funding would be ensured in the event that any or all of the benefit of the Order is transferred to another person (Article 6).	<p>Under the Funding Agreement, the benefit of the Order can be assigned by the Applicant to another person where such assignment is to a person to whom the Secretary of State has provided consent under the Order to receive a transfer of powers in the DCO (save where consent is not required in the limited exceptions outlined in Article 6(11)) (clause 6.2.1 of the Funding Agreement). In such event the parent company would remain responsible to fund the compensation and cost of acquisition of the necessary interests should the assignee fail to settle claims. As such there is the necessary protection for claimants in respect of any outstanding compensation claims following the exercise</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>of any compulsory acquisition powers. The Applicant, having reached agreement on HoTs with the significant majority of landowners and being in the process of settling option agreements, does not expect to have to exercise CA powers but those powers are retained so as to protect against circumstances where either agreement is not reached or in respect of any third party interests. This approach is adopted as good practice on other DCOs.</p> <p>Article 6(14) of the dDCO also provides that any notice of the transfer of benefit must state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the name and contact details of the person to whom the benefit of the provisions will be transferred or granted;</li> <li>b) the date on which the transfer is to take effect;</li> <li>c) the provisions to be transferred or granted; and</li> <li>d) the restrictions liabilities and obligations that will apply to the person exercising the powers transferred or granted.</li> </ul> <p>Article 6(14) also provides that confirmation of the availability and adequacy of funds for compensation associated with the compulsory acquisition of the Order land must be provided, save for (1) any transfers to a transmission licence holder, as such parties are regulated by OFGEM and ensured to have strong covenant strength, and (2) when the time limit for claims for the compulsory acquisition of land have elapsed, and any such claims have been resolved or withdrawn.</p>
Q3.3.0.26	The Applicant	The ExA notes the answer provided at REP5-045, Q2.3.0.21 in relation to Article 24 – Acquisition of subsoil and airspace only. Explain why this should apply to the entirety of the Order Land	The Applicant re-confirms its response at Deadline 5 (REP5-045) 2.3.0.21 that it requires the flexibility to apply articles 24 and 25 across the authorised project in order

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		particularly given that overhead electricity lines and the laying of cables do not extend throughout the Order land.	<p>to minimise the extent of the interests to be acquired from owners. The Applicant considers that this is appropriate in the context of subsoil for cables to be laid underground or in the context of subsoil and airspace for electricity lines to be installed overhead where the entire freehold interest may not be required.</p> <p>It should, however, be noted that the wording within Article 24 of the dDCO refers to acquisition of rights for subsoil or airspace of the land. The undertaker would not therefore be seeking both of these rights over the entirety of the Order Land as for the most part the undertaker would be using subsoil rights for the cable route but flexibility as to either subsoil, airspace or both is required. The purpose of this article is also to protect a landowner by limiting the strata of an interest to be acquired to that actually needed (instead of acquiring the whole of the land) – enabling the ownership of the unrequired elements to remain with the landowner.</p>

#### 4 Cumulative effects of other proposals

##### 4.0 General cumulative effects, including phasing

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			



#### 4.1 Onshore cumulative effects of other proposals (construction)

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

## 5 Development Consent Order and Deemed Marine Licences

### 5.0 General

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.0.1	The Applicant, Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Outstanding matters in the dDCO of concern to MMO</b></p> <p>Provide an update on progress in resolving issues raised by the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) [REP6-014] related to ExA Written Question 2.5.0.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cable Crossings;</li> <li>- Disposal Site queries and references;</li> <li>- Definition of Inert.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cable crossings:</b></p> <p>As stated in the latest version of the SoCG [REP6-029] <i>"The MMO acknowledges the Applicant's comments on the matter of cable crossings and on this occasion accepts that specific instances of cable crossings cannot be specified at this time and volumes of cable protection are secured within the DCO/DML."</i> Therefore, this matter has been <b>agreed</b> within the SoCG</p> <p><b>Disposal sites:</b></p> <p>The MMO provided the Applicant with a confirmation letter with the disposal site references for the DCO/DMLs on 4 March 2020, and these have been included within the version of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7. There is just one very minor amendment that the MMO have asked the Applicant to make to the Site Characterisation Report which the Applicant has agreed to, and this is reflected in the updated (and likely final) version which has been submitted for Deadline 7. Therefore, all matters relating to sediment disposal have been <b>agreed</b>.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p><b>Definition of Inert:</b></p> <p>The Applicant's position is that a definition is not required because, unlike a conventional disposal site, foreign material is not being introduced to the marine environment. Sediment will only be moved between discrete locations within the site, and this will only be over a matter of a few hundred metres. Furthermore, sampling undertaken to support the EIA has shown no evidence that the sediments within the offshore project Order limits contain contaminated material over and above that which occurs naturally (Chapter 9 Marine Water and Sediment quality of the ES [APP-222]).</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the MMO have provided the Applicant with a proposed definition used by OSPAR 14 Guidelines. The definition is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Inert material of natural origin, that is solid, chemically unprocessed geological material, the chemical constituents of which are unlikely to be released into the marine environment. The type of inert material including the reason for its classification as inert should be indicated”</i></p> <p>Discussions between the Applicant and the MMO on the requirement for and specific wording of the definition are ongoing and the latest position will be reflected within the SoCG with the MMO which will be submitted at Deadline 8.</p>

## 5.1 Articles

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.1.1	The Applicant	<p><b>dDCO Article 15(3) wording regarding Internal Drainage Boards:</b> Respond to the Water Management Alliance (WMA) [REP5-057] concern that the use of the word 'belong' in dDCO Article 15(3) does not apply to WMA Member Boards who regulate and maintain but do not own watercourses.</p>	<p>As the Applicant explains in response to Q3.5.8.6 below, the Applicant has discussed this matter with the WMA and the parties have come to an agreed approach – the outcome of which results in slightly revised wording within the definition of "specified work" at Schedule 17, Part 7 of the dDCO. This amendment has been made to the revised dDCO submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 3.1 (version 6)).</p>
Q3.5.1.2	The Applicant, National Farmers Union	<p><b>Article 16: Authority to survey and investigate the land onshore</b> As neither party has responded specifically to the suggestion in Q2.5.1.6 and repeated their former positions, parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	<p>The Applicant resists any wording which would limit the Applicant to surveys and investigations for a specified duration and with the use of equipment that was only previously specified prior to the survey/investigation. As the Applicant explained in its comments on the NFU's response to Q5.1.7 at Deadline 4 [REP4-011], to do so would add an additional inefficiency on those undertaking the surveys – for example, in the event an extra investigation was required the team would need to withdraw from the land and serve additional notices, then remobilise on site and enter the land a second time. This would increase the overall duration of occupancy on the landowner's land and potentially increase the risk of damage to land and crops.</p> <p>In any event, as outlined in Appendix B of the OCoCP [REP5-010], the Agricultural Liaison Officer will be appointed by the Applicant prior to the commencement of pre-construction activities and will be the prime contact for ongoing engagement about practical matters with landowners, occupiers and their agents before and during the construction process. This includes undertaking pre-construction and day-to-day discussions with affected parties to minimise disruption to existing farming regimes and timings of activities. It is through this avenue that landowners could raise questions on the surveys.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Applicant does not consider it necessary to amend the dDCO.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.1.3	The Applicant, National Farmers' Union	<p><b>Article 26: Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised project</b></p> <p>Both parties have now set out examples of other applications for, and made DCOs which make the case for 14 days' (the Applicant) and 28 days' (the NFU) notice periods before entering on and taking temporary possession of land under Article 26(2) [REP6-014, responses to Q2.5.1.7 and Q2.5.1.8].</p> <p>1. Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	<p>The Applicant relies on its response at Q2.5.1.8 to [REP6-014], as outlined below:</p> <p>The relevant provisions (sections 18 to 23) of the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 (for this question only, the Act) are not yet in force and it is unclear whether or when they will be brought into force, and whether further regulations will be introduced to provide more detail on the operation of the temporary possession regime. As the Act is not yet in force, the Applicant is of the view that it is not currently possible to understand or reflect accurately the temporary possession provisions as intended by Parliament in respect of DCOs. It is not yet known whether the provisions will apply to DCOs or whether there will be any transitional arrangements. The Applicant has therefore applied the 'tried and tested' temporary possession regime that has been included in numerous DCOs to date, and is well understood by practitioners, agents and contractors. Similar provisions were included in the Silvertown Tunnel Order 2018 (article 3(1)(p) and article 29), the Eggborough Gas Fired Generating Station Order 2018 (article 26(12)) and the A19/ A184 Tesco's Junction Alteration Development Consent Order 2018 (article 2(7) and article 29).</p> <p>In contrast to the HS2, A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross and A303 Stonehenge Scheme projects cited by the National Farmers' Union, there are no residential properties within the land identified as subject to compulsory acquisition powers under the dDCO, and the Applicant considers that a 14 day notice period as set out in Article 26 of the dDCO remains appropriate for this project.</p>
n/a	n/a	<p><b>Article 27: Temporary use of land for maintaining authorised project</b></p> <p>Refer to questions under Requirement 19.</p>	

## 5.2 SCHEDULE 1 PART 1: Authorised Development

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

## 5.3 SCHEDULE 1 PART 3: Requirements

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.3.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 15: Scenarios, stages and phases of authorised development onshore</b></p> <p>Provide your proposed wording for sequential post-consent approvals for stages if required, ensuring it takes on board comments from Breckland Council and NNDC regarding avoiding a disjointed approach [REP5-045, response to Q2.5.1.5] and [REP6- 014, response to responses to Q2.5.1.5 and Q2.5.7.1].</p>	<p>The Applicant has discussed this matter with the relevant planning authorities (RPAs) on a conference call on 12 March 2020 and the Applicant understands that there are no differences of opinion in relation to stages. The Applicant and the RPAs are in agreement that it is prudent to apportion the route into stages to align with the RPA boundaries. As the Applicant has outlined previously in REP4-019, there may also be stages for discrete elements of the onshore transmission works such as the landfall, the onshore project substation, and the National Grid extension.</p> <p>Following the Applicant's response to WQ2.5.1.5 submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-045], the Applicant has considered other DCOs in the context of partial discharge. There is no precedent for a partial discharge mechanism found in other DCOs. However, the Applicant considers that, as currently drafted, there is sufficient flexibility in the DCO to set appropriate stages to align with the construction approach (once a contractor is appointed) as well as RPA boundaries.</p> <p>If it became apparent that the Applicant needed to proceed with a distinct element of the works within a stage prior to having discharged all the relevant plans for that stage then, rather than a partial discharge, the Applicant considers that it may be more appropriate to update and resubmit the written scheme for stages under R15(4); this would then allow the Applicant to isolate approval for those works under a (new) stage. From a practical point of view, however, it would</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>be prudent for the contractors and the Applicant to be comfortable that there are no potential issues or areas of concern from the RPAs for any stages within the RPA administrative area before proceeding.</p> <p>In this context it may be appropriate to amend R15(4) to make it explicit that the written scheme for stages can subsequently be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>15(4) The onshore transmission works must not commence until a written scheme setting out the stages of the onshore transmission works for the relevant onshore phase has been submitted to the relevant planning authority, which scheme may subsequently be amended from time to time as notified to the relevant planning authority.</i></p> <p>Whilst the Applicant does not consider the above text to be entirely necessary, the Applicant has updated the dDCO at Deadline 7 accordingly.</p>
Q3.5.3.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 15: Scenarios, stages and phases of authorised development onshore</b></p> <p>Your response to NNDC's suggested wording for R15 additions [REP6-014, response to NNDC response to Q2.5.1.5] refers to its suggestion regarding proposed additions of timetables for discharge of Requirements, but is not clear regarding the proposal to include "an indication as to when each stage is expected to commence and complete".</p> <p>Provide a response.</p>	<p>The written scheme notifying the stages under R15(4) may be discharged at an early stage following appointment of contractors. Therefore, at the time of submission of the scheme, the anticipated construction start and finish dates for each stage may not be known. Given this, the Applicant considers that this element of detail is more appropriate to provide pursuant to the PPA, along with programmes for discharge of Requirements relating to each relevant stage. As the Applicant outlines in response to Further Written Question 2.5.7.1 [REP5-045] the PPA would cover, amongst other things, a project plan and programme for the timely discharge of Requirements across the "stages" (supported by PPA funded resource). The PPA is a more flexible mechanism to enable regular dialogue and liaison through, for example, meetings with the RPAs. It is through this iterative process that accurate and up to date information – including on the expected programme for discharge – could be shared with the RPAs.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.3.3	North Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Requirement 15: Scenarios, stages and phases of authorised development onshore</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment on the Applicant's view that programmes for submission and timetables for discharge would be better dealt with in the PPA? [REP6-014, response to NNDC response to Q2.5.1.5]</li> <li>2. Are you still of the view that an indication of stage commencement and completions should be included in Requirement 15?</li> </ol>	
Q3.5.3.4	The Applicant, North Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Requirement 15: Scenarios, stages and phases of authorised development onshore</b></p> <p>Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers the ExA to its response to WQ Q3.5.3.1 and Q3.5.3.2 above as well as its previous response to Q2.5.1.5 and Q2.5.7.1 submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-045] together with its comments on responses to these respective questions submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6- 014].</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the previous submissions and the Applicant does not consider that any further changes are necessary to either Requirement 15 or the related Schedule 16 discharge process. This process was agreed during the Norfolk Vanguard examination and the Applicant therefore considers that there is benefit for all parties (the Applicant, RPAs, and stakeholders) of ensuring consistency across both projects in the discharge or requirements. The Applicant also refers the ExA to NNDC's response to Q2.5.0.3 at Deadline 5 [REP5-067], which concurs with this position.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to discuss these matters with the RPAs and the Applicant has agreed to share a more detailed note on PPAs, which sets out a further explanation for potential programmes and liaison, with the RPAs.</p>
Q3.5.3.5	Breckland Council Broadland District Council	<p><b>Requirement 15: Scenarios, stages and phases of authorised development onshore</b></p>	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
	Norfolk County Council	Submit any comments on NNDC's suggestions, the Applicant's response and/ or whether you would want to see some or all of NNDC's suggestions incorporated in R15.	
Q3.5.3.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 16 (10): Levels set for the National Grid substation extension</b></p> <p>Should Requirement 16(10) of the dDCO set out different existing ground levels for Scenarios 1 and 2?</p>	<p>The standard design for the National Grid substation extension would be to make any extensions to both the east and west (Scenario 1 and Scenario 2) at the same ground level as the existing substation. The worst case in the Environmental Statement (ES) has been assessed on this basis. This allows for a continuous level busbar (the 400kV bar on which connections are made), including associated connections to the overhead line, switches and cable connections across the entire site. This approach maintains common electrical clearances for equipment and level access routes throughout the substation, which reduces construction, commissioning and operational risks.</p> <p>The standard design of a common ground level for both extensions being continuous with the existing substation has been assessed within the Environmental Statement (ES) including the Landscape and Visual Assessment and associated photomontages. The dDCO secures the dimensions as assessed within the ES.</p> <p>Accordingly, Requirement 16(10) of the dDCO does not need to set out different existing ground levels for Scenario 1 and 2.</p>
Q3.5.3.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 16 (13): Trenchless installation techniques</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any updates required for the Clarification Note Trenchless Crossings B1149 and Church Road, Colby [REP4-017] in the light of D5, D6 representations, and subsequent discussions with NCC?</li> <li>How can the Clarification Note Trenchless Crossings B1149 and Church Road, Colby [REP4-017], which sets out more details for open cut trenches in these two locations, be secured if trenchless crossings are not</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant will update the Trenchless Crossing clarification note to reflect the site specific aspects which were raised and addressed through Deadline 5 and Deadline 6 representations. The Updated clarification note will be submitted at Deadline 8 and will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two week period for open cut crossing works at this specific location including all necessary traffic management measures;</li> <li>Working outside of normal construction hours may be a requirement of a trenchless crossing or could be a choice for open cut crossing if beneficial to minimise the period of works;</li> </ul> </li> </ol>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>recommended for the purpose of passing under the B1149 and Church Road, Colby?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Would the entire document or parts of it be required to be secured?</li> <li>▪ If part, provide a new document containing the relevant parts.</li> </ul> <p>3. Without prejudice, set out appropriate wording to be included in the dDCO and any other relevant documents, including securing any further details, which would enable the SoS to include the use of trenchless installation techniques to pass under either or both of these locations, for scenario 2, if so required.</p> <p>There are further questions related to technical and land related aspects of both crossings in Section 12 of these questions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Traffic management measures will be required throughout the period of an open cut crossing however, no active works are required outside of construction hours. Active works may be required for a trenchless crossing outside of construction hours for technical reasons;</li> <li>▪ Updates to temporary land requirements and associated HGV deliveries to deliver materials required to support trenchless or open cut crossing methods at these specific locations.</li> </ul> <p>2. The Clarification Note Trenchless Crossings B1149 and Church Road, Colby [REP4-017] considers, following requests from NCC and NNDC, the comparative methods for a trenchless crossing and an open cut crossing at the B1149 and Church Road. The purpose of the document is to illustrate the relative differences between an open cut and trenchless crossing method at these locations, noting that trenchless methods allow mitigation of direct impacts to the features being crossed but result in different impacts associated with the technical requirements of the method such as additional plant, materials, temporary land requirements and timescales. The document provided [REP4-017] was a clarification note to explain the differences in impact between each type of crossing. The full and detailed construction method statement for the relevant crossing would be included within the final CoCP, as secured by Requirement 20(2)(g) of the dDCO. Given the original intention and purpose of the clarification note, and that construction method statements will be provided in accordance with the final CoCP under Requirement 20(2)(g), it is not considered necessary to secure the information contained in the clarification note.</p> <p>3. It is the Applicant's position that evidence has been submitted which demonstrates that open cut crossing methods are appropriate and feasible at these locations. For the B1149, the</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Applicant has addressed every issue raised by Norfolk County Council (NCC) to reach a position where NCC has no technical reason to object to the open cut crossing method. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has submitted a Technical Note Responding to Norfolk County Council's Request for Trenchless Crossings of the A1067 and B1149 as Appendix 2 of REP2-050, as well as a full assessment of the trenchless crossing of the B1149 (ExA.AS-2.D7.V1). These assessments are listed as documents considered to form part of the ES, which is itself a certified document under Article 37 and Schedule 18 of the dDCO.</p> <p><b>Church Road, Colby</b> As explained in the Position Statement Church Road, Colby [ExA.AS-1.D7.V1] submitted at Deadline 7, a trenchless crossing in this location would not achieve NNDC's aims of avoiding impacts to trees without an amendment to the Order limits to accommodate an alternative access. In addition, a full assessment of the alternative proposed would be required. A high level review of the alternative proposed has been undertaken by the Applicant and has been included in the position statement [ExA.AS.D7.V1]. This indicates that without further assessment and mitigation, potential impacts (not previously assessed) could arise in respect of noise and landscape and visual receptors. It could also introduce significant safety risks to road users along Church Road as a result of introducing two temporary junctions on a bend. Please also refer to the Applicant's response to Q3.12.05.</p> <p><b>B1149</b> The introduction of a trenchless crossing in this location would introduce a potentially significant noise impact to the nearest residential property and extend the construction programme for this crossing from 1-2 weeks to 9-10 weeks. However, should the SoS be minded to include a trenchless crossing of the B1149, Norfolk Vanguard</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>has undertaken an environmental assessment of this potential change to the previously assessed working methodology. As the same approach and methodology would be employed by Norfolk Boreas under Scenario 2 (with the crossing being undertaken by Norfolk Vanguard under Scenario 1), this assessment is considered directly applicable to Norfolk Boreas and has been submitted at Deadline 7 (ExA.AS-2.D7.V1). The assessment identifies that trenchless crossings require the flexibility to extend into the evening and night time due to the continuous nature of those activities, and in the event of evening or night time working there is the potential for significant construction noise impacts to occur at the nearest residential property. Accordingly, construction noise mitigation would be required; however, this would be captured within the Construction Noise Management Plan submitted with the final Code of Construction Practice, which is already secured under DCO Requirement 20.</p> <p><b>Amendments required to the dDCO</b></p> <p>The commitment to trenchless crossing methods is secured under dDCO Requirement 16(13). Therefore, should the SoS be minded to include a trenchless crossing of the B1149 and/or Church Road then these locations will need to be included as an addition at Requirement 16(13), with reciprocal changes in Schedule 6 and Schedule 8 of the dDCO as follows:</p> <p>Schedule 1, Part 3, Requirements:</p> <p>(13) In the event of scenario 2, trenchless installation techniques must be used for the purposes of passing under—</p> <p>...</p> <p>(t) B1149 (Work No. 6)</p> <p>(u) Church Road (Work No. 5)</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Schedule 6, Part 2, Scenario 2: Land in which only New Rights etc., may be acquired:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plot 13/05 for Church Road will need to be removed from 'Minor crossings inc. highway' and incorporated in the row immediately below in 'Minor crossings inc. highway required to be undertaken by trenchless crossing'</li> <li>Plot 19/05 for the B1149 will need to be removed from 'Minor crossings inc. highway' and incorporated in the row immediately below in 'Minor crossings inc. highway required to be undertaken by trenchless crossing'.</li> </ol> <p>These rows are currently located on page 158-160 of the tracked change dDCO submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-004).</p> <p>Schedule 8, Part 2, Scenario 2: Land of which temporary possession may be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plot 13/05 for Church Road will need to be removed from works relating to "Facilitating construction and carrying out the authorised project; carrying out the authorised project; access for carrying out the authorised project" (at Work No. 5) and inserted four rows further down, for works "Facilitating construction and carrying out the authorised project; trenchless crossing zone for construction and laydown and carrying out the authorised project; access for carrying out the authorised project" (also at Work No. 5).</li> <li>Plot 19/05 for the B1149 will need to be removed from works relating to "Facilitating construction and carrying out the authorised project; carrying out the authorised project; access for carrying out the authorised project" (at Work No. 6) and inserted into the row immediately above, for works "Facilitating construction and carrying out the authorised project; trenchless</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>crossing zone for construction and laydown and carrying out the authorised project; access for carrying out the authorised project" (also at Work No. 6).</p> <p>These rows are currently located on page 178-180 of the tracked change dDCO submitted at Deadline 5 (REP5-004).</p> <p>Finally, it would also be necessary for the Applicant to provide an updated version of the Works Plan at the time in which the documents are sent for certification under Article 37, which incorporates these additional trenchless crossings in this location.</p>
Q3.5.3.8	Norfolk County Council North Norfolk District Council Broadland District Council	<p><b>Requirement 16 (13): Trenchless installation techniques</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide any comments on the points above.</li> <li>2. Regarding point 3. above, provide responses to the Applicant's D7 response at D8.</li> </ol>	
Q3.5.3.9	North Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Requirement 19: Implementation and maintenance of landscaping</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that discussion is ongoing regarding how a ten-year replacement period could be secured [REP6-036, Pages 47 to 54].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is agreement with the Applicant over a way of achieving replacement planting over a ten-year period (if required), which would avoid net loss in a worst case scenario, through wording in the OLEMS (or elsewhere other than the dDCO) likely to be reached in the timescale of this Examination?</li> <li>2. If so, what is it?</li> </ol>	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		3. If not, submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.	
Q3.5.3.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 19: Implementation and maintenance of landscaping</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How can a ten-year obligation that would rely upon landowners providing consent for replacement planting be secured?</li> <li>2. In your opinion can this be achieved by amending Requirement 19(2) and Article 27(12) as suggested by NNDC?</li> <li>3. What would be the implications for Schedule 6?</li> <li>4. How would the six tests in relation to Requirements be met (necessary; relevant to planning; relevant to the development to be permitted; enforceable; precise; and reasonable in all other respects)?</li> <li>5. Respond to NNDC's points regarding the process you would go through to secure that landowner consent for replacement planting, what happens if this consent cannot be secured, whether additional tree planting could be delivered/ secured in other location(s) where landowner agreement has been/ can be secured?</li> <li>6. As well as the agreed addition to the OLEMS para 147, suggested by NNDC [REP6- 043, para 2.11] and updated SoCG [REP6-036, Page 52] have you included further wording as suggested to set out the process? If so what, and is it agreed with NNDC?</li> <li>7. Submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</li> </ol>	<p>1. &amp; 2. Requirement 19(2) of the dDCO could be updated to secure a ten year maintenance of landscaping obligation. Following further consideration and a discussion with NNDC on a conference call held on 19 March 2020, the Applicant has agreed to include updated wording in Article 27(12) and Requirement 19 of the dDCO to reflect NNDC's request. The wording, included in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 3.1 (version 6)), is as follows:</p> <p><b>Article 27</b></p> <p>"(12) In this article "the maintenance period" means—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) for the district of North Norfolk, the period referred to in requirement 19(2) in relation to the maintenance of landscaping;</li> <li>(b) in relation to any other part of the authorised project, means the period of 5 years beginning with the date on which the authorised project first exports electricity to the national electricity transmission network." <p><b>Requirement 19</b></p> <p>"...(2) Any tree, hedge, or shrub planted within the district of North Norfolk as part of an approved landscaping management scheme that, within a period of ten years after planting, is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the relevant planning authority, seriously damaged or diseased must be replaced in the first available planting season with a specimen of the same species and size as that originally planted unless a different species is otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>(3) Any other tree, hedge or shrub planted as part of an approved landscaping management scheme that, within a period of five years</p> </li></ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>after planting, is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the relevant planning authority, seriously damaged or diseased must be replaced in the first available planting season with a specimen of the same species and size as that originally planted unless a different species is otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority."</p> <p>As a result of these amendments, the 10 year re-planting period in North Norfolk's district is secured in the dDCO and the Applicant therefore considers that this matter is resolved.</p> <p>3. In relation to Schedule 6, there would not need to be any changes to the rights listed. The general compulsory acquisition (CA) right listed at Schedule 6 (Part 2, Scenario 2) of the dDCO, under '<i>Full cable rights</i>' at paragraph 1 states that the Applicant has "<i>The right to enter onto and remain on the land for the purposes of construction, installation, operation, <b>maintenance</b> and decommissioning of the <b>authorised project</b> and to....</i>". This therefore provides the Applicant with a right to maintain landscaping within the Order limits required as part of the authorised project, which is not time limited. However, the undertaker would not seek to rely on this right to maintain where a temporary power could, instead, be exercised in order to undertake the necessary works. This is so as to avoid any unnecessary encumbrance being created on the land in perpetuity. A temporary power for maintenance is already included in Article 27, but limited to 5 years. This applies across all land within the Order limits required for the maintenance of the authorised project (and would therefore also include a power to maintain landscaping). Therefore, by increasing the period for maintenance in Article 27 from 5 years to 10 years (but restricted to NNDC's administrative area and only for the purpose of landscaping), there is no change to the nature or extent of</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>the land or rights which can be acquired under the compulsory acquisition powers already contained in the dDCO at Schedule 6.</p> <p>4. Given that the Applicant has updated Requirement 19 and Article 27(12) to remove the element of landowner consent for the additional 5 years, the six tests (necessary; relevant to planning; relevant to the development to be permitted; enforceable; precise; and reasonable in all other respects) are satisfied.</p> <p>5 &amp; 6. The Applicant will look to replant trees as close as practicable to the location where removed, which will primarily be at an alternative location within the Order limits but outside of the cable easement. Landowner consent will not therefore be required for planting within the Order limits. Where this is not possible, other locations will be investigated i.e. on land adjacent to the Order limits, subject to agreement with the landowner; or locations in the district (as close of possible to the original location) where landowner agreement for tree planting has been secured. This information will be captured in an update to the OLEMS to be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>North Norfolk District Council will be consulted on the location of replacement planting as part of the approval of the final Landscape Management Scheme, secured under Requirement 18.</p> <p>7. The Applicant considers that this matter is now resolved and this will be updated in the next version of the SoCG with NNDC.</p>
Q3.5.3.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 20: Hydrogeological Risk Assessment for abstractions within 250m of works:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this and has addressed in the appropriate Section below.</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.3.12	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 20: Monitoring of residual adverse impacts on the water environment:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.3.13	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 20: Refined conceptual site modelling for each watercourse crossing:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.3.14	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 20: Risk Assessment based on chemical testing in the ground investigation reports:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.3.15	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 20: Consultation on contamination and approval of remediation:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.3.16	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 20: OCoCP in relation to Agricultural Private Water Supplies:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.13.3 Land Use and Agriculture.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.3.17	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 20: OCoCP</b> Note question below in Section Q3.13.2.1 regarding Tourism Mitigation Strategy.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.3.18	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 21: Traffic</b> Note question below in Section Q3.14.1.5 regarding Cumulative traffic effects in Cawston.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.3.19	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 25- definition of secondary consent bodies:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.3.20	The Applicant	<b>Requirement 25: Attenuation capacity at substations allowance for climate change:</b> Note question below in Section Q3.15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.

#### 5.4 OTHER REQUIREMENTS

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No questions			

#### 5.5 SCHEDULES 9 to 13: Deemed Marine Licences

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.5.21	Marine Management Organisation Natural England	<b>DML Schedule 9/10/13 Part 4 Condition 15 (4):</b> The MMO and NE to review the further comments from the Applicant at [REP6-014] on time periods for approvals including in relation to CfD timescales and provide further comments at Deadline 7.	
Q3.5.5.1	The Applicant, Marine Management Organisation Natural England	<b>Prospects for agreement on DML Schedule 9/10/13 Part 4 Condition 15 (4):</b> It appears unlikely that agreement will be reached between the Applicant, NE and MMO regarding four- or six-month submission periods in Schedule 9/10/13 Part 4 Condition 15 (4).	The Applicant's position is outlined in its response to Further WQ2.5.5.1 at Deadline 5, contained in the Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Further Written Questions [REP5-045]. The positions are also outlined in the SoCG with the MMO at Table 8 [REP6-029] and at Table 7 of the SoCG with NE [REP6-033].

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		The Applicant, MMO and NE to provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the Secretary of State.	<p>In summary, the Applicant has followed existing precedent, and has sought to maintain consistency with the approach taken in the East Anglia Three DCO, the Hornsea Project Three draft DCO, the Thanet Extension draft DCO, and the Norfolk Vanguard draft DCO.</p> <p>In addition, the plans to be submitted under the Norfolk Boreas project are likely to benefit from efficiency savings and lessons learned from the Norfolk Vanguard process. Equally, the stakeholders would be familiar with the general content and structure of the plans for discharge, following the Norfolk Vanguard process. The Applicant considers that these are persuasive points (in addition to those put forward previously) to justify a 4 month period for this particular project, even if other projects have a 6 month period.</p> <p>The Applicant is content to let the Secretary of State decide whether to impose a four month or a six month timeframe for discharge; and the Applicant would have nothing further to add on this matter following the close of examination. The Applicant also understands that the MMO are in support of this approach.</p>
Q3.5.5.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Prospects for agreement on DML Conditions for notice to mariners period and cable laying plan:</b></p> <p>Confirm whether agreement is likely to be reached with Trinity House (TH) prior to Deadline 8 and provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the Secretary of State in regard to matters below remaining to be agreed, as noted in the SoCG [REP6-039], including:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It has been agreed with both Trinity House and the Maritime and Coastguard Agency that the condition should remain as per the current draft DCO, with a 10 day notice period for notice to mariners. This is to maintain consistency with the Norfolk Vanguard dDCO including importantly post consent, when it is likely a single marine coordination centre will be responsible for issuing both project notices and therefore variations in notification timescales could lead to</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>1. The Applicant's request to replace a 10 day period for notice to mariners prior to commencement instead of 14 days [dDCO/DMLs Schedule 9 Part 4 9 (8), Schedule 10 Part 4 9 (8), Schedule 11 Part 4 4 (8), Schedule 12 Part 4 4 (8), Schedule 13 Part 4 3 (8)] to ensure consistency with the draft Norfolk Vanguard DCO.</p> <p>TH request to add to DML conditions [Schedule 9 Part 4 14 (1)(g) Schedule 10 Part 4 14 (1)(g), Schedule 11 Part 4 9(1)(g) , Schedule 12 Part 4 9(1)(g) , Schedule 13 Part 4 7(1)(f)] suggested text [REP6-039] commencing "... a detailed cable laying plan of the Order limits...".</p>	<p>errors. This agreement will be reflected in the next revision of the SoCGs to be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>2. 2.This matter remains outstanding however the Applicant is in discussion with Trinity House and the existing condition in the dDCO has been agreed with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency as reflected in the SoCG REP2-049.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that Trinity House's involvement in cable burial approval is already secured through Schedule 9-10, condition 14(1)(a) and Schedule 11-12, condition 9(1)(a) which cover agreement with the MMO in consultation with Trinity House and the MCA on the length and arrangements of all cables as part of the design plan – this condition also includes the Cable Monitoring and Installation Plan. However, for further clarity, the Applicant is also content to add "and Trinity House" to Condition 15(8) (Schedule 9-10) and Condition 10(8) (Schedule 11-12) as shown below (and this has been included in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 7):</p> <p><i>No part of the authorised scheme may commence until the MMO, in consultation with the MCA <u>and Trinity House</u>, has confirmed in writing that the undertaker has taken into account and, so far as is applicable to that stage of the project, adequately addressed MCA recommendations as appropriate to the authorised scheme contained within MGN543 "Offshore Renewable Energy Installations (OREIs) – Guidance on UK Navigational Practice, Safety and Emergency Response Issues" and its annexes.</i></p> <p>The other aspects referred to by Trinity House are also secured in the condition referred to above, through</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>the requirement to address the recommendations of the MCA contained within MGN 543. MGN 543 states:</p> <p><i>It should be determined at what depth below the seafloor export cables are buried to ensure there are no changes to charted depths. If burial is not possible, for example due to underwater features and/or seabed ground conditions export cables should be suitably protected such as by rocks or other such suitable mattress placements to mitigate the risks to vessels. Consequently, the MCA would be willing to accept up to 5% reduction in surrounding charted depths referenced to Chart Datum, unless developers are able to demonstrate evidence that any identified risks to any vessel type are satisfactorily mitigated.</i></p> <p>In drafting the DCO and the DMLs, the Applicant has sought to follow existing precedent unless a change can otherwise be justified, and has sought to avoid unnecessary duplication to ensure consents do not become overly complex or lengthy, and remain clear, consistent and workable. The drafting contained in the DML aligns with the wording in the East Anglia THREE DML, which is the most recent offshore wind farm consent to have been granted. It is also the approach adopted on the draft Order for Thanet Extension and importantly on the Norfolk Vanguard draft DML with which the Applicant wishes to maintain consistency given the sister nature of the two projects.</p>
Q3.5.5.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Schedules 9 and 10 Part 4, Conditions 14 (1) (c), (d), (g,) (j), 18, 19, 20 and 22:</b> Note questions below in Section Q2.6.0 Fishing and Fisheries.</p>	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.5.4	The Applicant	<b>Schedules 11 and 12 Part 4, Conditions 9 (1) (c), (d), (g), (j), 13, 14, 15 and 17:</b> Note questions below in Section Q2.6.0 Fishing and Fisheries.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.
Q3.5.5.5	Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Natural England (NE)	<b>Alternative to Schedule 11 &amp; 12 Part 4 Condition 9 (1) (m):</b> The MMO and NE to comment on the alternative condition proposed by the Applicant [REP6-016(ExA.AS-2.D6.V1 Alternative to the Grampian condition for the HHW SAC)] which would secure a Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan that would contain all of the elements of the HHW SIP, but would not defer the conclusion of AEoI to post consent.	
Q3.5.5.6	The Applicant	<b>Schedule 13 Part 4, Conditions 7 (1) (c), (d), (g), (j), 11, 12, 13 and 15:</b> Note questions below in Section Q2.6.0 Fishing and Fisheries.	The Applicant notes this and has addressed the question in the appropriate Section below.

## 5.6 SCHEDULE 15: ARBITRATION RULES

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

## 5.7 SCHEDULE 16: PROCEDURE FOR DISCHARGE OF REQUIREMENTS

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.7.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Table of requirements, discharge authorities and consultees and discharge process map</b></p> <p>Should the Timetable of requirements, discharge authorities and consultees and the Discharge process map [REP6-043, Appendix B and Appendix C] be certified documents, referred to in Schedule 16?</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that either of these appendices should be secured in the DCO for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix B (Discharge authorities): the Applicant considers it a helpful exercise to outline who within the council will need to be internally consulted before discharging a plan. However, the other relevant planning authorities have not inputted to NNDC's Appendix B and, in any event, securing this detail in the DCO might make the process too rigid and inflexible, when in practice the councils may need to call on other consultees beyond those listed. The Applicant also notes that there are a number of 'TBCs' within the fourth column of the table.</li> <li>Appendix C (Discharge Map): this appendix mirrors the process set out in Schedule 16. It would therefore be unnecessary duplication to secure a map of the same process within the DCO.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant considers that once fully worked up these documents could, instead, form part of the PPA.</p>
Q3.5.7.2	Breckland Council Broadland District Council, Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Table of requirements, discharge authorities and consultees and discharge process map</b></p> <p>Provide any comments on NNDC's Timetable of requirements, discharge authorities and consultees and the Discharge process map [REP6-043, Appendix B and Appendix C].</p>	
Q3.5.7.3	Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Schedule 16 2. (2) and (3): Deadlines for responses</b></p> <p>Are you content with the Applicant's response regarding the flexibility that would be</p>	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		provided by the ability to agree longer periods (Schedule 16: 1. (3) (c))?	
Q3.5.7.4	The Applicant, Breckland Council Broadland District Council, Norfolk County Council, North Norfolk District Council	<b>Schedule 16</b> Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.	<p>The Applicant refers the ExA to its response to Q3.5.7.1 above as well as its previous response to Q2.5.1.5 and Q2.5.7.1 submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-045] together with its comments on these respective questions submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6- 014].</p> <p>The Applicant discussed this matter with the councils on a conference call on 12 March 2020 and the Applicant understands that the procedure for discharge of Requirements at Schedule 16 is agreed. Whilst Norfolk County Council have raised some concerns in relation to the periods for discharge, Schedule 16 does give sufficient flexibility to agree an appropriate extension to the standard 8 week period under paragraph 1(3)(c) of Schedule 16. Given this, it is considered that the time periods specified strike the right balance to enable discharges within a reasonable and proportionate period.</p> <p>The Applicant also considers that it is important that the discharge process and timeframes are consistent across both Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas. The Schedule 16 discharge process was agreed during the Norfolk Vanguard examination and the Applicant therefore considers that there is benefit for all parties (the Applicant, RPAs, and stakeholders) of ensuring consistency across both projects. The Applicant also refers the ExA to NNDC's response to Q2.5.0.3 at Deadline 5 [REP5-067], which concurs with this position.</p>
Q3.5.7.5	The Applicant, Breckland Council Broadland District Council, Norfolk County Council,	<b>Planning Performance Agreements</b> Provide any update on matters since the response to responses to further written questions provided by the Applicant [REP6-014, responses to Q2.5.7.1].	The Applicant held a productive conference call with the RPAs on 12 March 2020. The Applicant will continue to discuss matters relating to discharge of Requirements and an associated PPA with the RPAs.



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
	North Norfolk District Council		The Applicant is also preparing a more detailed note on PPAs for the RPAs. This will set out a further explanation on what the PPA could cover – including reference to a programme and timetable for liaison between the Applicant and the RPAs (as explained further in answer to Q3.5.3.2 above).

## 5.8 SCHEDULE 17: PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.5.8.6	The Applicant	<p><b>dDCO Schedule 17 paragraph 71(3) (c): security for consent for additional water volume and additional cost recovery under IDB Byelaws:</b></p> <p>With reference to the 'reasonable requirements' of Schedule 17 paragraph 71 (3) (c), respond in detail to the Water Management Alliance (WMA) [REP5-057] request for assurance how Schedule 17 secures safeguarding of the provisions of Byelaws 3 and 28 of the Broads 2006 Internal Drainage Board and the Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board for consent to any increase in total volume of water to enter the Internal Drainage District and partial recovery of additional costs incurred by the WMA Member Board resulting from additional flows so consented.</p>	<p>he Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the WMA (in their Deadline 6 submission [REP6-057]). In short, the Applicant considers that the WMA Byelaws 3 and 28 are covered by the Protective Provisions in 'Schedule 17 Part 7, For the Protection of the Environment Agency and drainage authorities' (as outlined further below). The Applicant has provided this explanation to the WMA and they have subsequently responded to state:</p> <p><i>We are encouraged by your confirmation that in paragraph 71(2)(c) "reasonable requirements" is broad enough to cover Byelaw 28 and thus could include the charging of Surface Water Development Contributions among other things. In order to fully assuage our concerns, we request that you consider a slight modification to the definition of 'specified work' within paragraph 70(3)(c) so that it reads as follows:</i></p> <p><i>"affect any drainage work or the <b>total volume or volumetric rate of flow of water in or flowing to or from any drainage work;</b>"</i></p> <p><i>This alteration, together with your assurances of the broad scope of 71 and 72 would give us confidence that the provisions of these specific Byelaws are safeguarded within Schedule 17.</i></p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>The Applicant is content to adopt the proposed change and this is secured in the updated draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 3.1 (version 6)). The Applicant understands that this matter is therefore agreed.</p> <p>For completeness, the Applicant considers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts as a result of increases in total volume of water entering the Internal Drainage District (as dealt with at Byelaw 3) are covered by paragraph 72 of the protective provisions, which provides that the IDB must be in no worse a position as a result of the works and that the developer must carry out protective works to ensure that efficiency for flood defence purposes is not impaired, and the risk of flooding (amongst other matters) is not increased.</li> <li>• In addition, the Applicant considers that the provisions of Byelaw 3 (as referred to above) are also covered by paragraph 71(3)(c) of the protective provisions which states that any approval may be given subject to reasonable requirements of the IDB for protection of drainage works.</li> <li>• The Applicant considers that paragraph 71(3)(c) of the protective provisions is also drafted sufficiently wide to cover recovery of additional costs resulting from additional flows (Byelaw 28).</li> </ul> <p>In any event, and whilst Article 15(3) does not apply, the IDBs' costs are also covered by paragraph 77 of the protective provisions, which require the undertaker to compensate for costs and expenses of (amongst other things) raising or lowering of the water table in land adjoining the authorised development, or any sewers, drains or watercourses.</p>
Q3.5.8.7	The Applicant, Environment Agency	Provide an update on discussions with the EA over protective provisions. Has agreement been reached? If not, provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the SoS.	The Applicant refers the ExA to the Applicant's comments on the EA's response to Q2.3.0.29, submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6- 014]. The Applicant has held further discussions with the EA in order to explain

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>its position, but the parties have not yet been able to come to an agreed position.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the timeframe within the protective provisions at Schedule 17, Part 7 - together with a deemed discharge mechanism - is appropriate and proportionate in order to unlock nationally significant infrastructure development projects in a timely manner.</p> <p>In summary, the Applicant has followed existing precedent, and has sought to maintain consistency with Hornsea Project Two, Triton Knoll, Hornsea Project Three and, in particular, Norfolk Vanguard. This is of particular importance in the case of consistency with the Norfolk Vanguard dDCO in which it is likely that a coordinated approach for the discharge of requirements would be adopted. Accordingly, variations in the timetable for post-consent approvals could lead to confusion and error.</p>

## 5.9 CONSENTS, LICENCES AND OTHER AGREEMENTS

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

## 6 Fishing and fisheries

### 6.0 Fishing and fisheries

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.6.0.1	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisation (NFFO)	<b>NFFO investigation of the impact of seals:</b> Advise the status of NFFO investigation of the impact of seals on commercial fishing and any recommendations that may have emerged.	
Q3.6.0.2	The Applicant	<b>Export cable siting restrictions in relation to MPA Byelaw Restricted Area 36:</b> Provide update on whether agreement with Eastern IFCA is likely to be reached by Deadline 8 on export cable route restrictions in relation to MPA Byelaw Restricted Area 36 and confirm the Applicant's final position if agreement is not reached.	<p>Due to the fact that EIFCA byelaw Area 36 overlaps more than half the width of the Norfolk Boreas offshore cable corridor it is unlikely that the Applicant will be able to commit to avoiding installation of export cables within Area 36 in its entirety at this stage. Therefore, it is unlikely that agreement will be reached on this point within the examination. However, it may be possible to commit to avoid Area 36 during the detailed design phase once the extent of Annex I <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef in this location is known.</p> <p>The Applicant's final position (during the examination) is therefore as follows:</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to avoiding Annex I <i>S.spinulosa</i> where possible when cable routing, and this would include within Area 36. The Applicant has also committed to not installing cable protection within the priority areas to be managed as <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef. One of these priority areas occupies a large proportion of Area 36 and thus there would be no habitat loss as a result of cable protection in this area. The Applicant is therefore confident that with this mitigation Annex I <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef within Area 36 would not be adversely affected by the project nor would the project inhibit the ability of reef</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>to restore in the areas where Natural England have the highest confidence that this is possible.</p> <p>Importantly, the Applicant does not believe that a commitment to exclude cable installation in Area 36 at this stage is an appropriate mitigation measure. This is because if Annex I <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef were to be present at the time of construction to the south of Area 36 and not within it, the Applicant may be required to avoid an area with no reef to the detriment of an area which contained actual reef.</p> <p>The Applicant also considers that a one-off activity of installing a cable within Area 36 would be significantly different to the repeated and spatially more extensive activity of bottom-towed fishing (which the byelaw for Area 36 has been principally designed and would be implemented to prevent) . Therefore, whilst it is appropriate to exclude certain fishing activity, it is not appropriate to extend this to exclude cable installation.</p> <p>In summary, the Applicant does not expect to reach agreement with EIFCA on this issue during the Examination period. However, the Applicant will maintain the existing good working relationship with EIFCA, with the intention to engage on the potential to avoid Area 36 during the detailed design stage.</p>
Q3.6.0.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Matters not yet agreed with NFFO/Visned:</b></p> <p>Provide an update on whether any further agreement with NFFO/VisNed is likely to be reached by Deadline 8 on the following matters of disagreement recorded in the SoCG at Deadline 6, and if agreement is not reached, what the Applicant's final position is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. assessment of impact by subgroupings of vessels;</li> <li>2. spacing between structures to facilitate resumption of fishing activity;</li> </ol>	<p><b>Applicant's Update on Progress on the SoCG</b></p> <p>In the context of the progress made to date in respect of the Statement of Common Grounds (SoCG) with the National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) and VisNed submitted at Deadline 2 and Deadline 6 (REP2-043 and REP6 -031), it is important to note that, as the starting point, the SoCG was drafted incorporating</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		3. effects of 500m safety zones around Service Operation Vehicles (SOV) for maintenance activities; 4. gear snagging risk mitigation including notification of shallow burial of cables when discovered; 5. cumulative impact assessment of losses of fishing activity in relation to assumptions on resumption of towed gear fishing activities.	<p>the previous matters agreed during the examination phase of Norfolk Vanguard.</p> <p>As such, the SoCG takes account of specific issues raised during consultation undertaken in respect of Norfolk Boreas as well as previous discussions on matters agreed with VisNed/the NFFO during the examination phase of Norfolk Vanguard.</p> <p>Matters agreed during the examination of Norfolk Vanguard together with additional matters agreed during post-application consultation for Norfolk Boreas are outlined in Table 2.1 of the SoCG and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The baseline characterisation;</li> <li>• The impacts included for assessment;</li> <li>• The improvement to the worst-case scenario in respect of fishing associated with the removal of 9MW turbines and of floating foundations from the design envelope;</li> <li>• Communication with regards to the establishment of safety zones and protocols for the relocation of static gear and the provision of detail on these matters in the Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan (FLCP);</li> <li>• Adherence to Fishing Liaison with Offshore Wind and Wet Renewables Group (FLOWW) guidance, including in relation to the establishment of suitable arrangements for attributable gear damage;</li> <li>• Consideration of reburial approaches or back filling in the first instance as a way of avoiding the need for new areas of cable protection; and</li> <li>• Consideration of options which minimise potential for snagging risk where cable protection is proposed.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the matters agreed above, since the submission of the Environmental Statement (ES) the project design parameters have</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>been reviewed and the 10MW and 11MW turbine options are no longer being considered, with the smallest turbine option currently proposed being 11.55MW. This would result in a reduction in the worst-case maximum number of turbines from 180 (10MW option) to 158 (11.55MW option). There would also be an increase of 80m in the minimum spacing between turbines (from 720m to 800m) and in the width of corridor left clear of infrastructure (from 650m to 730m) associated with this change in project design envelope.</p> <p>The SoCG with the NFFO/VisNed was updated at Deadline 6 (REP6 - 031) to refer to this update to the project design envelope under both the Applicant's and NFFO/VisNed's positions. Whilst the changes proposed have not resulted in a material change to the positions in respect of the outstanding matters on which the Applicant and the NFFO/VisNed support different views, they do result in an improvement to the worst-case scenario parameters in respect of commercial fisheries, as the changes proposed will result in an 80m increase to the minimum spacing between turbines.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on the outstanding matters listed by the Examining Authority in this written question are provided below.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it unlikely that further agreement with the NFFO/VisNed will be reached on these matters within the examination.</p> <p><b>Applicant's Position on Aspects Highlighted by the Examining Authority with regard to the SoCG with the NFFO/VisNed</b></p> <p><u>1. Assessment of impact by subgroupings of vessels:</u></p> <p>As described in the SoCG (REP6 -031) the assessment of commercial fisheries follows an impact significance matrix approach taking account of receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude. This is in line</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>with standard Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) methodologies (as outlined in ES Chapter 6 Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology, Document reference 6.1.6, APP -219) and the methodology used for assessment of commercial fisheries for other projects, including Norfolk Vanguard.</p> <p>Fisheries receptors are identified by national fleet and fishing method, in line with available fisheries data. Consequently, the impact assessment is undertaken on that basis, using standard receptor sub-groupings (i.e. in line with those used by the relevant national fisheries data agencies to collect information on fishing activity). As noted in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries, due to data limitations, it is beyond the scope of the EIA to assess impacts on individual vessels. It is however recognised that the level and distribution of fishing activity and dependence on fishing grounds within the offshore project area will vary between individual vessels within the same fleets.</p> <p>It is the Applicant's final position that this methodology is appropriate for the assessment of impacts on commercial fisheries receptors.</p> <p><u>2. Spacing between turbines to facilitate resumption of fishing activity</u></p> <p>The minimum spacing between turbines (and associated corridors clear of infrastructure within which fishing can resume) has increased as a result of changes in the project design envelope throughout the application and examination process starting at 680m (on floating foundations, which were removed from the design envelope at the ES stage) at the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) stage and increasing to 720m (on tetrabase foundations- representing the worst case for commercial fisheries receptors) in the assessment presented in the ES, to a final worst case scenario spacing of 800m (on tetrabase foundations) after the recent removal of the 10MW and 11MW turbine options from the design envelope.</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>It is the Applicant's final position that the minimum worst case spacing proposed is sufficient to make fishing viable between turbines for Dutch and Anglo Dutch beam trawlers. In this context it is important to note that the minimum spacing proposed by Norfolk Boreas is in line with that previously assessed by other projects in the region, including East Anglia One and East Anglia Three<sup>2</sup>. For these projects, the NFFO/VisNed stated in their SoCGs that the spacing proposed would be sufficient to allow fishing to resume within the operational sites in safe conditions.</p> <p>It is also important to note that there is currently no legislation in the UK preventing fishing from occurring within wind farms and that the level of fishing activity which may resume within operational sites will therefore largely depend on the perception of individual skippers with regard to operating fishing gear in offshore wind farm projects.</p> <p>With the above in mind, under the assessment of loss of grounds in respect of beam trawling by Anglo-Dutch and Dutch vessels, impact magnitude was considered to range from low to medium, depending on the level of activity that may resume within the Norfolk Boreas Site (low where skippers resume fishing in the Norfolk Boreas Site and medium where skippers elect not to fish within the Norfolk Boreas Site).</p> <p>In the case of seine netting, the assessment considered that, under the worst-case design parameters, there was little potential for activity to be able to resume within the Norfolk Boreas site. Therefore, the worst-case assumption taken for assessment was that seine netting will not be undertaken within the Norfolk Boreas Site during operation.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Minimum spacing between turbines considered for East Anglia ONE was 625 (within rows) and 850 (between rows) (assuming 50 m operational safety zones would be in place); minimum spacing considered for East Anglia THREE was 675m within rows and 900m between rows (assuming 50m operational safety zones would be in place).

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p><u>3. Effects of 500m safety zones around Service Operation Vehicles (SOV) for maintenance activities</u></p> <p>As noted in the Applicant's Comments on Written Representations (REP3-007), the worst-case scenario presented in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries makes reference to the implementation of 500m safety zones during operation associated with major maintenance works. These are as defined in Part 1, Regulation 2 of the Electricity (Offshore Generating Stations) (Safety Zones) (Application Procedures and Control Access) Regulations 2007.</p> <p>As described in the SoCG with the MCA, safety zones triggered by the use of SOVs during major maintenance are currently not supported by the MCA and a case would need to be included and considered as part of the safety zone application phase post consent, should the Applicant consider using this type of vessel.</p> <p>In the context of this assessment it is important to note that any loss of grounds associated with safety zones during the operational phase (whether those associated with major maintenance works or with the use of SOVs may these be required) would be localised and affect a given discrete area over a short period of time.</p> <p><u>4. Gear snagging risk mitigation including notification of shallow burial of cables when discovered</u></p> <p>The Applicant's final position is that the Deemed Marine Licence (DML) conditions and the provisions made in the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (Document reference 8.19, APP-710) are appropriate to minimise potential snagging risk.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Measures proposed by the Applicant (and secured through consent conditions) which are of relevance with regards to minimising potential for snagging risks are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Scour Protection and Cable Protection Plan required under the draft DCO Schedules 9 and 10 (Part 4 Condition 14(1)(e)) of the Generation Assets Deemed Marine Licences (DMLs), Schedules 11 and 12 (Part 4 Condition 9(1)(e)) of the Transmission DMLs and Schedule 13 of the Interconnector assets DML (Part 4 Condition 7(1)(e)) in accordance with the Outline Scour Protection and Cable Protection Plan (Document reference 8.16, APP-707), must be approved by the MMO prior to construction. This document will be updated as the final design of the project develops and will include justification of the location, type, volume and area of cable protection, based on crossing agreements and pre-construction survey data to ensure only essential cable protection can be installed.</li> <li>• Condition 14(1)(e) of Schedule 9 and 10, Condition 9(1)(e) of Schedule 11 and 12 and Condition 7(1)(e) of Schedule 13 require that prior to commencement of licensed activities "...details of the need, type, sources, quantity and installation methods for scour protection and cable (including fibre optic cable) protection..." must be approved by the MMO.</li> <li>• Production of the Cable Specification, Installation, and Monitoring Plan (to be agreed with the MMO pursuant to Condition 14(1)(g) (Schedules 9 and 10), Condition 9 (1) (g)(Schedules 11 and 12) and Condition 7(1)(f) (Schedule 13) must include: (ii) a detailed cable (including fibre optic cable) laying plan for the Order limits, incorporating a burial risk assessment to ascertain suitable burial depths and cable laying techniques, including cable landfall and cable</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>protection measures; (iii) proposals for monitoring offshore cables including cable protection during the operational lifetime of the authorised scheme which includes a risk based approach to the management of unburied or shallow buried cables.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dropped objects will be reported to the MMO using the Dropped Object Procedures Form outlined in Schedules 9 and 10, Part 4, Condition 12 (10), and Schedules 11 and 12, Part 4, Condition 7 (11) and Schedule 13, Part 4, Condition 5 (10).</li> </ul> <p>Co-existence procedures noted in the Outline FLCP of relevance in the context of minimising snagging risk include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular and routine communications with the fishing industry;</li> <li>• Early provision of construction and cable laying plans, including location and methods for cable protection, if required;</li> <li>• Consideration for the use of guard vessels;</li> <li>• Development of a fisheries guidance document to reduce interactions with fishing activity and provide response procedures;</li> <li>• Cable burial monitoring;</li> <li>• Provision of procedures for the safe recovery of lost or snagged fishing gear; and</li> <li>• Appropriate communication with the fishing industry in the event that cables become unburied during the operational phase (i.e. through the Fisheries Liaison Officer (FLO) and appropriate channels such as the Kingfisher Information Service). This has been reflected in the draft DCO under Schedule 9 and 10, Part 4, condition 9 (12) and Schedule 11 -</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>12, Part 4 condition 4 (12). The Applicant considers that the wording included in the draft DCO is appropriate. This is also aligned with the wording recently agreed with the Maritime and Coastguard Authority (MCA) for the Norfolk Vanguard project.</p> <p><u>5. Cumulative impact assessment of losses of fishing activity in relation to assumptions on resumption of towed gear fishing activities</u></p> <p>As outlined in the SoCG with NFFO/VisNed, with regards to access to fishing within wind farm sites, in general terms the cumulative assessment presented in Chapter 14 Commercial Fisheries notes that fishing would be able to resume within operational wind farm sites with the exception of projects in countries where fishing within wind farms is prohibited. In the case of seine netting, the assumption is made that given the dimensions of the gear used, it would be highly unlikely for this method to resume in operational sites, regardless of whether or not fishing is permitted within wind farm arrays.</p> <p>Consideration was also given in the cumulative assessment to proposals for closed areas to fishing associated with Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and closures associated with measures implemented under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) , an aspect raised by the NFFO/VisNed during consultation both for Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard. Loss of grounds associated with these measures would be permanent for affected fishing methods. This was accounted for in the cumulative assessment.</p> <p>As noted above in respect of the assessment of the project alone, in the context of the cumulative assessment it is also important to note that there is currently no legislation in the UK preventing fishing from occurring within operational wind farms. The level of fishing activity which may resume within operational sites will therefore largely</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			depend on the perception of individual skippers with regard to operating fishing gear within wind farms. It is also important to note that the current trend in the offshore wind farm industry is for the use of large turbines (i.e. 10MW plus). These will require the application of increasingly wider minimum spacings and therefore facilitate fishing activity within operational sites.

## 7 Grid connection

### 7.0 Grid connection

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.7.0.1	The Applicant	<b>Offshore Ring Main (ORM):</b> Further to the written question [REP5-045, ExQ2.7.0.1], respond to the specific point regarding any consideration given to include options for any future connection into an ORM.	Whilst the undertaking in Ofgem's recent "decarbonisation programme action plan" is noted, this does not change the Applicant's position as set out in responses to previous representations on the subject of a potential east coast grid reinforcement (colloquially referred to as a single option: Offshore Ring Main, or ORM). The Applicant and a number of other developers are engaging on this issue, as part of the Offshore Wind Industry Council. However this workstream is in its very early stages, with a long way to go before concrete proposals are considered sufficiently evolved for an optioneering process, and appropriate solution(s) proposed for consent. As the infrastructure seeking to serve multiple developments would undoubtedly require a Development Consent Order under the NSIP process, the consenting process can be expected to take several years in itself. In parallel to the technical / environmental considerations, regulatory and legal reforms are also required. The

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>             expected construction time-frame for Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas, if both are consented, or for Norfolk Boreas alone is between 2022 and 2028, with first power generated in 2026. Therefore, it is simply not feasible that a large scale offshore grid reinforcement serving multiple projects can be implemented in time to facilitate connection of Norfolk Boreas (or Norfolk Vanguard) to the GB transmission system in order to meet the UKs energy demand profile. Accordingly, it is not appropriate or necessary to include options for Norfolk Boreas to connect into an ORM in the future. In any event, it is not possible to even consider potential options given the very early stage of the ORM, especially bearing in mind the advanced stage of the examination process which the Norfolk Boreas project has reached.           </p> <p>             The Applicant notes that beyond the current projects in development, The Crown Estate R4 leasing process is considering further development in the southern north sea. Furthermore, beyond the government's target of 40GW by 2030, the Committee on Climate Change recommend further development of offshore wind after 2030 – putting in place 75GW by 2050 to achieve net zero. To achieve this considerable step-up in installed capacity, the current annual rate of offshore wind deployment will have to double in the second half of this decade. It is these next round of projects and their successors that the Applicant and the Sector as a whole, sees the work of Ofgem, NG and OWIC enabling.           </p>

## 8 Habitats Regulation Assessment

### 8.0 River Wensum SAC

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

### 8.1 Norfolk Valley Fens SAC

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

### 8.2 Southern North Sea SAC

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.8.2.1	Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Discussions with Regulators Group:</b></p> <p>MMO to provide further details of discussions with Regulators Group [REP6-045], to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How the management tool will work in practice?</li> <li>2. Is it a tool just for an in-combination assessment to be undertaken or for MMO to use for the actual management of various activities?</li> <li>3. When will this be finalised?</li> </ol>	



### 8.3 Hasiborough, Hammond and Winterton SAC

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.8.3.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Alternative to the Site Integrity Plan:</b> The Applicant has proposed an alternative Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan (CSIMP) to the SIP [REP6-016] to address the concerns expressed by NE and MMO throughout the Examination. The Applicant to explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant has submitted the SAC position paper [REP6-016] which contains new mitigation commitments and the CSIMP as an Appendix. The SAC position paper is referred to in the updated SIP [REP6-011], but not in the dDCO itself. How would the CSIMP therefore be certified and secured?</li> </ol>	<p>As explained in Section 6 of the HHW SAC position paper [REP5-057] an alternative condition 9(1) (m) would be included within the DCO:</p> <p><i>(m) A cable specification, installation and monitoring plan for the installation and protection of cables within the Hasiborough, Hammond and Winterton Special Area of Conservation which accords with the principles set out in the outline Norfolk Boreas Hasiborough, Hammond and Winterton Special Area of Conservation Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan such plan to be submitted to the MMO (in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body) at least six months prior to commencement of licensed activities."</i></p> <p>The following amendment to condition 9(1)(g) is also proposed to clarify that the Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan referred to in condition 9(1)(g) applies outside of the HHW SAC only:</p> <p><i>"9(1) The licensed activities or any part of those activities must not commence until the following (as relevant to that part) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the MMO (g) A cable specification, installation and monitoring plan for the installation and protection of cables outside of the Hasiborough, Hammond and Winterton Special Area of Conservation, to include....."</i></p> <p>The two alternative conditions; one securing the Site Integrity Plan (SIP) and one securing the Cable Specification Installation and Monitoring Plan (CSIMP), will both be included within the next version of the draft DCO (to be submitted at Deadline 7), such that if the SoS determines that development consent can be granted,</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>the SoS can also chose which condition and associated control document to secure in the DCO.</p> <p>Annex 1 of the Applicant's Additional information for the HHW SAC position paper contains the proposed Outline Norfolk Boreas HHW SAC CSIMP [REP6-017] and it would be this document which would be secured (and certified as document 8.20) if the SoS decides to include the alternative condition 9 (1)(m).</p>
Q3.8.3.2	Natural England, Marine Management Organisation, other IPs	<p><b>Alternative to the Site Integrity Plan:</b> All IPs to provide any additional information regarding the CSIMP or SIP that will assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	
Q3.8.3.3	The Applicant, Natural England	<p><b>Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan:</b> The Applicant [REP6-019] commits to decommission cable protection at the end of the Norfolk Boreas project life. If Sabellaria spinulosa colonised over the cable during operation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there the potential that removing cable protection could result in more damage than leaving it in-situ?</li> <li>2. Should there be some flexibility in the CSIMP for removal to take place unless discussion with the relevant SNCB conclude otherwise?</li> </ol>	<p>As stated by Natural England throughout the examination (for example Appendix 2.1 of their Relevant Representation [RR-099], they do not consider <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef which has colonised artificial substrate as being Annex I reef. The Applicant has made the commitment to decommission the cable protection to allow for <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef to recolonise natural substrate once the cable protection has been decommissioned. During discussions with Natural England by both the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard projects, Natural England have, in principle welcomed a commitment such as the one that has been made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant considers that there is a strong likelihood that the cable protection would be colonised by <i>S.spinulosa</i> to such an extent that it could be considered reef. This position is made clear within the Information to Support HRA Report [APP-201]. Two important requirements for <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef to establish are a stable substrate on which the larvae can settle and start to grow and enough suspended sediment to construct their tubes. These requirements would both be met by the cable installation process as the cable protection, where used, would provide a stable</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>substrate and the cable installation process would locally increase the levels of suspended sediment providing the species with additional tube building material aiding the reef building processes. It is therefore likely that at least some of the cable protection would be colonised.</p> <p>It should be noted that the largest Area to managed as Annex I <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef (identified by Natural England) shown in Figure 5.1 of the HHW SAC SIP [REP6-011] which is also an area that Natural England have the "highest confidence" that reef can occur within it (shown in dark Purple in Figure 5.1) overlaps with the Bacton to Baird Pipeline, the Bacton to Zeebrugge pipeline and an active telecommunications cable. Although there is no direct evidence that reef has established on these features, as none of them have been surveyed for the presence of <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef it does indicate that the local environmental conditions allow <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef to occur where infrastructure exists, thus providing further evidence for the Applicant's assertion that the cable protection will be colonised.</p> <p>However given Natural England's position as stated above, removal of the cable protection and reef which has established on it during Norfolk Boreas decommissioning could allow the possible establishment of <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef on underlying natural substrate and thus would be accepted by Natural England as Annex I reef which would contribute to the conservation objectives of the HHW SAC.</p> <p>2. Notwithstanding this and should Natural England agree, the wording of the commitment could be updated to read (suggested additional text is underlined):</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p><i>Norfolk Boreas commit to decommission cable protection at the end of the Norfolk Boreas project life where it is associated with unburied cables due to ground conditions (where required for crossings this will be left in situ) <u>should it be agreed with Natural England and the MMO that this is compliant with the conservation objectives of the HHW SAC.</u></i></p>
Q3.8.3.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Alternative Cable Routes:</b>            The Applicant has in its Position Paper on Derogation [REP6-025] addressed alternatives for the project. Can the Applicant explain if there are alternatives for the marine cable route to be routed around the SAC to avoid impacts altogether?</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered possible routes to avoid the Haisborough Hammond and Winterton SAC altogether; however these are not feasible for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>Any route to the North of the HHW SAC would also be restricted by the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, which like the HHW SAC is designated for Annex I Sandbanks and <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef. As can be seen in Figure 4.2 Offshore constraints [APP-249] of the Environmental Statement (ES) the HHW and North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SACs form a barrier with only a narrow gap of less than 1km between them. Also in this area there is a significant amount of oil and gas infrastructure including surface and subsurface infrastructure and pipelines. Much of this infrastructure would represent a hard constraint to the project and a route through this would not be possible. Furthermore, to the north of Happisburgh lies the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ (Figure 4.2 Offshore constraints [APP-249] of the ES). This was identified as a hard constraint during the site selection process, with many stakeholders (including Natural England, the MMO, The Wildlife Trusts and EIFCA) strongly advising the project to avoid this site. It should be noted that similar advice was not provided for the HHW SAC. The Applicant heeded this advice and from an early stage in the site selection process and the MCZ was avoided.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>During the site selection process, a route which would pass to the south of the HHW SAC and make landfall in the Lowestoft area was assessed, see section 4.7 of Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-217] of the ES (also see Figure 4.1 in the Applicant's In principle Habitats Regulations Derogation Provision of Evidence [ExA.Dero.1.D7.V1]). This route was ruled out as it would be considerably longer than the other routes considered, as well as being more complex, requiring approximately double the number of cable/pipeline crossing agreements than that of the proposed offshore cable corridor to Happisburgh South. In addition, the reason that the aforementioned route south of the HHW SAC was required to make landfall as far south as Lowestoft is because there is a significant area of active aggregate dredging located immediately to the south of the southernmost boundary of the SAC, see Figure 4.1 in the Applicants Habitats In principle Habitats Regulations Derogation Provision of Evidence [ExA.Dero.1.D7.V1]). Aggregate dredging areas are considered a hard constraint as the installation of cables would not be permitted within a licensed area. Furthermore, a route to the south of the HHW SAC would also pass through the Outer Thames Estuary SPA, which is avoided by the current proposed route.</p> <p>In summary, any route to the north of the HHW SAC would not be possible due to the presence of the North Norfolk Sandbanks and Saturn Reef SAC, the Cromer Shoal MCZ and significant oil and gas infrastructure in that area and any route to the south would not be possible due to a large area used for aggregate extraction.</p>
Q3.8.3.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Relationship of historic environment, sandbank and reef features in SAC:</b> The Clarification note on optimising cable routeing</p>	The Applicant has provided the requested plan as Appendix 8.1 to this document. When viewing the plan it should be noted that, as stated in the clarification note, only a small percentage of A2

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>through the HHW SAC [REP4-022] provides an overlay plan of Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZs), A2 seabed anomalies of potential archaeological interest and areas to be managed as <i>S. Spinulosa</i> reef.</p> <p>Provide a further composite plan overlaying on the above features within the red line boundary in addition any sandbank features of conservation significance in the HHW SAC.</p>	<p>anomalies are likely to be confirmed as being of archaeological interest, with an even smaller number being given protection by AEZs. Thus, the A2 anomalies presented in the plan do not represent a hard constraint. In the event that an A2 anomaly could not be avoided then other mitigation, as agreed with Historic England, would still be possible. The A2 anomalies presented in the plan are single data points and do not represent a geographical area on the map. Therefore, the map appears more congested than would be the case on the ground.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the areas to be managed as <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef are shapefiles provided by Natural England to show the areas where they have higher confidence that <i>S.spinulosa</i> reef <u>could</u> occur and not where they believe it to currently be present. As requested by the ExA areas of Annex I sandbanks have been added to the Plan. As can be seen in Figure 3 of Appendix 3 of the HHW SAC control document [REP6-011 or REP6-017] the cable corridor does avoid the majority of areas to be managed by sandbanks and where it does not it does cross them in such a way that overlap is minimised (i.e. perpendicular to the sandbank). It should be noted however that the Sandbank features would recover rapidly from cable installation<sup>3</sup> and therefore they <u>do not represent a hard constraint for cable installation</u>. More relevant for sandbanks is the long term impact of habitat loss caused by the placement of cable protection. Appendix 3 of the HHW SAC control document [REP6-011 or REP6-017] illustrates that it is likely that it would be possible to avoid the placement of cable protection within areas Identified as Annex I Sandbanks.</p>

<sup>3</sup> Natural England state in the Relevant Representation [RR-099] that the mobile nature of this particular sandbank system would make it more likely to recover from changes in structure. Since the submission of the Relevant Representation, the Applicant has made a number of additional commitments to promote recover which have been welcomed by Natural England [REP6-051].

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			The Applicant remains confident in its conclusion that the offshore cable corridor has been designed to allow sufficient room to avoid impacts to sensitive features. Areas of seabed have been identified where the space available is potentially limited, however at these locations there is sufficient room to route export cables to avoid significant impacts.
Q3.8.3.6	Marine Management Organisation (MMO) Natural England (NE) Historic England (HBMCE)	<p><b>Micrositing within the HHW SAC:</b></p> <p>In [REP5-073] the MMO noted that it still has concerns that micrositing may not be possible at the time of construction and would like this to be dealt with at consenting stage rather than post consent; and also that NE have queried how the MMO would make a decision between the potential impacts to Annex 1 reef and Archaeological interest features.</p> <p>In order to assist the ExA in assessing the likelihood of successful micrositing to avoid these composite constraints, MMO, NE and HBMCE to comment on the Applicant's response to these concerns [REP6-013] claiming that "micrositing is possible at present and that there is unlikely to be any discernible difference in extent or location of the different constraints when final cable routing is undertaken" with specific reference to the reconciliation of multiple constraints including any additional constraints that may be presented by the presence of sandbanks in the cable corridor.</p>	

#### 8.4 Offshore ornithology

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.8.4.1	Natural England	<b>Elements of Precaution:</b> NE to respond to the Applicant's comments [REP6-042] regarding the combination of individual elements of precaution.	
Q3.8.4.2	Natural England	<b>In-combination Assessment:</b> NE to comment on the Applicant's updated in-combination collision risk modelling [REP6- 024].	

#### 8.5 Greater Wash SPA

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.8.5.1	Natural England	<b>Little gull:</b> Table 1 of NE's Deadline 4 representation [REP4-040] states that NE is unable to rule out an AEOI to little gull of the Greater Wash SPA from in-combination collision mortality when Hornsea Projects Three and Four are included. However, section 7.2 of the same document states that NE agrees an AEOI can be ruled out. Further to the Applicant's revised in-combination assessment submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6-024], can NE clarify its position in this regard.	



## 8.6 Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Haisborough Hammond and Winterton SAC

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.8.6.1	The Applicant, Natural England	<p><b>Derogation:</b></p> <p>The Applicant submitted an initial Position Paper on Derogation for relevant qualifying features at Flamborough and Filey Coast (FFC) SPA, Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Haisborough Hammond and Winterton SAC [REP6-025]. While the ExA is aware that compensatory measures have been proposed for Norfolk Vanguard, it reminds the Applicant that compensatory measures for Norfolk Boreas should be specifically for this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without prejudice, can the Applicant provide the necessary information for the SoS to consider whether the project can pass the IROPI test for each site?</li> <li>Can the Applicant state when it will submit its fuller derogation cases?</li> </ol> <p>What are NE's comments on compensation measures proposed?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As requested, the Applicant has provided a without prejudice in-principle habitats regulations derogation provision of evidence, which includes consideration of in-principle compensation, for each designated site which will permit the Secretary of State (SoS) to reach a determination on IROPI with respect to Norfolk Boreas in the event that the SoS cannot rule out AEoI notwithstanding the Applicant's clear position that AEoI can be ruled out both for the project alone and in-combination .</li> <li>As stated above this has been submitted at Deadline 7 (ExA.Dero.D7.V1).</li> </ol>
Q3.8.6.2	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Natural England	<p><b>CRM for gannet and lesser black backed gull (LBBG):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RSPB has previously stated that it cannot agree no AEoI of gannet of the FFC SPA and LBBG of Alde-Ore Estuary SPA from collision mortality from Norfolk Boreas alone. Further to the Applicant's revised CRM at Deadline 5 [REP5-059], can the RSPB provide an update on its position in relation to these features and collision impacts from Norfolk Boreas alone. If the RSPB is unable to rule out an AEoI, please can it provide its reasons.</li> </ol>	<p>The Applicant notes that this question is directed to the RSPB, however considers it important to stress that very large reductions have been achieved in collision risk for all species following the design mitigations (increase in draught height to 30m from mean high water springs for 124 x 14.7MW turbines and to 35m for 158 x 11.55MW turbines). Gannet collisions have been reduced by 74% (from 58 to 15 collisions apportioned to Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA) and for lesser black-backed gull by 63% (from 5.9 to 2.1 using Natural England's preferred parameters and 4.3 to 1.6 using the Applicant's preferred parameters, collisions apportioned to the Alde Ore Estuary SPA).</p>

## 8.7 Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.8.7.1	Natural England	<p><b>AEol:</b> NE [REP6-051] cannot agree to no AEol for gannet, guillemot and razorbill when Hornsea 3 and 4 are included. Accepting that uncertainty of the Hornsea projects are outside of the Applicant's control, are there further measures the Applicant could provide to satisfy NE on no AEol?</p>	<p>The Applicant has presented evidence to demonstrate that there is no risk of AEol for gannet, guillemot and razorbill from the Flamborough and Filey Coast (FFC) Special Protection Area (SPA) due to the project alone and in-combination with other plans and projects (REP2-035). This has been agreed by Natural England for the project alone and in-combination with other plans and projects when Hornsea Projects Three and Four are excluded (REP4-040).</p> <p>The only scenario for which Natural England (REP4-040) did not agree that an AEol could be ruled out for these three species was when Hornsea Projects Three and Four are included, due to the uncertainties associated with these projects:</p> <p><i>'However, due to Natural England's significant concerns regarding the incomplete baseline surveys for the Hornsea 3 project, and the associated level of uncertainty as regards the potential impacts of that project, together with the inevitable uncertainty associated with the figures for Hornsea 4 from the PEIR and are subject to change...'</i></p> <p>[note the above text was stated in REP4-040 for all three species].</p> <p>Therefore the Applicant considers that Natural England's concern is with respect to the uncertainties the Hornsea projects introduce to the in-combination assessments (the Applicant understand this relates to the baseline data used for the Hornsea Project Three assessment and the fact that only a preliminary assessment is available for Hornsea Project Four), and this is the reason Natural England has been unable to rule out AEol with their inclusion.</p> <p>Furthermore, since this was also Natural England's position at the close of the Norfolk Vanguard examination, it appears that no level of mitigation for Norfolk Boreas alone could satisfy Natural England's concerns with respect to in-combination effects. Since the</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>contribution to the in-combination total from Hornsea Projects Three and Four is wholly beyond the control of the Applicant there is nothing more that the Applicant can do.</p>
Q3.8.7.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Derogation:</b> The Applicant to explain why gannet, razorbill and guillemot are not included in the Position Paper on Derogation [REP6-025].</p>	<p>As noted in response to Q3.8.7.1, the Applicant has presented evidence to demonstrate that there is no risk of AEol for gannet, guillemot and razorbill from the FFC SPA due to the potential effects of the project alone and in-combination with other plans and projects (REP2-035), and this has been agreed by Natural England with the exception of when Hornsea Project Three and Four are included (REP4-040).</p> <p>The situation for gannet, guillemot and razorbill is therefore materially different from Natural England's position on kittiwake from the FFC SPA and lesser black-backed gull (from the Alde-Ore Estuary SPA) for which Natural England considers that AEol cannot be ruled out irrespective of whether or not Hornsea Projects Three and Four are included (REP4-040). This was also Natural England's position for Norfolk Vanguard.</p> <p>Therefore it is the Applicant's understanding that Natural England's position on AEol (that this can't be ruled out with the inclusion of Hornsea Projects Three and Four) for gannet, guillemot and razorbill from the FFC SPA rests solely on the uncertainties due to the Hornsea projects, which are outside the Applicant's control. Since the SoS's request for a derogation case for Norfolk Vanguard only identified those SPA features for which Natural England could not rule out AEol when Hornsea Project Three was not included (i.e. kittiwake from FFC SPA and lesser black-backed gull from AOE SPA), the Applicant considers that this is a robust and appropriate basis on which to consider in principle derogation for Norfolk Boreas and therefore there is no need to consider derogation for these features (gannet, razorbill and guillemot).</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			Furthermore, even with the uncertainties that Natural England has expressed about all ornithological impacts at the Hornsea Project Three wind farm, the SoS did not request consideration of derogation for these species for that wind farm.

## 9 Landscape and Visual Effects

### 9.0 The Applicant's landscape and visual assessment

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

### 9.1 The Applicant's visual assessment

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.9.1.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Sensitivity of receptor</b> Explain how the motorists along the A47 are assessed as having the same sensitivity as residents represented by other viewpoints [APP-242], eg Viewpoints VP4, VP5, VP6, VP8, VP9, VP10.</p>	<p>It may be useful to read the answer to Q3.9.1.2 first, as it explains how sensitivity is assessed. In summary, sensitivity is assessed by combining the value of the view and the susceptibility of the viewer to the change that will arise as a result of the proposed development. Typically, the value of the views in the study area will be medium as there are no formal or informal viewpoints with visibility of the onshore project substation or National Grid substation extension. There are also no landscape designations which would otherwise denote a special scenic quality and there is an existing influence from</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>energy infrastructure. The variable in the assessment is typically susceptibility to change.</p> <p>In total, four of the 12 viewpoints are representative of visual receptors; namely Viewpoint 8: Chapel Road, Necton; Viewpoint 9: St Andrews Lane, Necton; Viewpoint 10: Holme Hale and Viewpoint 12: Ivy Todd. The statement that motorists are assessed as having the same sensitivity as residents is not true in respect of Viewpoint 9: St Andrews Lane, which is representative of residents on St Andrews Lane. Here, the sensitivity is assessed as medium to high, which is higher than the medium sensitivity attributed to motorists on the A47. It is also higher than the medium sensitivity attributed to residents represented by Viewpoint 8 and Viewpoint 12, reflecting the higher landform at the northern end of St Andrews Lane and the more open aspect across the adjacent farmland towards the National Grid substation extension, that some residents would experience as a result.</p> <p>In respect of Viewpoint 8: Chapel Road, Necton, and Viewpoint 12: Ivy Todd, the sensitivity rating is medium, the same as that of motorists on the A47 and slightly less than that of residents on St Andrews Lane. The susceptibility of residents to the potential effects of the proposed development is moderated by the lower-lying location of Chapel Road and the lower-lying location and extent of tree cover in respect of Ivy Todd. This means that residents are less susceptible as they don't have the same open outlook or visual connection with the site. In respect of Viewpoint 10: Holme Hale, the sensitivity of the residents is lower than that of the motorists and this reflects the very limited susceptibility of residents to the proposed development as there would be very limited visibility from the settlement.</p> <p>While typically the susceptibility of road-users would be lower than residents, the very close proximity of road-users on the A47 to the National Grid substation extension and the A47 junction, increases</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>their susceptibility to the effects of the proposed development. This part of the assessment also factors in consideration of the large volume of visual receptors that will be experiencing views, from the A47. This consideration is covered in Paragraph 56 of the LVIA Methodology [APP 677, Section 6] which states; "A viewpoint that is visited or used by a large number of people would tend to have a greater importance than one gained by very few people, although this is not always the case." There are approximately 20,000 vehicles passing the viewpoints on the A47 every day.</p>
Q3.9.1.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Visual assessment terminology</b></p> <p>Provide clarity on the visual assessment process in terms of "value of view", "value of receptor", "susceptibility to change", "sensitivity of visual receptor", "sensitivity of view", "overall sensitivity to change" [APP-677, Section 6]. Specifically clarify if "overall sensitivity to change" and "sensitivity of view" are the same.</p>	<p>The "value of the view" relates principally to the recognised value associated with a formal viewpoint, whilst also considering the value of informal viewpoints and/or the scenic qualities and condition of the landscape which makes up the view. It also takes into account the consideration of the volume of people experiencing that view. In respect of the representative viewpoints used in the LVIA, the value is typically medium to reflect the absence of any formal or informal viewpoints, and/or any landscape designations which would otherwise indicate a special scenic value.</p> <p>The "value of the receptor" is a term that is used more in respect of landscape receptors than visual receptors, as in the visual assessment, value is particular to the view and not the visual receptors. The exception occurs where the value of a principal visual receptor is being described, for example where a special value is attached to a tourist route.</p> <p>The "susceptibility to change" assesses the susceptibility of the visual receptors to the change that would be brought about by the introduction of the proposed development in its specific location. This takes into account the nature of the viewer, the occupation or activity they are likely to be engaged in, and their experience of the view, for example residents at home and in gardens experiencing static views or road-users on the A47 experiencing transitory views. It also</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>considers what the principal characteristics of the view are, for example if there is a strong existing focus or an existing influence from a specific type of development, that will also have an influence on their susceptibility to the proposed development.</p> <p>The “overall sensitivity to change” combines the assessment of the value of the view and the susceptibility of the visual receptors to the proposed change, in order to arrive at an overall rating for sensitivity which considers both the nature and experience of the visual receptors and the value and key characteristics of the view they are experiencing. This is then combined with the rating for magnitude of change to determine whether the effects are significant or not.</p> <p>The “sensitivity of a visual receptor” is referring primarily to the susceptibility of the visual receptors to the proposed development, as it is this part of the sensitivity rating that relates to visual receptors.</p> <p>The “sensitivity of the view” is referring primarily to the value of the view, as it is this part of the sensitivity rating that relates to the view. The “sensitivity of the view” is therefore different to the “overall sensitivity to change,” and is one of the factors considered in the overall “sensitivity to change”.</p>

## 9.2 Alternatives considered

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.9.2.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Top Farm</b> Confirm whether the Top Farm site was considered as an alternative site, if this is different from Top Farm being “reviewed as an alternative site”. If so when was it considered/ reviewed [REP2-021, response to Q2.2.8(2)]?</p>	<p>The Top Farm site was not specifically considered as an alternative to the current proposed location because Top Farm is located within the 3km search area around the existing Necton National Grid Substation that had previously been reviewed as part of the site selection process</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>(detailed in ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-217]).</p> <p>This search area, within which Top Farm is located, was reviewed as part of an early stage of the site selection process in 2016 and 2017, during Phase 1 non-statutory consultation; the search area was presented at seven public exhibition events held across the scoping area, including one at Necton on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016.</p> <p>Top Farm is located within Sector 1 and 5 of the search area (shown on ES Figure 4.9 [APP-256] and in ES Appendix 4.9 [APP-545]). All five sectors of the search area were presented to the local community and feedback was sought. The 3km search area around the existing Necton National Grid Substation was then refined as a result of environmental constraints to produce the “keyhole” search area (ES Figure 4.10 [APP-257]). The keyhole search area was subsequently consulted on during Phase II non-statutory consultation in March 2017 at community events and stakeholder meetings. It was immediately prior to this stage that the sectors within which Top Farm is located were excluded from further consideration in the site selection process. This is because these sectors (and therefore Top Farm) fell within the residential buffer zone (ES Figure 4.10 [APP-257] and ES Appendix 4.10 [APP-546]).</p> <p>As detailed in the Applicant's response to the Open Floor Hearing [REP1-036]:</p> <p>Top Farm, would have two significant effects – moving the onshore project substation closer to more residential properties, including within the currently excluded residential buffer zones, and requiring significant earthworks in order to level the footprint, prior to commencement of construction works. This second consideration is significant because it would require a lengthier pre-construction and construction period to establish a level foundation, require greater traffic movements to remove excavated materials and transport</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			additional construction materials with associated impacts such as noise, and create a more notable impact on landscape character and visual amenity due to additional earthworks. The site is also constrained from a technical perspective by the presence of overhead lines.
Q3.9.2.2	The Applicant	<b>Top Farm</b> Clarify the heights mentioned regarding the comparison made between the Top Farm site and the proposed onshore project substation site (proposed site 65m to 70m and Top Farm 65m to 75m) [REP2-021, response to Q2.2.8(2)] in light of the dDCO secured "existing ground levels" set at 73m AOD (Scenario 1) and 72m AOD (Scenario 2) in Requirement 16 (8)(a) and (b) [REP5-003].	The height range of 65m to 70m has been taken from the OS 1:25,000 map of the area. Appendix 9.1, Figures 1d and 2d show an outline of the onshore project substation footprints in respect of Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 respectively. The 65m contour line passes to the south-west of the site and the 70m contour through the centre of the site, while the 75m contour set beyond the north-east of the site. In order to understand how the proposed platform levels of 72m (Scenario 2) and 73m (Scenario 1) fit with the existing site levels, it is necessary to refer to the more detailed contour plans shown on the updated version of Appendix 9.1 – Figures 1b and 2b submitted at Deadline 7 [ExA.AS-4.D7.V2]. These show that in the north-east corner of the site the levels rise slightly beyond the 70m contour to close to 74m in respect of Scenario 2 and 74m in respect of Scenario 1. This explains how the proposed platforms can be accommodated within existing site contours and without building up levels.

### 9.3 Landscape effects

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.9.3.1	The Applicant	<b>Landfall zone</b> Provide an aerial image of the landward part of the landfall zone clearly marking the England Coast Path, the 125m line from the cliff edge, and the proposed	A plan showing the landfall aerial image as requested has been produced and is presented in Appendix 9.2.

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		landfall compound zone, indicative landfall compounds and onshore cable route.	

#### 9.4 Visual effects

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

#### 9.5 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

#### 9.6 Good Design

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.9.6.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Design and Access Statement (DAS)</b></p> <p>Submit an updated DAS in which consideration has been given to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reference to the National Infrastructure Commissions' Design Principles for National infrastructure;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant agrees to include a reference to the '<i>National Infrastructure Commissions' Design Principles for National Infrastructure</i>' and the identified four design principles can be considered as part of the design process and included within an updated DAS.</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reference to and inclusion of the examples of the “<i>agricultural style</i>” typology submitted to the Examination [REP5-0047, Appendix 9.2];</li> <li>▪ Reference to the proposed district-wide post consent DASs,</li> <li>▪ Clarity and certainty over the involvement of Necton Parish Council (at its request) (eg in para 70);</li> <li>▪ Reference to an overall design approach or vision, not just mitigation (para 65);</li> <li>▪ Whether an additional aim is also to assist in seeking approvals under Requirement 18;</li> <li>▪ Whether there should be a statement about Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 in the DAS, in terms of cumulative effects and what could be achieved in Scenario 1, when the Norfolk Vanguard substations would be constructed;</li> <li>▪ The NFU’s suggestion in the updated SoCG with the Applicant [REP6-032, Pages 6 to 7] that a statement to confirm that cut and fill (for the proposed onshore project substation) would be undertaken at the midpoint to minimise landscape impact should be included in the DAS;</li> <li>▪ Whether materials and colours of the small control buildings associated with Work No. 10A should be included in the Design Guide;</li> <li>▪ Checking the proposed National Grid substation extension indicative mitigation planting Scenario 2 drawing is consistent with that in the ES.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The photographs of agricultural style submitted in Appendix 9.2 [REP5-047] can be included as an appendix within the DAS.</li> <li>• The DAS captures the principles of design on above ground infrastructure; it would not therefore be necessary to provide a separate DAS post-consent. The DAS has been updated to include a new paragraph to make clear the relevance and applicability of the principles in the DAS across all districts.</li> <li>• The detail added to Section 5.3.6 of the DAS [REP5-012] on the Design Process states that stakeholders will be refined in light of the information provided in collaboration with Breckland Council. Examples of stakeholders who will be engaged with are provided and include Necton Parish Council along with Holme Hale Parish Council, relevant landowners, closest residents and other relevant residents / groups. The Applicant is committed to engage with all relevant stakeholders during this process and will amend the wording in the DAS to make this clear they will engage with Necton Parish Council and relevant landowners.</li> <li>• Reference to design approach will be added to paragraph 65.</li> <li>• The Design and Access Statement is to provide details of the use, layout, scale and appearance of onshore project substation</li> <li>• The Applicant can confirm that the proposed mitigation planting at the National Grid Substation under Scenario 2 is the same on DAS Figure 8 [REP5-017] as presented on ES Figure 29.20b [APP-5 05]. There is a slight difference in some of the other features shown on the figures e.g. DAS Figure 8 shows existing attenuation ponds as well as the proposed new location, and ES Figure 29.20b shows the overhead line search area, however this is not a permanent feature so is not shown on the DAS figure.</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			An updated DAS Version 4, has been submitted at Deadline 7.
Q3.9.6.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Design and Access Statement</b></p> <p>Address seeming inconsistencies in what is intended regarding the design process and Design Guide's role with regards some of the architectural features, such as materials and colour bearing in mind NPS EN-1's requirement to take into account function and aesthetics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Whether the wording "<i>landscape design rather than the substation architecture</i>" gives the wrong impression of what is intended as set out in Appendix 1;</li> <li>▪ Whether the Design Guide content (Appendix 1) should state that functionally non-negotiable aspects of the architecture (such as converter hall height, footprint etc) which would be driven by function, would be set out in the Design Guide;</li> <li>▪ Whether the Design Guide should make a link to the OLEMS, by which the materials and colour of the onshore project substation are secured (R18(2)(j));</li> <li>▪ Whether some of the references to colour should also state materials;</li> <li>▪ Whether it would be a colour and materials comparison study (Appendix 1), and whether some of the testing of this would actually occur outside in the vicinity of the proposed onshore project substation, clarifying the penultimate paragraph of Appendix 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to the technical and functional requirements of the onshore project substation there are a limited number of architectural elements which can be influenced, which is why the Design Guide will be focused on landscape design rather than substation architecture. The onshore project substation is largely made up of structural electrical equipment the design of which cannot be influenced.</li> <li>• The Design Guide will set out the design of the built features, including the structural components which are functionally non-negotiable, as well as the landscape features. The Applicant will update the text in the DAS to make this clear.</li> <li>• A reference to the OLEMS and Requirement 18 (2)(j) will be added to the Design Guide.</li> <li>• The construction material for the proposed converter building serves a functional purpose in providing a managed environment for the sensitive converter equipment and will include structural requirements to support features such as internal overhead gantries. Consideration will also be required on the construction material functionality with respect to aspects such as fire safety, weatherproofing and maintainability. The Applicant would identify any construction material optionality, if available, which satisfies the functional requirements and this could be considered within the design process. The DAS will be updated to reflect materials options will be considered if they meet the necessary technical / functional requirements.</li> </ul> <p>As the selection of the materials to be used will be dictated by the functional requirements of the onshore project substation, the comparative study would focus principally on the choice of colour. This would offer the greatest scope in terms of changing the</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			appearance of the onshore project substation. The photomontages would be used to illustrate the colour options by applying a range of colours to the model of the converter halls. Furthermore, baseline photography would be taken at different times of the year to represent the seasonal changes in the colours of the local landscape and the models presented in the context of these changes. In order to best understand and appreciate the colour options, it is advised that site visits be carried out by the local authority and stakeholders, where the photomontages can be considered, along with test panels of the different colour options.
Q3.9.6.4	The Applicant	<b>Use of Design and Access Statement</b> Would the Design and Access Statement be used in the contractor procurement process?	Yes, the Applicant would provide the tendering contractors the DAS as part of the package of relevant consent documents for them to consider through the procurement process.
Q3.9.6.5	Breckland Council Necton Parish Council The National Farmers' Union NSAG Other IPs	<b>Design and Access Statement: further comments</b> Further to comments at Deadline 5, the SoCG between the Applicant and the NFU [REP6- 032] and Breckland Council's future role which would be responsible for post consent approvals: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide any comments on the DAS submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-013] to [REP5- 017].</li> <li>2. Provide any views on any of the points in the two questions above and/ or any further points you consider should be included or amended.</li> </ol>	
Q3.9.6.6	The National Farmers' Union	<b>DAS: Consultation with landowners</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further to comments in the SoCG between the Applicant and the NFU [REP6-032] are you content with the DAS wording regarding landowner involvement [REP5-013, para 66 and 72]?</li> <li>2. If not propose amended wording for either of these paragraphs or additional wording.</li> </ol>	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Confirm if your request relates to all landowners affected by the proposed onshore project substation.</li> <li>4. Do comments also relate to any aspects of the proposed National Grid substation extension?</li> </ol>	
Q3.9.6.7	Breckland Council	<p><b>Future approvals</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How would you ensure the right skills to engage in the design process (as set out in REP5-013, Plate 4) and to consult, amend if necessary and approve would be available to the Council?</li> <li>2. Do you have any further comments on the DAS wording regarding future engagement [REP5-013, para 72] whereby you and the Applicant would determine which stakeholders would be engaged in the design process in light of the information in the Design Guide?</li> <li>3. Is there anything further you would wish to see incorporated regarding Scenario 1, where the Norfolk Vanguard substations may have preceded the design process described in the DAS for the Norfolk Boreas proposed development?</li> </ol>	

## 9.7 Matters arising from the accompanied site inspection (ASI) on Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> January

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.9.7.1	The Applicant	Provide updated contour drawings at Deadline 7, with contours visible under colour shadings for substation and other assets [REP5-047, Appendix 9.1, Figures 1b and 2b].	Updated plans have been produced and are presented in Appendix 9.1.

## 10 Marine and Coastal processes

### 10.0 Marine and Coastal processes

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

## 11 Navigation

### 11.0 Navigation

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

## 12 Onshore construction effects

### 12.0 Cable corridor and ducting

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.12.0.1	The Applicant	<b>Workfront strategy</b> Should the explanation provided at [REP5-045, ExA2.12.0.1] be included in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS)? If not, why not?	As detailed in the Applicant's response to ExA Q2.12.0.1 [REP5-045];  At all times the sectionalised duct installation workfront strategy will be employed, save for trenchless crossing locations, along the cable route (Scenario 2 only). The length of the workfront may however

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>differ from the notional 150m during the construction process to maintain the principle of mitigation (excavate, install and reinstate within a 1 to 2 week period) whilst appreciating some sections of the cable route will be more or less complex. This reason for flexibility in the workfront length can be added to the OLEMS [REP5-022] to clarify the securement of 150m workfronts, where possible and that the sectionalised duct installation workfront strategy will apply at all times.</p>
Q3.12.0.2	The Applicant, Norfolk County Council	<p><b>B1149 Crossing</b> The ExA notes the arguments presented by the Applicant in the Clarification Note Trenchless Crossings B1149 and Church Road, Colby [REP04-017], by NCC in its D5 submission [REP5-066], and by the Applicant in its response [REP6-013]. 1. Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	<p>It is the Applicant's position that an open cut crossing method is appropriate and feasible at this location.</p> <p>As stated in the technical note [REP4-017] to retain flexibility in the trenchless crossing method which could be most appropriately employed for the location (e.g. HDD, micro-tunnelling, auger boring) additional temporary land, outside of the current Order limits, would be required.</p> <p>Whilst it is possible to develop a bespoke design to enable a trenchless crossing in this location (in the event the SoS decides that a trenchless crossing of the B1149 is necessary), this bespoke design would only accommodate the HDD trenchless crossing method, and no other trenchless crossing method. This is because only a single compound could be included within the existing Order limits. This compound would need to be set back approximately 250m from the crossing location, rather than alongside the trenchless crossing launch and exit locations.</p> <p>At all other trenchless crossing locations flexibility is retained for all trenchless crossing methods so that the most appropriate solution can be employed following ground investigation, cable design (sizing) and detailed design of the trenchless crossing.</p> <p>Therefore, to accommodate an HDD at this specific location within the Order limits would constrain the Project design prior to detailed design and investigations being conducted. For a bespoke trenchless design, a temporary works compound of 100m x 45m (4,500m<sup>2</sup>)</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>would be required to support the works within the existing Order limits.</p> <p>Norfolk Vanguard, in response to the Secretary of State's letter dated 6 December 2019, has undertaken an environmental assessment of this potential change to the previously assessed working methodology. The assessment identifies that trenchless crossings require the flexibility to extend into the evening and night time due to the continuous nature of those activities, and in the event of evening or night time working there is the potential for significant construction noise impacts to occur at the nearest residential property. Accordingly, construction noise mitigation would be required; this would be captured within the Construction Noise Management Plan submitted with the final Code of Construction Practice, which is already secured under DCO Requirement 20.</p> <p>As the same approach and methodology would be employed by Norfolk Boreas under Scenario 2 (the crossing being undertaken by Norfolk Vanguard under Scenario 1), in the event that the SoS required a trenchless crossing of the B1149, this assessment is considered directly applicable to Norfolk Boreas and has been submitted at Deadline 7, as 'Norfolk Vanguard Environmental Assessment for Trenchless Crossing of B1149' [ExA.AS-3.D7.V1].</p>
Q3.12.0.3	The Applicant	<p><b>B1149 Crossing</b>            Provide an aerial image(s) clearly marking the full extent of the traffic management proposals at the B1149 crossing (AC89) including the access point AC90, diversion lane, extent of the required resurfacing and the cable corridor. If it helps clarity mark the south western verge and the north eastern verge on separate copies of the aerial image.</p>	<p>An aerial image showing the traffic management proposals is presented in Appendix 12.1.</p>
Q3.12.0.4	Broadland District Council	<p><b>B1149 Crossing (open cut trench/ trenchless crossing)</b>            Provide your views on the effect on hedgerows and trees in</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that hedgerow removal would be required to accommodate a trenched crossing of the B1149 and the</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		relation to the trenchless crossing and proposed diversion lane under discussion for the B1149, as mentioned by NCC [REP5-066, final page].	associated traffic management. The removal of hedgerow along the cable route, including a crossing at the B1149, has been assessed in the Environment Statement, all hedgerow will be reinstated on completion of construction and as such no significant effect is identified. The length of hedgerow removal is increased as a result of the traffic management, however the increase in length does not result in a material change to the assessment conducted.
Q3.12.0.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Church Road, Colby (open cut trench/ trenchless crossing)</b></p> <p>Further to NNDC's update, in which it is stated that you are considering the NNDC option presented, provide your comments [REP6-043].</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a review of potential environmental constraints and opportunities of the proposed amendment to the crossing of Church Road, Colby, proposed by NNDC at Deadline 5 [REP5-067]. Full details of the review are presented in the Position Statement on Church Road, Colby submitted at Deadline 7 [ExA.AS-01.D7.V1]. The review identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed realignment to the running track would introduce potentially significant safety risks to road users along Church Road without further detailed assessment and the identification of additional mitigation;</li> <li>• Potential for significant construction noise impacts at Banningham Hall Farm Cottages for up to 19 weeks, given the proximity of this noise sensitive receptor to both the works areas and the two proposed new road junctions (15m).</li> <li>• Whilst trees can be replaced in the location from which they would be removed under NNDC's alternative proposal, there is the potential for significant landscape and visual impacts to be experienced by residents of Banningham Hall Cottages (significant for 5-10 years) due to trees being removed directly opposite this property until replacement trees become established. In addition, Banningham Hall will have direct views of the trenchless crossing compound (for the duration of the trenchless crossing works – approximately 10-12 weeks) compared to the more contained activities of open cut trenching for a shorter period of time.</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>Furthermore the amendment cannot be accommodated within the existing Order limits.</p> <p>The Applicant's final position is that NNDC's proposed alternative is not a proportionate or appropriate alternative and the proposed trenched crossing of Church Road is considered appropriate given that access through the hedgerows lining Church Road will always be necessary. Micrositing will seek to minimise tree losses, any trees removed will be replaced as close as practicable to the location where they were removed, and hedgerows will be fully reinstated.</p> <p>As detailed in the Position Statement on Church Road, Colby submitted at Deadline 7 [ExA.AS-01.D7.V1] the Applicant has undertaken a high-level survey to establish, in approximate terms, which trees would be likely to be removed to accommodate the trench crossing and to illustrate the potential for some replacement trees to be included, along with the replacement of the hedgerows, as part of the mitigation planting. The survey identified three immature and one semi-mature tree will require removal and that at least two replacements trees can be planted within the Order limits, with a further potentially be accommodated following detailed design.</p> <p>The Applicant's final position is that owing to the very small number of trees being removed and the presence of existing notable gaps in the trees cover already at this location, the change brought about by the loss of these four trees will not notably alter the baseline landscape character. Replacement planting of hedgerows would ensure the sense of enclosure on Church Road could be restored once the hedgerows matured. The Applicant has committed to replacing all trees within North Norfolk to ensure no net loss. To further mitigate potential impacts micro-siting of the cable will be undertaken to limit tree removal and to target smaller specimens for any tree removal</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>required, as well as to maximise the opportunity for replacement trees to be planted within the Order limits.</p> <p>If all replacement tree planting cannot be accommodated within the Order limits (subject to detailed design post-consent) then they will be replaced as close as practically possible, ideally further along to ensure no net loss of trees on Church Road (subject to landowner consent outside of the Order limits).</p> <p>Given there will be no notable change in the landscape character of Church Road and that all tree losses will be replaced, this is considered sufficient to mitigate impacts from tree losses at this location.</p>
Q3.12.0.6	Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Church Road, Colby (open cut trench/ trenchless crossing)</b></p> <p>Comment on the highways aspects of the Applicant's reasoning for not adopting NNDC's suggested alternative accesses which would enable a trenchless crossing [REP6-014, response to NNDC's response to Q2.9.3.1] regarding the introduction of new junctions, their proximity to each other and to an existing junction, their location opposite the farm access, the bend in the road and visibility, the HGV movements and the timescale (as set out in the second two bullet points). In responding include reference to and comparison with the Applicant's proposal, which also includes an access near the same bend in the road [APP-011, Sheet 13 of 42, AC59] and [REP4-017].</p>	
Q3.12.0.7	The Applicant, North Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Church Road, Colby (open cut trench/ trenchless crossing)</b></p> <p>Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a Position Statement on Church Road, Colby submitted at Deadline 7 [ExA.AS-01.D7.V1] which contains additional information on potential impacts on Church Road and potential mitigation measures, including details of the site survey. The Applicant's final position is that given there will be no notable change in the landscape character of Church Road and that all tree</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>losses will be replaced, this is considered sufficient to mitigate impacts from tree losses at this location</p> <p>In any event, the Applicant is strongly of the opinion that the national benefits of the proposed development significantly outweigh these localised impacts. Therefore, to the extent that matters cannot be agreed between the Applicant and NNDC, this will ultimately be a matter for the ExA to consider and for the Secretary of State to determine.</p>

## 12.1 Mobilisation areas

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.12.1.1	North Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Mobilisation Areas</b></p> <p>Are you content with the additional wording which the Applicant has added to the OCoCP [REP5-011, Section 3.2.1]?</p>	
Q3.12.1.2	The Applicant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respond to NNDC's point that there are other matters which relate more to visual amenity impacts, beyond the remit of environmental protection issues [REP6-043, response to Q2.12.1.3].</li> <li>Is the term "<i>neighbouring communities</i>" [REP5-011, para 61] sufficiently wide to cover all relevant types of sensitive receptors – eg the Quaker Burial Ground adjacent to Trenchless crossing zone 14a/b and Mobilisation area MA10?</li> </ol>	<p>1. The CoCP provides a mechanism to ensure that all environmental impacts associated with construction will be controlled and mitigated. The final CoCP will include a site layout showing the location of mobilisation areas, trenchless crossing technique (e.g. HDD) compounds, the onshore project substation temporary works area and National Grid substation extension temporary works area and the main features of these sites. As such these will be subject to a review and approval process by the relevant planning authority as part of the discharge of Requirement 20.</p> <p>Further information on the process for ensuring measures are in place to minimise any effects relating to these elements has been included in Section 3.2 of the OCoCP. The main control for any visual amenity is</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>the height of temporary welfare facilitates and storage units which is stated in Section 3.2, as no greater than 3m in height. The OCoCP sets out the principles which will be adopted to minimise effects however site-specific control measures will be identified when further details of the construction activities are available post-consent to ensure the most appropriate mitigation is identified, including any potential visual amenity impacts if applicable.</p> <p>2. The additional information in the OCoCP [REP5-011] at section 3.2 paragraph 61, has been specifically included to address concerns on neighbouring communities/human receptors and is considered to be an appropriate term. The impacts on other sensitive receptors such as buried archaeology or ecology are covered by the relevant topic specific management plans e.g. Written Scheme of Investigation Archaeological Investigation and Ecological Management Plan.</p>

## 12.2 Noise and Vibration

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.12.2.1	The Applicant, North Norfolk District Council Broadland District Council	<p><b>Noise Sensitive Receptors</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the Joint Position Statement with North Norfolk DC on Noise Sensitive Receptors [REP6-022]. The ExA also notes unresolved matters with Broadland DC in the updated Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) [REP6-026], regarding the appropriateness of the position of sensitive receptors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant, North Norfolk DC and Broadland DC to submit a joint position statement regarding Noise Sensitive Receptors, as an update to the submissions</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant has updated the joint position statement previously agreed with North Norfolk District Council (NNDC) to also address the concerns raised by Broadland District Council (BDC) and circulated it to both authorities.</li> </ol> <p>An Updated Joint Position Statement on Noise Sensitive Receptors [ExA.AS-2.D7.V1] has been submitted at Deadline 7. This position statement reflects the position previously agreed with NNDC and has been updated to include an agreed position with BDC, subject to the updates of the OCoCP, to be submitted at Deadline 8.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>[REP6-022] and [REP6-026]. Joint Position Statement to include detail on the process for reaching agreement (if agreement has not been reached) including implications if no agreement reached before close of Examination.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The dDCO [REP5-044] defines noise sensitive locations (Noise Sensitive Locations) (NSL) as those in Table 25.27 of ES chapter 25 [APP-238]. Provide an updated table 25.27 in light of the joint position statement with North Norfolk DC and Broadland DC.</li> <li>Should the definition of NSLs in the dDCO [REP5-044] be updated to refer to the definition in the ES Chapter 25 [APP-238]? If not, is there a potential for confusion between NSLs as defined in the dDCO and NSRs as defined in the ES?</li> </ol>	<p>2. and 3. The definition of noise sensitive locations in the dDCO is specific to Requirement 27 for control of noise <u>during the operational phase</u>, to identify the locations in the vicinity of the operational onshore project substation noise levels, where operational monitoring will take place to ensure compliance with the agreed noise levels i.e. <i>'the location of the relevant Receptor Identifier <b>SSR1-SSR11</b> in Table 25.27, Chapter 25 of the environmental statement.'</i> These are specific to the locations around the onshore project substation which could be affected by operational noise.</p> <p>The definition and location of noise sensitive receptors considered within the position statement and discussed with NNDC and BDC relate to noise sensitive receptors <u>during construction</u> and along the onshore cable route and as discussed in the position statement are not just the representative locations assessed in the ES (Table 25.27). These will include any receptors as defined in the updated table presented in the position statement and to be included in the OCoCP.</p> <p>Therefore, the Applicant considers the terms as currently used are appropriate.</p>
Q3.12.2.2	The Applicant, Broadland District Council	<p><b>Old Railway Gatehouse</b></p> <p>The SoCG with Broadland DC [REP6-026] states that the mitigation of cumulative noise, vibration and air quality effects along The Street at Oulton are captured within <i>"section 4.3.2 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) [APP-699] and secured through dDCO Requirement 21"</i>.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant to update the section and document reference in light of the revised OTMP [REP5-026] submitted to this Examination.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reference to the OTMP will be updated to reflect the latest OTMP.</li> <li>The proposed alterations to Old Railway Gatehouse are offered as optional additional measures to further minimise potential perceived disturbance by the residents. They are not necessary to mitigate the effects to non-significant.</li> </ol> <p>As detailed in the assessment specifically considering the noise, vibration and air quality effects at the Old Railway Gatehouse at Oulton (undertaken by Norfolk Vanguard and submitted as part of the Examination as Appendix 1 of the Broadland Statement of</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Confirm if the proposed alterations to Old Railway Gatehouse (identified as optional measures to further minimise disturbance) are part of the mitigation measures that reduce the cumulative adverse effects on the property to non-significant.</li> <li>3. Provide evidence of consent or progress of receiving consent from the property owner to implement measures to further minimise perceived disturbance impacts. If this consent is not yet achieved, then how can the proposed mitigation be given weight in the ExA's consideration?</li> <li>4. Broadland DC, clarify what you mean by "<i>the cumulative impacts on living conditions for the occupier need to be assessed further</i>" in the SoCG [REP6-026]?</li> <li>5. Broadland DC, given that the principles of the mitigation measures specified are acceptable, specify the imperative to revise the working in the OTMP and how.</li> </ol>	<p>Common Ground Version 1 submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-047]). Mitigation was proposed for potential cumulative impacts from road traffic in the form of a cap on the maximum number of daily HGV movements, a temporary speed restriction, regarding the road surface in proximity to the Old Railway Gatehouse, incorporation of passing places along The Street and priority warning signs in proximity to The Old Railway Gatehouse. With these mitigation measures in place residual impacts related to noise and vibration were not significant based on the agreed Environmental Impact Assessment criteria. Norfolk Boreas has committed to adopting these mitigation measures which are captured within Section 4.3.3 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) [REP5-025] and secured through DCO Requirement 21.</p> <p>3. During the Norfolk Vanguard examination the Norfolk Vanguard project team did contact the resident of Old Railway Gatehouse including discussions on the proposed additional measures to be undertaken at the property. Phone calls were held with the resident in April and May 2019, both of which were followed up with email correspondence.</p> <p>Subsequently both Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas have committed to adopting these measures should the resident wish to take them forward.</p> <p>No further contact has been made by Norfolk Boreas as the measures proposed are as discussed for Norfolk Vanguard. The Applicant will look to engage further with the owner with a view of progressing these matters post-consent when further design details are available.</p> <p>The proposals are optional additional measures to further minimise potential perceived disturbance by the residents. If they are not consented to by the resident then the mitigation measures secured</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			in the OTMP [REP5-025] are sufficient to mitigate impacts to a non-significant level.
Q3.12.2.3	North Norfolk District Council Broadland District Council Breckland District Council Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Enhanced Mitigation</b></p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) version 3 [REP5-011, para 131], refers to potential requirement for enhanced mitigation to be identified for specified receptors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. North Norfolk DC and other discharging authorities to comment if “<i>potential requirement</i>” should be strengthened, and if so, propose wording.</li> </ol>	<p>As agreed with NNDC through the Joint Position Statement on Noise Sensitive Receptors [REP6-022] , additional information on the locations potentially requiring enhanced mitigation will be captured in an updated OCoCP. The potential requirement is reflective that the need for the enhanced mitigation is dependent on the type of activity, for example in some locations enhanced mitigation may only be required if night time working at trenchless crossings is required.</p> <p>Further information on the enhanced mitigations required will be detailed in the Construction Noise (and vibration) Management Plan produced as part of the final CoCP, approved by the relevant planning authority.</p>
Q3.12.2.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Enhanced Mitigation</b></p> <p>With reference to your response regarding noise barriers [REP2-021], highlight where in the revised OCoCP version 3 [REP5-011], is the commitment to assessing impacts of the noise barriers secured? Confirm if reference to section 3.7 (artificial lights) remains accurate in the revised OCoCP version 3 [REP5-011].</p>	<p>In the Written Response to this within [REP-021], the Applicant stated:</p> <p><i>“Barrier design would be dependent on the surroundings and optimised depending on the required level of required mitigation. There are various methods which could be employed and varying designs. BS5228:2009+A1:2014 identifies that the effectiveness of a barrier is limited by transmission over and around the barrier, provided that the barrier material has a mass per unit of surface area exceeding about 7kg/m<sup>2</sup>. Standard demountable barriers are widely available from a number of manufacturers to attenuate noise where necessary. The actual final design would need to be selected based on level of required attenuation, proximity to sensitive receptors, task specific and using Best Practicable Means.”</i></p> <p>Furthermore, the response continues:</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p><i>"Where barriers are identified as being appropriate for noise mitigation, the location would be agreed with the Local Planning Authority (Section 9.1.2.2 of the OCoCP (REP1-018))."</i></p> <p>The Applicant will update the text within the OCoCP to reflect this.</p> <p>With regards to Section 3.7 of the OCoCP (version 3) [REP5-011] the text is accurate. As stated, the details of the location, height, design and luminance of all floodlighting to be used during the construction of the project, together with measures to limit obtrusive glare to nearby residential properties, will be set out in the Artificial Light Emissions Management Plan which will be submitted to the local authorities for approval prior to construction commencing.</p>
Q3.12.2.5	The Applicant, North Norfolk District Council Broadland District Council Breckland District Council Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Enhanced Mitigation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. North Norfolk DC and other discharging authorities, should the OCoCP [REP5-011, section 9.1.2.2] include a commitment for noise barrier locations to be agreed with relevant local planning authorities?</li> <li>2. Should there be a commitment for the assessment of the impact of noise barriers to be carried out in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities?</li> <li>3. Applicant to comment.</li> </ol>	<p>A Construction Noise (and vibration) Management Plan (CNMP) will be developed and included in the final CoCP, as required under Requirement 20 (2)(e) of the draft DCO and submitted for approval to the relevant planning authority. The CNMP will detail the design of onshore assets and will incorporate Best Available Techniques (BAT) and Best Practicable Means (BPM) to minimise any associated noise impacts; where applicable, enhanced mitigation measures will also be detailed, such as noise barrier locations.</p> <p>The CNMP will be developed prior to construction when further details of the construction activities are known, this will ensure that the most appropriate controls and mitigations are identified. The development of the CNMP will include a review of the construction activities and the identification of any potential noise sensitive receptors (as defined in Table 1 of [REP6-022]) which may be affected.</p> <p>Based on the type of construction activity proposed, e.g. establishment of a mobilisation area, and the sensitivity of the receptor, the CNMP will then detail the appropriate controls which</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>will be in place to minimise any potential effects. The results of the process will be submitted to and reviewed by the relevant planning authority as part of the final CoCP and discharge of DCO Requirement 20 (2).</p> <p>As detailed in the Joint Position Statement with NNDC [REP-022] the Applicant will update the OCoCP to reflect this.</p>
Q3.12.2.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Enhanced Mitigation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do you agree with the suggestion from North Norfolk DC [REP6-043] that selecting Category A would be more appropriate to protect receptors from night-time noise disturbance?</li> <li>2. If not, why not?</li> <li>3. If there is agreement, provide a commitment in OCoCP.</li> </ol>	<p>The approved approach for construction phase impacts, as outlined within the Noise and Vibration Method Statement (Royal HaskoningDHV, 2018, unpublished) and utilised in Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration of the ES [APP-238] is the threshold based 'ABC' method. The method is detailed within BS 5228, which specifies a construction noise limit based on the existing ambient noise level and for different periods of the day.</p> <p>The predicted construction noise levels were assessed against noise limits derived from advice within Annex E of BS 5228. Table 25.4 APP-238] is reproduced from BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 Table E.1 and presents the criteria for selection of a noise limit for a specific receptor location. These threshold levels were determined from measured representative existing baseline noise levels.</p> <p>The BS 5228 night time threshold corresponding to Category A is 45dBA. The BS 5228 Category B threshold (50dBA) at night time was determined applicable to receptors CRR2 and CRR30 due to their locations in close proximity to the carriageway, (the B1145 and the A47 respectively). All other receptors were identified as Category A.</p> <p>However, in the interests of ensuring the protection of residential amenity during the sensitive night time period, the Applicant has no objection to adopting the 45dBA threshold i.e. Category A at all receptors.</p> <p>For context along the Onshore Cable Route the conservative construction phase scenario identified exceedances over the night</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>time 45dBA threshold at CRR1, CRR3, CRR5, CRR26 and CRR31. For the night time 50dBA threshold (Category B) only CRR2 and CRR30 exceeded this level during the proposed worst case scenario. In all instances enhanced mitigation measures were advised.</p> <p>The Applicant will update the text within the OCoCP to reflect that the 45dBA threshold will be adopted for all residential receptors during the night time period.</p>

### 12.3 Construction Hours

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No questions			

## 13 Socio-economic effects

### 13.0 Skills and Employment Strategy

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No questions			

### 13.1 Jobs

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No questions			

### 13.2 Tourism

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.13.2.1	The Applicant, North Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Tourism Mitigation Strategy</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that there is agreement between the Applicant and North Norfolk DC that the long-term effect on the long-term effects of the cable route on the tourism economy will be not significant. The ExA further notes that the disagreement between the parties is on the impact of cable corridor construction phase on local tourism businesses, the need for a tourism and associated business impact mitigation strategy, and securing this through a requirement in the dDCO.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Applicant to provide a brief summary of its assessment to the specific point about the impact of the cable corridor construction phase (including 150m workfronts, location and duration of installation of mobilisation area compounds, and landfall location) on local tourism and associated businesses.</li> <li>2. The Applicant to provide, without prejudice, wording for a dDCO Requirement relating to tourism and associated businesses in case the SoS decides to include such a Requirement</li> <li>3. Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</li> </ol>	<p>1. The Applicant considers that there is no evidential link that the short-term construction presence for an offshore wind farm in North Norfolk would lead to an actual or perceived impact on tourism. The Applicant has fully assessed this in the ES (Chapter 30) [APP-243]. As stated in Section 30.7.1 the Applicant has committed to number of embedded mitigation measures to ensure that the impact of construction on local tourism businesses is minimised. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tourism and recreation receptors were considered as part of site selection and the constraints mapping process. Through constraints mapping and site selection, overlap and direct interaction with a number of key sites have been avoided such as The North Norfolk AONB and the Heritage Coast, Blue flag beaches, golf courses, caravan parks.</li> <li>• Strategic approach to delivering Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard and use of a sectionalised workfront strategy to minimise the amount of land being worked at any one time and would minimise overall disruption.</li> <li>• Commitment to long HDD at the landfall to avoid restrictions or closures to Happisburgh beach and retain open access to the beach during construction and agreement not use the beach car park at Happisburgh South.</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community engagement is ongoing and will continue throughout the development of the project including with key tourism and recreation stakeholder, including business owners in the vicinity of the onshore works.</li> </ul> <p>As set out in Section 30.4.1 of Chapter 30 of the ES, a desk based study was used to collate data from websites (the full list can be found in Table 30.11) providing publicly available data to create a source – pathway – receptor model to demonstrate the mechanism of a potential impact. As set out in Section 30.5.1 of Chapter 30 of the ES, the model considered both direct and indirect impacts at both county wide and local levels. Through use of this model the Applicant was able to conclude the main tourism draws for each area, and if local tourism businesses would be affected by the cable corridor construction phase. Overall, as concluded in Section 30.7.4.4.4 of Chapter 30 of the ES, the impact on local tourism businesses during the cable route construction phase would be of <b>minor adverse effect</b>.</p> <p>2. The Applicant is not in a position to suggest suitable wording for a requirement of the type requested by the ExA. This is because it is not possible to draft such a requirement which would meet the tests in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) and embedded through paragraph 4.1.7 and 4.1.8 of EN-1. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant considers that the mitigation sought to be secured by NNDC through the requirement is not 'necessary' to meet any impacts identified in the ES. It would not be possible to remedy this through any bespoke drafting, such that a requirement could meet the test for requirements to be 'necessary' in paragraph 55 of the NPPF.</li> <li>In order to ensure any such requirement is precise, enforceable and reasonable in all other respects (in accordance with the</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>NPPF) the Applicant considers that it would be necessary to link the requirement to, for example, a supplementary planning document (for which full consultation had been undertaken prior to adoption) which contained a formula or mechanism to calculate the relevant contribution due, or at least set out the basis as to how such a calculation should be made. Without this it may not be possible to reach agreement on what level of compensation was due, or even how this should be calculated. It would also need to set out how any compensation payable would be apportioned to relevant tourism organisations and, indeed, which organisations supporting and promoting tourism in North Norfolk were considered to be relevant. To the Applicant's knowledge, no such policy document exists which can be referenced in such a requirement. Unless these matters were identified (i.e. in adopted policy) or clearly set out in a document which had been agreed between the relevant parties in advance of the requirement being imposed, any requirement drafted cannot refer to that document, and therefore cannot meet the tests of being precise, enforceable or reasonable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition, without any supporting policy such a requirement could not be said to be relevant to planning and relevant to the development to be permitted. This is because NNDC has not provided any evidence that there will be actual impacts on tourism as a result of negative perceptions of construction of offshore wind farms or, more particularly, as a result of negative perceptions of this particular development's construction. This is particularly so given the temporary construction period, along with the bespoke working front construction methodology and other construction mitigation already secured for this development. Indeed, NNDC have agreed that there will be no long-term impact from construction of the development and</li> </ul>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>state in their Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-087] that "the long-term impacts of the cable route on the tourism economy will be benign".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further, there is no mechanism in any policy (or agreed) document which would enable claimants to prove that compensation was required as a direct result of the development as opposed to other factors (whether micro or macro) which may impact the tourism industry in this particular location. Other factors may, for example, be coastal erosion (at a micro level), the weather and the exchange rate (at a macro level), as referenced in NNDC's LIR [REP02-087] (see paragraph 14.27 and 14.28). These are not matters which can be addressed through the drafting of a requirement, and would need to be set out in detail in, for example, a policy document or agreed between the parties in advance of any requirement being imposed so that they could be referenced within the relevant requirement.</li> <li>• Finally, the Applicant is not aware of any precedent for a requirement or condition securing mitigation on tourism impacts as a result of temporary construction impacts from offshore wind farms (or indeed any other industry) which could be used to inform the drafting of such a requirement.</li> </ul> <p>NNDC has put forward a proposed requirement on which the Applicant has commented in the Applicant's response to Q2.13.2.1 submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-045], and REP3-011 together with the Position Statement at Appendix 1 of REP3-011 titled 'Position Statement North Norfolk District Council Requested Requirement to Address Perceived Tourism Impacts'.</p> <p>In summary, this proposed requirement would not meet the test set out in paragraph 55 of the NPPF for the reasons set out above;</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>compensation is not necessary to mitigate any impacts identified in the ES; the requirement lacks precision in requiring mitigation by way of an unquantified financial payment with no agreed or adopted mechanism for its calculation post consent; it would not be possible for claimants to prove that compensation was required as a direct result of the development; and there is no quantum of compensation that can be specified so that it can be said that the compensation sought is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>3. The Applicant refers the ExA to its previous submissions on this matter – most notably in response to Q2.13.2.1 submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-045], and through REP3-011 together with the Position Statement at Appendix 1 of REP3-011 titled 'Position Statement North Norfolk District Council Requested Requirement to Address Perceived Tourism Impacts'. The Applicant notes that NNDC's LIR [REP2-087] (see para 14.17) states that if the ExA accepts that there is the potential for substantial negative impact on tourism in North Norfolk, the Applicant has not provided any evidence that a balancing exercise favours making the DCO despite those negative impacts. In that event, the Applicant is firmly of the view that the national and long term benefits of this important renewable energy development significantly outweigh any temporary and localised impact on tourism in North Norfolk. Those benefits are clearly set out throughout the Applicant's submissions to the examination, including in the Planning Statement submitted with the application [APP-693] and more recently in the draft Derogation Case submitted at Deadline 7 [ExA.Dero.D7.V1]. If the ExA is in any doubt on the very important and significant national benefits of this development, then further submissions can be made on this by the Applicant.</p>

### 13.3 Land use and Agriculture

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.13.3.2	The Applicant, National Farmers' Union (NFU)	<p><b>OCoCP in relation to Agricultural Private Water Supplies:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide an update on progress resolving outstanding disagreement in the SoCG with the NFU [REP6-032] relating to wording in the OCoCP regarding interference to Agriculture Private Water Supplies.</li> <li>2. If agreement is not reached before the end of the Examination, what would be the consequences for the application?</li> </ol>	<p>1. The Applicant considers that it is necessary for the wording 'reasonable endeavours' to be included given that to remove this qualification could lead to a suggestion that the Applicant would need to undertake works and/or provide an alternative supply by any means. This could lead to a suggestion that the Applicant would need to invoke its compulsory acquisition powers in order to find an alternative plot for the landowner/agricultural tenant, which would not be reasonable or proportionate in the circumstances.</p> <p>Furthermore, there could be circumstances where the Applicant could contribute to the costs of relocating cattle to an alternative location with a water supply. In this instance, the Applicant would not directly be providing an alternative supply of water but would instead be facilitating the provision of a reasonable alternative. The wording "reasonably" and "reasonable endeavours" would therefore allow greater flexibility for the parties to agree a pragmatic solution at the time and in view of the particular circumstances.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider any wording on this matter that exists in existing OCoCPs for relevant projects of a similar type.</p> <p>2. The Applicant will continue to engage with the NFU with a view to agreeing suitable wording prior to the end of examination.</p> <p>In the event that the parties cannot agree on the exact wording to be included in the OCoCP then this will fall to be considered by the Secretary of State. It should, however, be noted that the Applicant does not dispute the main principle of the matter but, rather, the Applicant considers that the wording should maintain flexibility for the parties to</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>agree to a commercial solution at the time. It is for these reasons that the Applicant considers the following should maintain reference to 'reasonable endeavours':</p> <p><i>"...Where an existing private water supply to an agricultural holding is adversely and directly, affected by the construction of the Proposed Works, if <b>reasonably</b> requested by the landowner/agricultural tenant, the Developer will use <b>reasonable endeavours</b> to provide or procure or meet the reasonable cost of the provision of an alternative.</i></p> <p><i>Where the supply is so affected temporarily by the construction of the Proposed Works, then the alternative need only be provided for the period during which it is affected.</i></p> <p><i>Where a request is made by the agricultural tenant or landowner for a permanent supply due to permanent severance of the existing supply caused by the construction of the Proposed Works then, if the landowner/agricultural tenant can demonstrate that an alternative means of supply is reasonably required for its agricultural operation, the Developer will use <b>reasonable endeavours</b> to provide or procure or meet the reasonable cost of an alternative."</i></p>

### 13.4 Public Health

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.13.4.1	Public Health England	<p><b>Effects of electromagnetic fields (EMF)</b></p> <p>1. Repeated question as no response yet received from PHE. Are you content with the Applicant's assumptions</p>	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>and assessment regarding EMF in ES Chapter 27 Human Health [APP-240], especially at the location where the underground cables of Hornsea Project Three would cross with Norfolk Boreas?</p> <p>The Applicant states at [REP1-036] that <i>"HVDC technology to transmit power from the wind farm to the national grid eliminates many potential impacts associated with EMF emissions. The available evidence from studies of humans and animals has been reviewed by Public Health England and internationally by the World Health Organisation and the International Agency for Research on Cancer. None of these expert bodies has identified any health risk for humans or animals exposed to DC magnetic fields."</i> Do you agree with this statement? If not, why not?</p>	

### 13.5 Other offshore industries and activities

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

## 14 Traffic and transportation

### 14.0 Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP)

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.14.0.1	Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Outline Traffic Management Plan</b></p> <p>Update your position on the OTMP [REP5-024 - REP5-028] and highlight any matters that remain unresolved.</p>	

### 14.1 Highway Intervention Scheme for Link 34 (B1145 through Cawston)

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.14.1.2	Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Highway Intervention Scheme</b></p> <p>What are your views on the suitability of the revised Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) [REP5-028, appendix 6] to mitigate the effects of construction traffic on link 34 Cawston Village, in light of the Road Safety Audit (RSA) and the Applicant's responses to the recommendations [REP5-055].</p>	<p>A meeting was held with NCC on the 16th March 2020 to discuss the Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) Road Safety Audit (RSA). During this meeting NCC indicated that no further amendments were required to the HIS and there were no remaining technical objections. Accordingly, NCC also indicated they will be completing the RSA log to finalise the scheme.</p> <p>NCC have raised a potential concern with regard to driver compliance, that drivers may fail to yield at pinch points causing traffic to back up, inducing unacceptable delays.</p> <p>In response to this concern, the Applicant has agreed to intensify the monitoring regime to facilitate early warning of issues and to work with NCC to develop correction measures to be introduced should driver compliance concerns manifest. On agreement of these measures, they will be included in an update to the Outline Traffic Management Plan [REP5-025].</p>
Q3.14.1.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Highway Intervention Scheme</b></p>	<p>The Applicant has addressed all the recommendations made in the Road Safety Audit (RSA) in the revised HIS drawings submitted at</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		Submit the updated HIS [REP4-016] for Link 34 taking on board the recommendations of the RSA [REP5-055].	Deadline 5 [REP5-027]. NCC have indicated that no further amendments are required to the HIS and there are no remaining technical objections. Accordingly, NCC also indicated they will be completing the RSA log to finalise the scheme.
Q3.14.1.4	The Applicant, Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Highway Intervention Scheme</b></p> <p>Provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the SoS in respect of the Highway Intervention Scheme.</p>	<p>There is no disagreement between NCC and the Applicant over the Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) – it is agreed by the Applicant and NCC that the HIS will deliver suitable and acceptable mitigation for Cawston. The HIS submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-027] can be described as a detailed outline scheme. It represented a cumulation of months of development having been subject to numerous revisions as a result of extensive stakeholder engagement and two independent Road Safety Audits. The detail of the scheme has been taken much further than would ordinarily be expected at this stage. It is unusual for a scheme to be worked up to this level of detail in advance of consent, but the Applicant was nevertheless willing to do so recognising the concerns of local communities and to give the Examining Authority, and in turn the Secretary of State, comfort as to its feasibility for adequate mitigation, which is secured and can be delivered,</p> <p>As previously outlined, the Applicant has addressed all the recommendations made in the Road Safety Audit (RSA). NCC have indicated that no further amendments are required to the HIS and there are no remaining technical objections. Accordingly, NCC also indicated they will be completing the RSA log to finalise the scheme.</p> <p>NCC have raised a potential concern with regard to driver compliance, that drivers may fail to yield at pinch points causing traffic to back up, inducing unacceptable delays.</p> <p>In response to this concern, the Applicant has agreed to intensify the monitoring regime to facilitate early warning of issues and to work with NCC to develop correction measures to be introduced should driver compliance concerns manifest. On agreement of these</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			measures they will be captured in an update to the Outline Traffic Management Plan [REP5-025].
Q3.14.1.5	The Applicant, Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Road Safety Audit</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would the proposed maintenance regime of grass cutting of visibility splays, address the problem highlighted in the RSA of ongoing maintenance and how would overhanging vegetation be managed?</li> <li>2. Provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the SoS in respect of the Highway Intervention Scheme.</li> </ol>	<p>A meeting was held with NCC on the 16th March 2020 to discuss the Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) Road Safety Audit (RSA). During this meeting NCC indicated that no further amendments were required to the HIS and there were no remaining technical objections. Accordingly, NCC also indicated they will be completing the RSA log to finalise the scheme.</p> <p>NCC have raised a potential concern with regard to driver compliance, that drivers may fail to yield at pinch points causing traffic to back up, inducing unacceptable delays.</p> <p>In response to this concern, the Applicant has agreed to intensify the monitoring regime to facilitate early warning of issues and to work with NCC to develop correction measures to be introduced should driver compliance concerns manifest. On agreement of these measures, they will be included in an update to the Outline Traffic Management Plan [REP5-025].</p>
Q3.14.1.6	The Applicant	<p><b>HGV delivery period restrictions</b></p> <p>Clarify the discrepancy in the HGV delivery period restrictions in the Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) (Version 3) [REP5-026], between the timings set out on page 29, table 3.4 and page 38 para 122.</p>	<p>1. The NCC grass cutting specification for visibility splays has been selected as a proxy for the timing and frequency of maintenance required for the overhanging vegetation, as no such guidance exists specific to vegetation clearance. The timings and frequency in the grass cutting specification (i.e. 5 cuts during the growing season (May to September)) will be applied to the overhanging vegetation. NCC has agreed that this satisfies their highway safety duty of care and therefore is deemed appropriate for the HIS.</p> <p>NCC have been consulted and have agreed the frequency and timing of maintenance for the overhanging vegetation (based on the timing and frequency contained in the grass cutting specification) is appropriate.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			2. The Applicant refers to the response to Q3.14.1.4.
Q3.14.1.7	The Applicant, Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Cumulative traffic effects in Cawston</b></p> <p>The revised OTMP [REP5-026, para 125] states: "Norfolk Boreas Limited is committed to adopting the scheme under both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 and the principle that the first project (either Hornsea Project Three or Norfolk Boreas) to proceed to construction would deliver the full scheme of mitigation and the final project would be responsible for removing the measures once all project's construction phases are complete."</p> <p>1. In order to account for both scenarios, should the reference to the 'first project' include Norfolk Vanguard, alongside Norfolk Boreas and Hornsea Project Three?</p> <p>The joint statement in the SoCG with Orsted [REP6-037, page 7] states: "The Applicant and Hornsea Project Three (UK) Ltd have committed to the implementation of the outline scheme at The Street, Oulton, and the B1145, Cawston which would be sufficient to mitigate impacts for either the Applicant alone, Hornsea Project Three (UK) Ltd alone, or for these projects together. All of the identified measures to mitigate cumulative construction traffic impacts on shared road links will be captured in each Projects' Outline (Construction) Traffic Management Plans (OTMPs) (see document reference 8.8 of the Application, APP-699 for the Norfolk Boreas project). The details and development of the schemes are ongoing, but the scheme in principle is agreed."</p> <p>2. The Applicant to update the document reference for the OTMP to reflect the most recent OTMP (Version 3) [REP5-026].</p> <p>3. In light of the colour coding in the SoCG [REP6-037]</p>	<p>1. Yes, the Applicant will amend the OTMP [REP5-025] to add Norfolk Vanguard.</p> <p>2. The Applicant will update the reference on page 7 of the Orsted SoCG [REP6-037] to reflect the latest version of the OTMP.</p> <p>3. The ongoing discussion relates to the development of Cawston HIS. The Applicant has continued to liaise with Orsted during the scheme development and the latest scheme detail and RSA have been shared. However, the Applicant is awaiting formal feedback on the information from Orsted and as such the cell in the SoCG was updated to show this is 'under discussion' to reflect the current position.</p> <p>4. The Applicant has revised Requirement 21(4) to remove reference to "(Link 34)", as suggested by the ExA. This change has been made to the dDCO submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 3.1 (version 6)).</p> <p>In relation to the suggested change to remove "relevant" (... "<i>and any relevant cumulative impacts identified, in respect of Link 34 as referred to in Chapter 24 of the environmental statement.</i>"), the Applicant does not consider that this is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The parties are not in a position to know at this stage which of the projects referred to in the cumulative impact assessment will receive consent and proceed to construction;</li> <li>• The traffic mitigation measures should be 'relevant' to the initial assessment and it would not be proportionate or reasonable to require fresh consideration of cumulative impacts post-consent and prior to submitting the final traffic management plan; and</li> </ul>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>and the final line in the above statement, set out what specific matters are still under consideration. Provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the SoS</p> <p>4. The Applicant to consider revised wording for the dDCO: “(4) The traffic management plan referred to at sub-paragraph (1)(a) must include the final detailed scheme of traffic mitigation for impacts of the authorised development alone, and any <del>relevant</del> cumulative impacts identified, in respect of Link 34 as referred to in Chapter 24 of the environmental statement (Link 34). The final scheme must be approved in writing by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highway authority”.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To view this paragraph in isolation, without reference to 'relevant', could be interpreted that the Applicant would be required to undertake further assessments and incorporate future projects that are brought forward following consent and prior to construction. Whereas the onus should and would be on the future projects undertaking a cumulative assessment with Norfolk Boreas to ensure that any cumulative impacts can be acceptably mitigated prior to those future projects receiving consent.</li> </ul> <p>For these reasons, it is considered necessary to retain the use of the word 'relevant' within Requirement 21(4).</p>
Q3.14.1.8	The Applicant, Norfolk County Council Broadland District Council Cawston Parish Council	<p><b>Alternative traffic movement through Cawston</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant to submit separate drawings for Options 2, 3 and 4 [REP5-054] for the Alternative Cawston Access Options. Provide any further information for all three options that can help understand the options as discussed with IPs.</li> <li>Does the Applicant intend to develop further any of the Options 2 or 3 or 4 or all three? What is the process for reaching an agreement between Applicant, NCC, Broadland DC and Cawston PC over Options 2 or 3 or 4 for the movement of construction traffic, and implications if no agreement reached before close of Examination?</li> <li>The Applicant to respond to the concerns raised by NCC regarding Option 5 [REP5- 054] as further mitigation alongside Option 1 (current HIS). The Applicant to respond to the concerns raised by NCC regarding Option 5 [REP5- 054] as further mitigation alongside Option 1 (current HIS).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual figures showing options 2, 3 and 4 are included in Appendix 14.1.</li> <li>In summary, there is no prospect of reaching agreement on Options 2, 3 or 4. The Applicant does not therefore propose any process, beyond that which has already been undertaken, for doing so. This is because these options are unworkable; there is already an acceptable option in place; the other options were never proposed in pre-application consultation; there is no clear reasoning for NCC's apparent change of view to permit an access off the B1149; and any alternatives would be disproportionate, given they would not apply to either Norfolk Vanguard or HP3.</li> </ol> <p><b>Workability</b></p> <p>The Applicant's position on those options, and the conclusion that it is not appropriate to take them forward, based on considerations such as construction methodology, environmental impacts, and land requirements (including associated changes to Order limits), is clearly set out in the Position Statement on Cawston Traffic and in response to WQ 2.14.1.6 of the ExA's second written questions.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>4. The Applicant to set out the possibility of using Option 5 as further mitigation alongside Option 1 (current HIS), including timescales for addressing NCC's concerns, consulting with IPs, and submission into the Examination? How could this be agreed with Vanguard and Hornsea Three and secured in the DCO?</p>	<p><b>Existing acceptable option</b></p> <p>It was, and still is the case, that NCC believe that a suitable access strategy, in the form of the HIS, can be produced that acceptably mitigates all impacts, both alone and cumulatively with HP3. As explained in the response to WQ3.14.1.4 above there is no disagreement between NCC and the Applicant on the acceptability of this mitigation; the recommendations of the Road Safety Audit (RSA) have been accepted. As detailed in response to Q3.14.1.2 NCC have indicated that no further amendments are required to the HIS and there are no remaining technical objections.</p> <p><b>Pre-application consultation</b></p> <p>Alternatives have not previously been considered, notwithstanding extensive pre-application consultation with NCC through an evidence plan process for both Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas. It was only at the previous Issue Specific Hearing 3 on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2020 (ISH3) and well after the end of the examination period for both Norfolk Vanguard and HP3, that NCC's changed position appeared to enable any <i>possible</i> consideration of these options. Up until ISH3, NCC had stated that an access taken from the B1149 would not be acceptable on the grounds of highway safety and traffic management concerns.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that NCC's change in position is as a result of the further evidence submitted by the Applicant in relation to a trenched crossing of the B1149. However, traffic management measures potentially lasting 24 months are of a different magnitude to the traffic management measures required for 2 weeks during a trenched crossing. It is also unclear why the B1149 should be subject to a trenchless crossing (acknowledging NCC have no technical objection to an open trenched crossing) given that NCC consider</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>similar traffic management measures would enable an access to be made from the B1149.</p> <p><b>NCC's apparent change of view</b></p> <p>Importantly, NCC's change of view on an access from the B1149 only emerged after completion of the Norfolk Vanguard and HP3 examinations, and long after the Norfolk Boreas application was submitted. Not only would further consideration of these alternatives at this late stage be wholly at odds with the spirit and intent of the evidence plan and pre-application consultation process (which formed the basis of the scheme drawings, Order limits and environmental assessment of both Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas); it would also be wholly at odds with the Secretary of State's policy on consideration of alternatives set out in paragraph 4.4 of NPS EN-1.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 4.4.3 of NPS EN-1 draws attention (among other things) to the need for proportionality in considering alternatives; the need for alternative proposals to be commercially viable and physically suitable; that, whenever possible, alternatives should be identified before an application is made; and where an alternative is first put forward by a third party after an application has been made, the onus may be placed on the person proposing the alternative to provide the evidence for its suitability.</p> <p><b>Proportionality</b></p> <p>These Options do not represent a variation of the agreed HIS. They would constitute a completely new mitigation strategy from that already adopted for HP3 and for Norfolk Vanguard. This would be wholly disproportionate, particularly given that it would not mitigate any effects of Norfolk Vanguard, which would generate the majority of the traffic in the event of Scenario 1 – the most likely option where Norfolk Vanguard lays the ducting as enabling works for Norfolk Boreas. Further, in a cumulative scenario, it would not mitigate any</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>effects of the HP3 traffic, which has yet to be profiled and has therefore been assessed at a much higher level and over a much longer period than either Norfolk Boreas or Norfolk Vanguard.</p> <p>In conclusion, therefore, whilst there is no prospect of agreement on Options 2, 3 and 4, there is sufficient evidence before the Examining Authority, and in turn the Secretary of State, to rule out these Options. They are not appropriate alternatives to the HIS. It is not, in any event, necessary to consider these alternatives any further given that the agreed position between NCC and the Applicant is that the HIS can mitigate impacts on Cawston in an acceptable way.</p> <p>3. and 4. The Applicant has had further discussions with NCC regarding their concerns on Option 5, confirmed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Forward visibility at the junction of Heydon Road (Long Lane) and the B1145;</li> <li>2) Adequate visibility at the junction of Heydon Road (Long Lane) and Heydon Road;</li> <li>3) Adequate visibility at the junction of the B1149 and Heydon Road;</li> <li>4) Impact on amenity for non-motorised users;</li> <li>5) Conflict and delay with regard to the existing use by agricultural traffic; and</li> <li>6) Structural integrity of the route to accept the proposed HGV demand.</li> </ol> <p>The Applicant provided updated drawings for Option 5 to NCC during a meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> March 2020, however NCC indicated that they do not consider Option 5 to be a suitable alternative. Had Option 5 been acceptable to NCC in principle, the Applicant would have been willing to consider it further, but this is not the case. Whilst the Applicant has explored with NCC whether it might be possible to address their concerns, and is willing to continue to do so, there is now limited scope, particularly within the examination timetable to</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			take matters further. Ultimately, Option 5 is not required to mitigate the impacts on Cawston, as the Applicant has addressed all the recommendations made in the RSA and NCC have indicated that no further amendments are required, impacts can be mitigated acceptably by the HIS. Whilst it may now not be possible to progress Option 5, there is still a suitable mitigation strategy which can be delivered in the form of the HIS.

#### 14.2 Cable Logistics Area (CLA) along Link 89 in Outlon

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
n/a	Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Cycle Routes</b></p> <p>Are you convinced that the Highway Mitigation Scheme for Link 68 [REP5-026] [REP5- 045] is adequate to enable NMUs to continue using The Street and Heydon Road, safely? The ExA acknowledges that this location has no national, regional or local designation as a cycle route/walking route. However, in your response take into account the ExA's observations at USI on 20 January 2020 [EV2-003], and Oulton PC's submission [REP6- 044].</p>	

#### 14.3 Link 69 Little London Road in North Walsham from the B1145 Lyngate Road to an access point 210m east

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

#### 14.4 Outline Access Management Plan and Access to Works Plan

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.14.4.9	The Applicant, Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Types of accesses</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Distinguish between the types of accesses included in Outline Access Management Plan (OAMP) [APP-701] and the Access to Works plan [APP-011]?</li> <li>2. Provide a full list of the different types of accesses by reference to appropriate plans.</li> <li>3. Identify and justify all anomalies and exclusions. For instance, explain why some access routes, such as AC11, which appears to be a point of access to the onshore cable route [APP-701, para 3, bullet 3] is not in Table 2.1, and access routes such as AC131, which appears to be an access to works, is included in Table 2.1.</li> <li>4. Update the OAMP accordingly to include the explanations provided in 1-3 above, and any additional information as relevant.</li> <li>5. NCC to comment.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Outline Access Management Plan (OAMP) [APP-701] details the accesses which are required for the construction phase of Norfolk Boreas only. The Access to Works Plans [APP-011] include all potential access points whether they are for the construction period or for the operational period once Norfolk Boreas has been constructed.</li> <li>2. Table 14.1 provided in Appendix 14.2 details the full list of accesses as identified in the Access to Works Plans [APP-011]. Table 14.1 provides a breakdown of which accesses are required for either construction purposes or operational purposes. Details are also included of the proposed access design concepts (A, B, C or D) as detailed within the OAMP [APP-701] Section 3.3. Additional information on the Operational access types have been included.</li> <li>3. In respect to AC11, this access has the potential to be a haul road crossing access only. However, due to close proximity to the existing crossroads to the north, it is unlikely to be approved by NCC on safety grounds. Alternative access to the cable corridor can be gained at AC10 and AC12.</li> <li>4. As AC131 is identified within Table 2.1 of the OAMP and thus is included within the OAMP.</li> <li>5. It is not deemed necessary to update the OAMP at this stage as all adequate construction information on the accesses have been included in the OAMP and OTMP.</li> <li>6. NCC to comment.</li> </ol>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.14.4.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Access AC 133 Swanton Morley</b></p> <p>The ExA observed the narrow and restricted width of Access AC133 at the USI on 16 March 2020 [EV2-004]. Applicant to explain the adequacy of this access for its defined purpose.</p>	<p>AC133 is a right of access for operational access only as illustrated in Figure 5.4 [APP-266] and its exclusion from Table 2.1 of the OAMP [APP-701]. This access would not be used for any construction activities and provides a right of access for operations and maintenance purposes post-construction, such as inspections, which would be conducted using light vehicles.</p>

## 15 Water Resources and Flood Risk

### 15.0 Water Resources and Flood Risk

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.15.0.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Hydrogeological Risk Assessment for abstractions within 250m of works:</b></p> <p>Clarify if and how and when the dDCO and OCoCP will respond to the EA note in response to Q2.15.03 that all abstractions within 250 m of the works should be reported to the EA along with an Hydrogeological Risk Assessment rather than the current OCoCP [REP5- 010] wording of "all private water supplies within the construction area".</p>	<p>The Applicant proposed to update Section 6.1.2 of the OCoCP as follows to incorporate the requirements requested by the EA in response to Q2.15.0.3;</p> <p><i>'The identification of any groundwater abstractions for public and private water supply (both licensed and unlicensed and including shallow wells) within 250m of the construction area will be identified prior to construction.</i></p> <p><i>The location of private water supplies within 250m of the construction area will be identified through discussions with landowners and during the pre-construction land survey, as detailed in Appendix B.</i></p> <p><i>Details of any groundwater abstractors identified along with a hydrological risk assessment for the works, a groundwater monitoring proposal if appropriate, or an evidence-based</i></p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p><i>justification of the reasons why a risk assessment and monitoring are not required will be submitted to the Environment Agency prior to construction.</i></p> <p>An updated OCoCP will be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>The commitment is secured though the OCoCP therefore no update to the draft DCO is required.</p>
Q3.15.0.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation and compensation for adverse ecological effects of culvert installation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a detailed response to the specific part of EA comment [REP5-070] to Q2.15.0.2 that the impact of ecological discontinuity caused by effects of permanent culverts (e.g. for species that do not like to move through culverts) should be compensated by enhancing marginal and in-channel habitats in the vicinity.</li> <li>2. Explain how mitigation of ecological effects from installation and removal of temporary culverts is secured.</li> <li>3. The Applicant to provide any additional information to assist the ExA in making its recommendation to the Secretary of State.</li> </ol>	<p>1. and 2. As agreed with the Environment Agency, in the event that permanent or temporary culverts are required then the identification of any appropriate mitigations with respect to ecological, or hydrological impacts, will be identified as part of the site-specific watercourse crossing plans secured under draft DCO Requirement 25. Consideration will be given to both the direct impact on any potential habitat or species using the habitat. Should enhancements be required to provide sufficient mitigation then these will be detailed and identified in the scheme crossing plans, as detailed in the OCoCP [ REP5-010], secured through DCO Requirement 20; <i>'The Applicant has committed to develop a scheme and programme for each watercourse crossing, diversion and reinstatement, which will include site specific details regarding sediment management, and pollution prevention measures, any appropriate enhancements and post-construction monitoring.'</i></p> <p>To provide further clarity the Applicant will further update the OCoCP to identify that the scheme will also include details of any required ecological or hydrological mitigation measures.</p> <p>In addition, species specific ecological mitigation is secured through the OLEMS [REP5-023] for potentially affected species such as water</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>voles, otters and fish including full baseline surveys and where required pre-construction surveys to confirm their presence and should any further mitigations be required in the event species are present at any of the permanent or temporary culvert locations, this will be identified and detailed in the final Ecological Management Plan, secured under DCO Requirement 24.</p> <p>3. The Applicant understands that with the proposed updates to the OCoCP the Environment Agency have no further concerns on ecological impacts of permanent or temporary culverts and therefore does not feel any additional information is required.</p>
Q3.15.0.3	Environment Agency (EA), Natural England (NE)	<p><b>Monitoring of residual adverse impacts on the water environment:</b></p> <p>Confirm satisfaction with or comment on the Applicant's answer [REP5-045] to Q2.15.0.11 regarding monitoring of residual adverse impacts on the water environment; in particular whether the post-construction monitoring requirement for watercourse crossings that has been covered in the updated OCoCP submitted at Deadline 5 is adequately secured to the satisfaction of EA and NE.</p>	
Q3.15.0.4	Environment Agency (EA)	<p><b>Refined conceptual site modelling for each watercourse crossing:</b></p> <p>Confirm satisfaction with the updated OCoCP [REP5-010] commitment to develop a scheme and programme for each watercourse crossing, diversion and reinstatement, particularly whether this adequately addresses the EA expectation for provision of refined conceptual site modelling for each watercourse crossing to be included in each site specific CoCP.</p>	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.15.0.5	Environment Agency (EA)	<p><b>Risk Assessment based on chemical testing in the ground investigation reports:</b> Confirm satisfaction with or comment on the Applicant's response [REP6-014] to EA's comments on Q2.16.2.4 regarding Risk Assessment based on chemical testing in the ground investigation reports that showed detections of 'low level hydrocarbons which is unexpected given the land uses in the area of the crossings'; in particular whether the commitment to additional groundwater protection and undertaking more detailed hydrogeological risk assessments has been adequately covered and secured through the updated OCoCP submitted at Deadline 5 to the satisfaction of EA and NE.</p>	
Q3.15.0.6	Environment Agency (EA)	<p><b>Consultation on contamination and approval of remediation:</b></p> <p>Confirm satisfaction with or comment on the Applicant's response [REP6-014] to EA's comments on Q2.16.2.5 regarding consultation and approval procedures for remediation of suspected contamination or spills, in particular the adequacy and extent of application of proposed wording for a future update of the OCoCP Section 13 Environmental Incident and Response and Contingency to include that the 'Environment Agency incident response teams must be notified where an environmental incident could cause spillage or contamination into a watercourse including drains'.</p>	
Q3.15.0.7	North Norfolk DC (NNDC), Natural England	<p><b>Definition of secondary consent bodies:</b></p> <p>Comment on the Applicant's response at [REP6-014] to NNDC comment [REP5-067] on Q2.15.0.1 (that dDCO Requirement 25, in relation to watercourse crossings, refers specifically to some but not all secondary consent bodies)</p>	

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p><i>"all parties who would be involved in the secondary consenting associated with watercourse crossings are captured and consulted under Requirement 25, these are the Environment Agency, Norfolk County Council as Lead Flood Authority and Internal Drainage Board (captured under relevant drainage authorities)."</i></p>	
Q3.15.0.8	<p>The Applicant, Environment Agency Norfolk County Council Breckland Council Water Management Alliance</p>	<p><b>Attenuation capacity at substations allowance for climate change:</b></p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment [APP-586] para 229 states that 'the outline drainage design' includes capacity for attenuation of 40% above that required for the 1 in 100 year event (i.e. provides a 20% margin of safety beyond a 20% allowance for climate change) but the OODP [APP-712] only refers to 20% proposed allowance for climate change, which appears to have been conceded by Norfolk CC as Lead Local Flood Authority in SoCG [REP6-035] on the basis of a 35-year operational life of the development.</p> <p>The Applicant to explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. how at the end of the operational life of the development the infiltration rate of the entire footprint of the project substations and the National Grid substation extension will in practice be restored to the same as the present-day and how this is secured by the DCO;</li> <li>2. how risks discussed in [REP6-035] of SuDS drainage features performing sub- optimally if designed for additional capacity could be mitigated by design and management in order to maintain the 40% additional aggregate attenuation capacity during operation that was included in the FRA.</li> </ol> <p>The Environment Agency, Water Management Alliance and</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the end of the operational life of the development, an onshore decommissioning plan must be submitted to the relevant planning authority for approval as secured in Requirement 29 of the dDCO. The onshore decommissioning plan will include details of the post-decommissioning drainage which is most appropriate at the time of decommissioning. The removal of impermeable materials and structures associated with the onshore project substation and National Grid substation extension and the return of the land to agricultural use will naturally restore the infiltration rate to present day levels.</li> <li>2. The requirement to include a 20% climate change allowance was agreed with Norfolk County Council Lead Flood Authority during the Norfolk Vanguard examination, and this agreement is reflected in the Norfolk Boreas SoCG [REP6-035]. The 20% climate change allowance is not a relaxation but is the correct level of climate allowance which is required in line with Environment Agency's Climate Change Allowance Guidance.</li> </ol> <p>The outline drainage design assumptions included an allowance of 40% for climate change, this was included as contingency to demonstrate proof of concept for design check purposes. In line with the EA guidance a climate change allowance of 40% is the worst-case allowance identified for developments that have a design life extending beyond 2070. The onshore project substation has a 35 year design life running from approximately 2026-2061,</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>Breckland Council are asked to comment on this proposed relaxation from the 40% figure that was included in the Flood Risk Assessment, in relation to both the project substation and the National Grid substation.</p>	<p>therefore it would not be necessary or appropriate to install a system with this level of allowance.</p> <p>As detailed in the SoCG these systems are designed to receive a certain volume of water. If they are over designed and receive less water than expected there is a risk they will silt up which could lead to impacts to the sensitive chalk river catchment. The best approach to avoid any risk is to design in line with guidance with a 20% climate change allowance.</p> <p>Hence, the commitment in the OODP that the surface water drainage plan will have sufficient storage / attenuation volume for a 1 in 100 year rainfall event, plus a 20% allowance for climate change, in line with the guidance and as a result there will be no increase in surface water runoff from the site. This has been agreed by NCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p>

## 16 General

### 16.0 General

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
Q3.16.0.1	The Applicant	<p><b>Climate Change:</b></p> <p>Accepting that the Applicant has designed in accordance with UKCP18, but considering the number of extreme events which have occurred over the last few months, the Applicant to expand on its response to Further Written Question 2.16.0.1 [REP5-045] to provide assurance that adaptation for offshore, landfall and onshore elements of the proposed project will be</p>	<p>It is the Applicant's intention to construct and operate a facility that will continue to generate low-carbon energy for a period of 25-30 years.</p> <p>Given the extent of the financial investment required to establish this facility, it is in the Applicant's own interests (as well as those of UK energy users) to ensure that all elements of the project are able to</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
		<p>resilient to climate events more extreme than those considered in UKCP18.</p>	<p>withstand extreme weather events over this projected operational lifetime. Failure to do so would entail significant financial risk to the Applicant, and could result in failure to recoup the initial investment.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident that the proposed siting and routing of the project infrastructure provides for a design with adequate resilience to expected climate trends.</p> <p>Specific examples include:</p> <p>At the onshore project substation, where the capacity of the attenuation ponds has allowed for the required 1 in 100 year event plus 20% climate change allowance.</p> <p>The design of the cable landfall provides a further onshore example: the degree to which the Transition Joint Bays will be 'set back' from the beach and cliff-line is a minimum of 125m, with flexibility to set back up to 325m, sufficient to accommodate not only the most up to date information and forecasts of coastal erosion (currently predicted to be between 50m and 110m by 2065) but also beyond. This will also be informed by predictive models of coastal processes, together with data from periodic surveys of the coastline at the landfall location.</p> <p>All offshore infrastructure is designed against standards that require the structures to withstand the conditions to which they are exposed for their entire lifetime. These standards include extreme events, with a return period of 50 or 100 years in the design process, and the projected changes caused by climate change.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>There is an innate conservatism in the standards used for design, to ensure that structures are designed to withstand conditions that they will be exposed to over their lifetime. This conservatism includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• choosing the most extreme conditions across the site for design purposes;</li> <li>• using a 50 or 100 year return period event for in design, even though the life time of the wind farm is 30 years;</li> <li>• using higher Representative Concentration Pathway <sup>4</sup> scenarios when deciding on applying uplifts due to climate change to parameters such as sea level rise, sea temperature and air temperature.</li> </ul> <p>Where, parameters have a high certainty of change (e.g. sea water temperature), these changes are captured in the design of offshore infrastructure.</p> <p>Where predictive models like this are used to inform detailed design, any relevant effects of known climate trends (such as sea level rise) would be included in the scope of the model. The Applicant will work closely with its advisers and consultants to ensure that these effects are properly understood and quantified, with reference to state-of-the-art climate projection tools such as UKCP18.</p>
Q3.16.0.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Sulfur hexafluoride (SF6):</b>            SF6 is the most powerful of the greenhouse gases. The Applicant to provide a statement detailing the use of SF6 in the project and how leaks of SF6 will be avoided.</p>	<p>Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6) is used as a high-performance insulating medium in some types of high-voltage equipment, such as switchgear. The use of SF6 insulation permits more compact component designs and arrangement of equipment, as the spatial separation between live conductors and grounded structures can be much lower than is</p>

<sup>4</sup> a way of categorising different emissions scenarios. They range from RCP2.5, which is rapid decarbonisation and sharp fall in emissions, to RCP 8.5, which is a continued growth in global emissions.

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>the case where conventional 'open terminal' technology is used. For this reason, compact Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) is often used in applications where space is limited, or where the cost of providing space is at a premium.</p> <p>It is well-known that SF6 is an extremely powerful greenhouse gas; it is also highly toxic. In order to control the environmental and safety risks associated with the use of SF6, equipment suppliers have worked together with industry bodies and national regulators to develop comprehensive guidance on the operation and servicing of equipment that contains the gas. Examples of such guidance include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEFRA/EA Guidance "How to operate or service high voltage switchgear containing SF6", available at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-operate-or-service-high-voltage-switchgear-containing-sf6">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-operate-or-service-high-voltage-switchgear-containing-sf6</a></li> <li>• CIGRE WG 23-02, "Guide for SF6 gas mixtures", CIGRE technical brochure 163, August 2000, available via <a href="http://www.cigre-sc23.org/publications">http://www.cigre-sc23.org/publications</a></li> <li>• CIGRE WG 23-10, "SF6 recycling guide", ELECTRA 173 (1997), 43-69</li> </ul> <p>In addition, some equipment suppliers are developing GIS products that do not require the use of SF6. These products generally use alternative gas mixtures with insulating properties that do not perform their function as well as SF6. As such, it is not always possible to achieve the same degree of 'compact design' as a functionally equivalent SF6-based product.</p> <p>Where switchgear needs to be deployed on offshore structures, the choice of whether to use GIS technology is strongly influenced by two considerations. Firstly, the switchgear has to be enclosed to protect it</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>from the elements, in particular from the moist, salt-laden air. Secondly, the switchgear – and its protective enclosure – has to be supported at a height of 40-50m above the seabed. Given these considerations, the compact physical characteristics of GIS typically lead to significant savings in overall material requirements, impacts and costs.</p> <p>In the Norfolk Boreas project, high-voltage switchgear will be deployed and operated at a number of different locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At each wind turbine</li> <li>• At the offshore converter stations</li> <li>• At the onshore converter station</li> <li>• At the point of connection to the National Grid (NG Necton substation)</li> </ul> <p>The switchgear at the wind turbines and at the offshore converter platforms will be Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS). The GIS on the converter platforms will use SF6, as there are currently no SF6-free products that can deliver the required electrical functionality (e.g. high load currents and/or high voltage ratings). The GIS at the turbines will operate in the 'medium-voltage' range (at 66kV), and the required load currents are not particularly high (800-1000A). It is quite possible that suitable SF6-free switchgear products will be available for Norfolk Boreas, prior to its construction. While the Applicant would welcome such a development, the selection of a SF6-free solution for use in the project would depend on the supplier meeting our technical and commercial requirements.</p>



PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			<p>The high-voltage switchgear at the onshore converter station and the National Grid extension at Necton will be conventional Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) which will contain SF6. The servicing and operation of this equipment will at all times follow the comprehensive guidance developed by industry bodies and national regulators as referenced previously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the undesirable environmental effects of SF6, the Applicant will put in place appropriate controls to eliminate as far as possible any potential leakage from GIS equipment containing the gas. Although the details of these control measures are not yet determined, some general principles are outlined below: The system of controls will meet and exceed the guidance provided by the UK Government (DEFRA/EA Guidance referenced above)</li> <li>The system of controls will be developed following a thorough review of other relevant guidance (eg. CIGRE WG 23-02).</li> <li>The Applicant will also draw on experience with GIS equipment in other parts of Vattenfall.</li> </ul>
Q3.16.0.3	All Interested Parties	<p><b>Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm responses to the Secretary of State's consultation letter dated 6 December 2019</b></p> <p>Submit anything from the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm responses to the Secretary of State's consultation letter dated 6 December 2019, published on the National Infrastructure Planning website, which is considered relevant to this Examination, and not already submitted, with an explanation of why it is of relevance.</p>	<p>The Applicant has had due regard to all responses to the Secretary of State's consultation letter and considers that only documents which the Applicant wish to directly draw upon as evidence should be submitted to the Norfolk Boreas Examination. Therefore, at Deadline 7 the Applicant has submitted the "Environmental assessment of trenchless crossing at the B1149" which was provided by Norfolk Vanguard Limited in response to the SoS letter. This document, as provided to the SoS, is directly relevant to Norfolk Boreas and has thus been submitted as document ExA.AS-3.D7.V1. No further Norfolk Vanguard documents have been submitted for Deadline 7.</p>

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
			Further documents may be submitted at future Deadlines however these will always be relevant to the materials submitted at that deadline and will be submitted in the context of the Norfolk Boreas project.
Q3.16.0.4	All Interested Parties	<p><b>Effects on local community</b></p> <p>Interested Parties are invited to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS not covered previously in the Examination, or in the responses provided above.</p>	

### 16.1 Environmental Statement (ES)

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			

### 16.2 Ground conditions and contamination

PINS Question Number	Question is addressed to:	Question:	Applicant's Response:
No Questions			