

ExQ3: March 2020**Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	Response
Q3.1.22	<p>Noise and vibration effects on the Cawston Conservation Area and listed buildings.</p> <p>Parties to provide any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS</p>	<p>Currently no further information to comment upon. It is understood that the applicant will provide an updated report in this respect to be submitted at deadline 7. The District Council will review it and submit written comments at a subsequent deadline.</p>
Q3.5.3.5	<p>Requirement 15: Scenarios, stages and phases of authorised development onshore.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Useful reference and can see no reason why it shouldn't be incorporated into the Requirements of the DCO.</p>
Q3.5.3.8	<p>Requirement 16 (13): Trenchless installation techniques.</p> <p>1. Provide any comments on the points above. 2. Regarding point 3. above, provide responses to the Applicant's D7 response at D8.</p>	<p>1. Trenchless crossing at B1149 should be added to the list at (para. 13) not only for the highway safety reasons given by the Highway Authority but also to reduce the impact on the natural environment that will be destroyed as a result of the open cut technique and the diversion lane.</p> <p>2. Uncertain what this is referring to.</p>
Q3.5.7.2	<p>Table of requirements, discharge authorities and consultees and discharge process map.</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>	<p>Useful reference and can see no reason why it shouldn't be incorporated into the Requirements of the DCO.</p>
Q3.5.7.4	<p>Schedule 16.</p>	<p>No further points to add.</p>

ExQ3: March 2020**Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	Response
	Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.	
Q3.5.7.5	<p>Planning Performance Agreements.</p> <p>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].</p>	Initial discussion held with representatives of the applicant and officers of the Districts and County Council in respect of the mechanism and requirements of Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs). Further information to be provided by the applicant for review by the Districts and County Council to enable agreement on the most effective use of PPAs and how to ensure comments from consultees can be received in a timely manner.
Q3.12.0.4	<p>B1149 Crossing (open cut trench/ trenchless crossing).</p> <p>Provide your views on the effect on hedgerows and trees in relation to the trenchless crossing and proposed diversion lane under discussion for the B1149, as mentioned by NCC [REP5-066, final page].</p>	Very concerned about the impact on the roadside hedgerows and trees as a result of an open cut trench across the B1149 for the installation of the cable route. The proposed diversion lane will significantly increase this adverse impact. The roadside hedgerows and tress will not be impacted to the same extent if a trenchless crossing is utilised subject to careful siting to avoid the better tree species.
Q3.12.2.1	<p>Noise Sensitive Receptors.</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> <p>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</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joint position statement on Noise Sensitive Receptors to be submitted by applicant. 2. Applicant to confirm. 3. Content that in the circumstances that a receptor location in proximity to the onshore cable route that is not specifically assessed within the ES will have its impact assessed by reference to a comparable location a similar separation distance to the cable route.

ExQ3: March 2020**Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	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> <p>2. 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.</p> <p>3. 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?</p>	
Q3.12.2. 2	<p>Old Railway Gatehouse.</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 "section 4.3.2 of the Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) [APP-699] and secured through dDCO Requirement 21".</p> <p>1. The Applicant to update the section and document reference in light of the revised OTMP [REP5-026] submitted to this Examination.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3. Provide evidence of consent or progress of receiving consent from the property owner to</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant to submit. 2. Request that the physical alterations to Old Railway Gatehouse comprising new double glazing on elevations towards the road and a noise attenuation barrier to the garden form part of the agreed package of measures to reduce the cumulative traffic impact of up to 3 onshore cable projects on the living conditions of the occupier. 3. Applicant to submit. 4. This is a reference to the impacts from traffic associated with up to 3 'cumulative' onshore cable projects passing this property. However after clarification from the applicant no further assessment is required. 5. Agreed that the OTMP will provide sufficient controls for potential traffic related noise, vibration and air quality impacts.

ExQ3: March 2020**Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	Response
	<p>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?</p> <p>4. Broadland DC, clarify what you mean by "the cumulative impacts on living conditions for the occupier need to be assessed further" in the SoCG [REP6-026]? 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.</p>	
Q3.12.2.3	<p>Enhanced mitigation</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. 1. North Norfolk DC and other discharging authorities to comment if "potential requirement" should be strengthened, and if so, propose wording.</p>	<p>Content that potential requirement is adequate subject to the required mitigation measures being identified during the detailed design stage and included in the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority as part of the final CoCP and discharge of requirements.</p>
Q3.12.2.5	<p>Enhanced Mitigation</p> <p>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?</p> <p>2. Should there be a commitment for the assessment of the impact of noise barriers be carried out in consultation with the relevant local planning authorities?</p> <p>3. Applicant to comment</p>	<p>1 & 2. The required mitigation measures will be identified during the detailed design stage and included in the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority as part of the final CoCP and discharge of requirements.</p> <p>3. Applicant to comment.</p>

ExQ3: March 2020**Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	Response
Q3.14.1.8	<p>Alternative traffic movement through Cawston.</p> <p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. 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?</p> <p>3. The Applicant to respond to the concerns raised by NCC regarding Option 5 [REP5- 054] as further mitigation alongside Option 1 (current HIS).</p> <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>1- 4. Applicant to submit.</p> <p>End</p>