

Application by Norfolk Boreas Limited for the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Windfarm
The Examining Authority's fifth round of written questions and requests for information (ExQ5)
Issued on 11 August 2020

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) fifth round of written questions and requests for information – ExQ5.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex B to the Rule 6 letter of 11 October 2019. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations, meetings and hearings and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique questions reference number and respond to both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 as appropriate. If you have already provided answers at the Issue Specific Hearings in November 2019 and January 2020, please reference the precise location of that response in the Examination Library.

Each question has a unique reference number. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact NorfolkBoreas@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include '**Norfolk Boreas ExQ5**' in the subject line of your email.

IPs may have responded to similar questions from, and submitted representations to, the ExA that examined the Norfolk Vanguard application for Development Consent. However, it is important to understand that this is a separate Examination, and the ExA will only examine what is in front of it. The ExA will not take account of submissions made to



another ExA, unless these are specifically brought into this Examination. If your responses to questions refers to, or are the same as another Examination, please submit the relevant sections to this Examination. In doing so, you are advised to review your response and make it specific to the Norfolk Boreas application. Please state your response for both Scenario 1 and for Scenario 2, where relevant.

Responses are due by Deadline 14: 25 August 2020

Abbreviations used:

AEOI	Adverse Effect on Integrity	OCoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
ASI	Accompanied Site Inspection	OLEMS	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice	OSes	Outline Skills and Employment Strategy
DAS	Design and Access Statement	OTMP	Outline Traffic Management Plan
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order	OWSI	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation
DML	Deemed Marine Licence	R	Requirement
EA	Environment Agency	RIES	Report on the Implications for European Sites
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	SAC	Special Area of Conservation
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	SES	Skills and Employment Strategy
ES	Environmental Statement	SI	Statutory Instrument
ExA	Examining Authority	SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
FFC	Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area	SoS	Secretary of State
HBMCE	Historic England	SPA	Special Protection Area
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling	SPZ	Source Protection Zone
HHW SAC	Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton Special Area of Conservation	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
IROPI	Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest	TMP	Traffic Management Plan
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing	USI	Unaccompanied Site Inspection
LIG	Land Interest Group	WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation
LIR	Local Impact Report	WTG	Wind Turbine Generator
LSE	Likely Significant Effect		
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs		
MLWS	Mean Low Water Spring		
MMO	Marine Management Organisation		
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding		
NE	Natural England		



NCC	Norfolk County Council
NNDC	North Norfolk District Council
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OAMP	Outline Access Management Plan

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010087/EN010087-000897-Norfolk%20Boreas%20Examination%20Library%20PDF%20Version.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of Questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ5.1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

Index	
1. Archaeology and Heritage Assets	7
1.0 Offshore and intertidal archaeology.....	7
1.1 Onshore archaeology	7
1.2 Onshore heritage assets	7
2. Biodiversity, Biological Environment and Ecology	7
2.0 Offshore benthic and marine mammals	7
2.1 Onshore ecology.....	7
2.2 Offshore ornithology	7
3. Compulsory Acquisition	8
3.0 Compulsory Acquisition	8
4. Cumulative effects of other proposals	8
4.0 General cumulative effects, including phasing	8
4.1 Onshore cumulative effects of other proposals (construction)	13
5. Development Consent Order and Deemed Marine Licences	13
5.0 General	13
5.1 Articles.....	14
5.2 SCHEDULE 1 PART 1: Authorised Development.....	14
5.3 SCHEDULE 1 PART 3: Requirements.....	15
5.4 SCHEDULES 9 to 13: Deemed Marine Licences	15
5.5 SCHEDULE 14: HEDGEROWS	16
5.6 SCHEDULE 15: ARBITRATION.....	17
5.7 SCHEDULE 16: PROCEDURE FOR DISCHARGE OF REQUIREMENTS	17
5.8 SCHEDULE 17: PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS	17
5.9 CONSENTS, LICENCES AND OTHER AGREEMENTS	17
5.10 SCHEDULE 19: COMPENSATION TO PROTECT NATURA 2000 NETWORK	17
6. Fishing and fisheries.....	17
7. Grid connection	18
8. Habitats Regulation Assessment.....	18
8.0 River Wensum SAC.....	18
8.1 Norfolk Valley Fens SAC	18
8.2 Southern North Sea SAC	18
8.3 Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton SAC.....	19
8.4 Offshore ornithology	19
8.5 Greater Wash SPA	19
8.6 Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Haisborough Hammond and Winterton SAC...	19
8.7 Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA.....	19
9. Landscape and Visual Effects	19
9.0 The Applicant's landscape and visual assessment.....	20
9.1 The Applicant's visual assessment	20
9.2 Alternatives considered	20
9.3 Landscape effects	20
9.4 Visual effects	20
9.5 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) and Design and Access Statement ..	20
9.6 Good design.....	24
9.7 Matters arising from the accompanied site inspection (ASI) on Thursday 23 January 2020.....	24
No questions.....	24
10. Marine and Coastal processes	24
No questions.....	24
11. Navigation.....	24
11.0 Marine Navigation and Shipping.....	24
11.1 Aviation and Radar	25
12. Onshore construction effects	25
12.1 Cable corridor and ducting	25



12.2 Mobilisation areas	25
12.3 Noise and Vibration	25
12.4 Construction Hours	25
13. Socio-economic effects	25
13.0 Skills and Employment Strategy	25
13.1 Jobs	26
13.2 Tourism	26
13.3 Land use and Agriculture	26
13.4 Public Health	26
13.5 Other offshore industries and activities	26
14. Traffic and transportation	26
14.0 Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP)	26
14.1 Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) for Link 34 (B1145 through Cawston)	26
14.2 Oulton	28
14.3 Link 69 Little London Road in North Walsham from the B1145 Lyngate Road to an access point 210m east	29
14.4 Outline Access Management Plan and Access to Works plan	29
No questions	29
15. Water Resources and Flood Risk	29
16. General and cross-topic questions	29
16.0 General	29
16.1 Environmental Statement (ES)	31
16.2 Waste management, ground conditions and contamination	31

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
1.	Archaeology and Heritage Assets	
1.0	Offshore and intertidal archaeology	
	No questions	
1.1	Onshore archaeology	
	No questions	
1.2	Onshore heritage assets	
	No questions	
2.	Biodiversity, Biological Environment and Ecology	
2.0	Offshore benthic and marine mammals	
Q5.2.0.1	Natural England (NE)	Micrositing to mitigate impacts to archaeological and Annex 1 habitat features: In response to R17.1.21 MMO [REP13-035] stated that it is content that the information within the proposed CSIMP does provide enough detail to assist with the discharging of the plan at the post consent stage. However, MMO defers to NE on all aspects relating to HRA. Therefore, is NE content with the Applicant's response to R17.1.21 [REP13-013]? If not, what further mitigation does NE consider necessary?
Q5.2.0.2	The Applicant	Decommissioning in the HHW SAC: Clarify if cable as well as cable protection would be removed from the HHW SAC in decommissioning.
2.1	Onshore ecology	
	No questions	
2.2	Offshore ornithology	
	No questions	

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
3.	Compulsory Acquisition	
3.0	Compulsory Acquisition	
Q5.3.0.1	The Applicant; NFU/LIG	Provide a detailed, track change update of the Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule [REP6-023] in relation to the status of negotiations [REP11-010].
4.	Cumulative effects of other proposals	
4.0	General cumulative effects, including phasing	
Q5.4.0.1	Interested Parties	<p>Projects included in cumulative impact assessment</p> <p>Provide any comments that you wish to make further to the Applicant's response to the ExA question at ISH5 [REP13-016, ref 8c]) and follow up from OFH2 [REP13-014, ref 4] in which the Applicant confirms that its response to WQ1 [REP2-021, response to Q4.0.1] stands regarding not including the Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal extension project(s) in the cumulative impact assessment for the Proposed Development.</p>
Q5.4.0.2	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative impact assessment and Scenarios</p> <p>a) Set out succinctly why different approaches have been adopted for cumulative impact assessment for offshore (no reference to scenarios) and onshore (includes reference to and differentiates between the two scenarios).</p> <p>b) Would there be any difference in findings if the offshore cumulative assessment had differentiated between scenarios?</p>
Q5.4.0.3	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative adverse effects over time in Broadland District</p> <p>At OFH3, the ExA heard submissions that there would be 11 years of cumulative construction stage adverse effects relating to traffic, noise and vibration, air quality, onshore heritage, health and visual would be felt by communities in Broadland District if the Order was consented.</p> <p>Confirm what the worst case scenario would be (duration of specific construction activities and number of years in total) for Cawston, Oulton and the crossing north of Reepham, based on the projects included in your cumulative assessment.</p>

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
Q5.4.0.4	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative adverse effects on health</p> <p>a) In Table 27.5 [APP-240], justify how disturbance or obstruction of roads and footpaths can be characterised as a 'temporary' source of impact leading to potential health effects, in Cawston and Oulton, in light of your response to Q5.4.0.3.</p> <p>b) How would the assessment of cumulative effects on health effects change in light of the duration of worst case cumulative construction period (your response to Q5.4.0.3).</p>
Q5.4.0.5	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects, inter-relationships and intra-project and inter-project cumulative effects</p> <p>Representations at, and in lieu of attendance at, OFH3, particularly at the Cawston and Oulton sessions) raise concerns about the cumulative, sequential, combined (when receptors would be subjected to multiple impacts) adverse effects of construction activities on communities.</p> <p>It is unclear to the ExA where the overall effects on communities such as Cawston and Oulton are set out in the assessment when taking into account cumulative effects from other projects and inter-relationships [APP-219, para 40] (also referred to as intra-project effects in the human health assessment [APP-240]).</p> <p>The intra-project cumulative assessment [APP-240, Section 27.7.1] does not take account of all impacts on one set of receptors and distinguishes in no finer detail for its site-specific assessment than "<i>population along the onshore cable route</i>".</p> <p>The inter-project cumulative assessment states that the geographic and temporal spread of the relevant projects means that populations would be unlikely to feel a significant increase in health effects as a result of multiple projects being constructed [APP-240, Section 27.7.2]. This is different to the representations made by Interested Parties and others at OFH3.</p> <p>a) Explain where the overall effects on communities are set out in the application documentation.</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) provide more rapid and effective response, alongside the project wide Local Planning Authority investigation procedures [REP10-006, Section 5.2] and [REP10-012, Section 2.4]? This might also be appropriate for the period of onshore construction at the landfall for the communities at Happisburgh.</p>
Q5.4.0.6	The Applicant; Norfolk County Council	<p>Cumulative effects at port(s)</p> <p>The ExA understands that confirmed details of the base port(s) to be utilised for offshore construction and maintenance has yet to be made in relation to offshore construction and operation of the proposed Norfolk Boreas OFW project. Once a decision was reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How would such facilities be provided or brought into operation? b) What would be the mechanism for the assessing and mitigating any adverse cumulative traffic and transport effects which could arise at the port(s)? c) Should the Outline Travel Plan (OTP) [APP-700] include a commitment to assess car parking needs and availability during the construction phase at the port(s) to identify potential cumulative effects on the local community including those associated with offshore construction workers' car parking, in order to develop a car parking strategy, in consultation with the relevant local authority, before the commencement of the offshore works? d) Should the Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) [REP10-016] include a commitment to assess HGV movements cumulatively, with any mitigation proposals for agreement with the relevant highway authority. e) Should the OTMP also include a commitment to prepare Route Access Surveys for ports other than Kings Lynn as that which is included for Kings Lynn prepared for Norfolk Vanguard OWF [REP10-020, Appendix 3]. f) If the principle is agreed, the Applicant to include suitable wording for the OTP and OTMP, or appropriate wording secured elsewhere. g) If the principle is not agreed, the Applicant to provide without prejudice wording for inclusion in the OTMP and OTP to cover these points, should the ExA be minded to recommend their inclusion to the SoS. h) NCC to comment.
Q5.4.0.7	The Applicant; Broadland DC;	<p>Community Liaison</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
	<p>North Norfolk DC; Breckland Council; Cawston Parish Council; Oulton Parish Council; Happisburgh Parish Council</p>	<p>The OCoCP sets out the role of a Community Liaison Officer [REP10-013, Section 2.4] and the role of an Agricultural Liaison Officer [REP10-013, Appendix B]. The OTMP sets out the role of a Traffic Management Plan Coordinator [REP10-017, Section 5.3]. The ExA notes that there is an indicative outline of the role description for the Traffic Management Coordinator.</p> <p>a) Provide a fuller description of all three roles, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key responsibilities • part time or full time; • location; • duration of contract; <p>b) The ExA notes that there would be project wide Local Planning Authority investigation procedures [REP10-016, Section 5.2] and [REP10-012, Section 2.4] in place. Is the role of the proposed Community Liaison Officer to provide an on-the-ground, local presence to enable a rapid and effective response to community concerns, in locations such as Necton, Cawston, Oulton and Happisburg? Respond to this question in light of the representations during OFH3.</p> <p>c) Where and how are these details secured?</p> <p>d) Other Interest Parties may wish to comment.</p>
Q5.4.0.8	<p>The Applicant; Broadland DC; North Norfolk DC; Breckland Council; Cawston Parish Council; Oulton Parish Council; Happisburgh Parish Council</p>	<p>Community Liaison</p> <p>The ExA is not clear whether the Community Liaison Officer, Agricultural Liaison Officer and Traffic Management Plan Coordinator are to be a shared resource with the Norfolk Vanguard OFW project and Hornsea Project Three if it were consented.</p> <p>a) Explain the relationship of each post to all three projects.</p> <p>b) What measures are proposed to provide a single point of contact for community liaison in the event of concurrent construction periods if the Proposed Development and Hornsea Three OWF were to both be consented and have concurrent construction periods.</p> <p>c) Where and how is this secured?</p> <p>d) Other Interested Parties may wish to comment.</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
Q5.4.0.9	The Applicant; Broadland DC; North Norfolk DC; Breckland Council; Cawston Parish Council; Oulton Parish Council; Happisburgh Parish Council	<p>Community Liaison</p> <p>a) Are Parish Councils to be consulted on the content and details of the Communications Plan?</p> <p>b) If they are, should this be included in the OCoCP?</p> <p>c) If they are not, why not?</p> <p>d) Other Interested Parties may wish to comment.</p>
Q5.4.0.10	The Applicant	<p>Respond to Points in Mulbarton Parish Council’s D13 submission</p> <p>Respond to the matters raised in Mulbarton Parish Council’s representations at Deadline 13.</p>
Q5.4.0.11	The Applicant	<p>The Crossing with Hornsea Three OWF, North of Reepham</p> <p>a) Explain what is meant by ‘overall thermal efficiency’ with respect to the crossing of cables between Hornsea Project Three, Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas [REP10-037, Page 16, 17].</p> <p>b) Further to matters raised by N2RS at OFH2 [EV12-002] regarding lack of certainty over HVAC or HVDC and therefore cable numbers should Hornsea Three OWF be consented, the NFU at OFH3 [EV13-011] and your statement in the latest SoCG with the NFU [REP10-037, pages 15 to 17], provide a method statement with cross-section illustrations for construction of the crossing point of cables which illustrates all the possible construction process options (open cut trench and trenchless) of the Proposed Development with both scenarios (ie with and without Norfolk Vanguard OFW) and Hornsea Three with HVAC and HVDC.</p> <p>c) In presenting the options set out the thermal efficiency factors and potential for disruption to agriculture for each option.</p> <p>d) Include in the OCoCP this method statement, or a version of it which sets out those options which would meet the “most thermally efficient crossing design”.</p> <p>e) Where is the commitment by all parties to ensure that other parties could still install their cables secured [REP9-026, para 23]?</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		f) The ExA understands that discussions are on-going with Ørsted for Hornsea Project Three to agree the most thermally efficient crossing design. What are the implications for this Examination if no agreement is reached?
Q5.4.0.12	The NFU and/ or LIG	<p>The Crossing with Hornsea Three OWF, North of Reepham</p> <p>The Applicant will submit the requested method statement for construction process options at the crossing with Hornsea Three OWF at Deadline 14 (25 August 2020) at the same time as responses to these written questions.</p> <p>You are requested to provide any comments, including suggestions for amendment on this at Deadline 15 (1 September 2020).</p>
Q5.4.0.13	The Applicant	<p>The Crossing with Hornsea Three OWF, North of Reepham</p> <p>a) In order that the ExA can be satisfied that the necessary design assurances would be in place to enable the Applicant to rely on base survey data by others as set out in the SoCG with Ørsted for Hornsea Three OWF [REP9-026, para 23], should Hornsea Three OWF proceed ahead of the Proposed Development, include a reference to the Agreement in the dDCO.</p> <p>b) Does this agreement regarding survey by others need to be reflected anywhere else in the documentation for the Proposed Development, such as the OCoCP, OLEMS, WSI etc?</p> <p>c) How would responsibility and liability be determined in the event of baseline surveys proving inaccurate?</p>
4.1	Onshore cumulative effects of other proposals (construction)	
	No questions	
5.	Development Consent Order and Deemed Marine Licences	
5.0	General	
Q5.5.0.1	Interested Parties	Updated dDCO

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		Provide any comments on the Applicant's updated dDCO submitted at D13 [REP13-007] to [REP13-012].
Q5.5.0.2	The Applicant	<p>Schedule of Changes to the draft Development Consent Order</p> <p>Further to submission of [REP13-012], provide further updates with all versions of the dDCO and:</p> <p>a) Check all other changes such as turbine numbers in Schedules 9 and 10 are included in the Schedule of Changes.</p> <p>b) Check that the refs tally with changes eg Ref 05, are the Schedules correct?</p>
Q5.5.0.3	The Applicant	<p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <p>Page 337 (Explanatory Notes) refers to certification of plans, etc as 'Article 38'. Should this be Article 37? [REP13-008]</p>
5.1	Articles	
Q5.5.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Article 2: Highway Authority definition</p> <p>Include in Article 2, a definition for Highway Authority: "<i>the highway authority</i>" means <i>Highways England or Norfolk County Council</i>";</p>
Q5.5.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Article 16: Authority to investigate the land onshore</p> <p>The NFU confirmed at OFH3 (Session 3) that either of its previously requested additions regarding equipment to be used and an estimate of how long surveys would take (to dDCO Article 16 or to the role description for the Agricultural Land Officer (ALO)) would allay the concerns of those it is representing [EV13-011].</p> <p>Notwithstanding your comments regarding additional inefficiencies and inconsistencies with the made Norfolk Vanguard DCO [REP13-015, ref 17], if the ExA came to a different conclusion from that contained in the Norfolk Vanguard DCO regarding the need for such procedures, if you wish, state a without prejudice preference for which way (Article 16 wording or wording in the ALO role description) this could be secured?</p>
5.2	SCHEDULE 1 PART 1: Authorised Development	

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
	No questions	
5.3 SCHEDULE 1 PART 3: Requirements		
Q5.5.3.1	The Applicant	Requirements 16 and 18 There are questions below under Section 5.9 of these questions.
Q5.5.3.2	The Applicant	Plans within the CoCP listed in Requirement 20(2): In answer to WQ2.15.0.9, REP5-045 confirms that the OCoCP now refers specifically to a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan to be produced post-consent "as part of the Environmental Emergency/Incident and Response Plan". Should both these plans be listed within R20(2) of the dDCO as specific plans to be covered by the CoCP?
Q5.5.3.3	The Applicant, The Environment Agency (EA)	Notification to EA Environmental Incident Response teams: Signpost whether and if so, where the OCoCP Section 13 Environmental Incident and Response and Contingency has been updated to include that the ' <i>Environment Agency incident response teams must be notified where an environmental incident could cause spillage or contamination into a watercourse including drains</i> ' reported as agreed with the EA in REP6-014.
5.4 SCHEDULES 9 to 13: Deemed Marine Licences		
Q5.5.4.1	The Applicant	Schedules 11 & 12 Conditions 9 & 14 for marine pollution contingency plan: In referring to the plan, condition 7(10) of the DMLs schedules 11 and 12 refers to Condition 14 (1)(d)(i) for the marine pollution contingency plan. However, in these transmission asset DMLs, the plan is actually secured through Condition 9 whereas it is secured in Condition 14 for the generation asset DMLs. Confirm and correct drafting error as appropriate.
Q5.5.4.2	The Applicant	Notification of shallow buried cables: Confirm whether the amendment proposed by NFFO in the SoCG [REP9-025] to the wording of Schedules 9 and 10 Condition 9 (12) of the dDCO including the words "a state of shallow burial or exposure of" in regard to cables on or above the seabed will be

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		effected; and whether equivalent condition wording will also be included in Schedules 11, 12 and 13 of the dDCO.
Q5.5.4.3	The Applicant; The Marine Management Organisation (MMO); Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)	<p>ERCOP Conditions 15 and 10:</p> <p>Condition 15(8) in Schedules 9 and 10 and 10(8) in Schedules 11 and 12 requires MMO confirmation in writing that the undertaker has adequately addressed MCA recommendations contained within MGN543 "Offshore Renewable Energy Installations (OREIs) – Guidance on UK Navigational Practice, Safety and Emergency Response Issues" and its annexes. The DML condition no longer refers explicitly to approval and implementation of an ERCOP.</p> <p>Confirm if this redrafting is accepted by MMO and MCA and confirm whether the same wording will be included in Schedule 13 of the dDCO.</p>
Q5.5.4.4	Natural England (NE); The MMO, Marine & Coastguard Agency (MCA); Trinity House (TH); Historic England (HBMCE)	<p>Decommissioning of cables in HHW SAC Conditions 20 and 3(1)(g):</p> <p>Confirm satisfaction or otherwise with change to the dDCO [REP13- 007/008] that includes a new cable decommissioning condition 20 in Schedules 11 and 12 and removes condition 3(1)(g) prohibiting rock or gravel dumping.</p>
Q5.5.4.5	The Applicant; The Marine Management Organisation (MMO); Trinity House (TH)	<p>MMO objection to Part 5 of Schedules 9 to 13 Procedure for Appeals</p> <p>Confirm satisfaction with the amendment to the Boreas dDCO/DMLs in [REP13-007/008] removing part 5 following the determination of the Norfolk Vanguard application. The MMO had previously sustained an objection to Part 5 of Schedules 9 to 13 which proposes an override of the Marine Licensing (Licence Application Appeals) Regulations 2011 (Appeal Regulations) to enable the Applicant to appeal a MMO decision or failure to determine within the prescribed time period. In SoCG [REP9-023] the parties agree with each other that it should be the Secretary of State who decides this matter. TH also supported the MMO's position in regard to arbitration or appeal and deemed refusal.</p>
<p>5.5 SCHEDULE 14: HEDGEROWS</p>		
Q5.5.5.1	The Applicant	<p>Schedule 14</p> <p>Update Schedule 14 and/ or the Important Hedgerow Plans to resolve seeming anomalies as follows:</p> <p>a) Potentially important hedgerow 62 appears in the Schedule but not on plan;</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) Hedgerow 296 is important on plan and potentially important in Schedule 14;</p> <p>c) Potentially important hedgerow 297 appears on plan but not in Schedule 14; and</p> <p>d) Important hedgerow 295 appears on plan but not in Schedule 14.</p>
5.6	SCHEDULE 15: ARBITRATION	
	No questions	
5.7	SCHEDULE 16: PROCEDURE FOR DISCHARGE OF REQUIREMENTS	
	No questions	
5.8	SCHEDULE 17: PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS	
Q5.5.8.1	The Applicant; National Grid; Cadent Gas; Network Rail; Anglian Water; The Environment Agency; Ørsted	<p>Changes to Protective Provisions consistent with Vanguard made DCO:</p> <p>The ExA notes the update provided by the Applicant at ISH5. Can it now confirm that any drafting changes made to Protective Provisions in response to the making of the Norfolk Vanguard Development Consent Order are now agreed by all parties [REP13-008 and REP13-012; REP13-016]. Other parties may wish to comment.</p>
Q5.5.8.2	The Applicant; The Environment Agency (EA)	<p>Part 7 para 73 Presumption of deemed consent or refusal:</p> <p>The ExA notes the continuing disagreement between the Applicant and the Environment Agency in relation to deemed discharge mechanism [REP9-020]. The ExA also notes the position set out by the Applicant at ISH5 [REP13-016]. Does either party wish to add anything further?</p>
5.9	CONSENTS, LICENCES AND OTHER AGREEMENTS	
	No questions	
5.10	SCHEDULE 19: COMPENSATION TO PROTECT NATURA 2000 NETWORK	
	No questions	
6.	Fishing and fisheries	

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
Q5.6.0.1	The Applicant; Trinity House (TH)	Request for specific DML wording to be added re reduction in clearance depth: Trinity House (TH) stated in [REP8-034] and confirmed in the SoCG [REP9-028] that it continues to disagree with the Applicant regarding the DML condition wording and maintains its request for specific wording to be added on the grounds that a reduction of over 5% in clearance depth may cause a significant hazard to navigation without the timely risk mitigation that TH are concerned to secure in the DMLs. TH requested to signpost where in the examination alternative drafting has been provided, and if no drafting is available, provide suitable wording for consideration.
Q5.6.0.2	National Federation of Fishermens' Organisations; (NFFO)/ VisNed	Assessment of loss of fishing grounds during the operational phase: Confirm satisfaction or otherwise with the Applicant's position in [REP9-025] that the revised minimum worst-case turbine spacing proposed is sufficient to make fishing viable for beam trawlers and that NFFO/VisNed confirmed in their final SoCGs for East Anglia One and East Anglia Three that the spacing proposed would be sufficient to allow fishing safely to resume within the operational sites; and that safety zones would only be required in relation to major maintenance works and therefore, any loss of grounds associated with this would be very localised and short term.
7. Grid connection		
	No questions	
8. Habitats Regulation Assessment		
8.0 River Wensum SAC		
	No questions	
8.1 Norfolk Valley Fens SAC		
	No questions	
8.2 Southern North Sea SAC		

ExQ5 11 August 2020**Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020**

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
	No questions	
8.3 Haisborough, Hammond and Winterton SAC		
Q5.8.3.1	Natural England	For clarification, in [REP13-038] NE, in its response to R17.1.22, refers to comments in the risk and issue log provided at D12. The ExA has no record of this log. The last log [REP10-065] was submitted at D10, is this the one NE intended to refer to?
Q5.8.3.2	The Applicant; Natural England	To update the ExA on the outcome of the meeting scheduled for 13 August in [REP13-013].
8.4 Offshore ornithology		
Q5.8.4.1	Natural England	For in-combination effects, does NE have a view on the following scenario? Each OFW considered could be said to have a de minimis effect on bird mortality. However, at what point does a number of de minimis effects accumulate into a significant effect?
8.5 Greater Wash SPA		
	No questions	
8.6 Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and Haisborough Hammond and Winterton SAC		
Q5.8.6.1	The Applicant	In the event that no AEoI could not be agreed for all or any of the HRA sites and without prejudice, is the Applicant willing to work with NE and the ExA in providing a fully developed derogation case to submit to the SoS by the end of the Examination?
Q5.8.6.2	Natural England	Accepting that NE have strategic decisions to make resulting from the SoS letters referring to Norfolk Vanguard, Hornsea 3, and other recent OWF decisions, can it provide its best estimation of being able to provide definitive decisions on AEoI by the end of the Examination?
8.7 Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA		
	No questions	
9. Landscape and Visual Effects		

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
9.0	The Applicant's landscape and visual assessment	
	No questions	
9.1	The Applicant's visual assessment	
	No questions	
9.2	Alternatives considered	
	No questions	
9.3	Landscape effects	
	No questions	
9.4	Visual effects	
	No questions	
9.5	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS) and Design and Access Statement	
Q5.9.5.1	The Applicant	<p>Onshore project substation 12m access strip for large machinery</p> <p>Further to the Land Plan showing the "area to be cleared of landscaping obstruction" [REP13-020], include a cut-out plan in the DAS which illustrates the adjustments to the mitigation planting in the north east corner of the Order Limits for the onshore project substation from that currently shown on the Scenario 1 Mitigation Planting Plan [REP7-010, sheet 3 of 8].</p>
Q5.9.5.2	The Applicant; National Grid	<p>Finishes for National Grid substation extension</p> <p>a) Further to requests and comments at OFH3, can the electrical equipment required for the National Grid substation extension be coated or manufactured with a matt finish?</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) If so, the Applicant is requested to include relevant wording to secure this either in the DAS or in the OLEMS.</p>
Q5.9.5.3	The Applicant; NFU/LIG	<p>Action Point 12 from ISH5 For clarity, the ExA is anticipating more than materials options to be submitted at D14 [REP13-017, action# 12].</p> <p>a) The action point states "<i>sketch design options for layout, massing and "agricultural style" for the proposed onshore project substation.....</i>"</p> <p>b) An indication of scale should be provided on any sketch elevations etc eg a person or a double decker bus.</p> <p>c) Points agreed with the landowner such as the "<i>different layout and approach to some of the landscaping and drainage features on the site</i>" [REP13-015, page 17] should be illustrated.</p>
Q5.9.5.4	The Applicant; The NFU/ LIG	<p>Layout and drainage and landscape features at proposed onshore substation Confirm whether the landowner of land on which the proposed onshore substation would be located is in agreement on the "<i>different layout and approach to some of the landscaping and drainage features on the site</i>" [REP13-015, page 17] to which the Applicant refers.</p> <p>If not set out the areas where differences still exist and what in your/ the landowner's opinion needs further resolution.</p>
Q5.9.5.5	Breckland Council; Necton Parish Council; Holme Hale Parish Council; NSAG; the NFU and LIG; Landowners and Interested Parties with an interest in Necton	<p>Independent Design Review for substations In light of comments received at OFH2 [EV12-002] and OFH3 (Necton Session) [EV13-011], the decision on Norfolk Vanguard, which gives greater certainty to Scenario 1, and the ExA's ongoing concern about the complexity and detail contained in post-consent approvals for R16 and R18, the resource constraints of Breckland Council and the statements in the NIC Design Principles, the ExA invited the Applicant to consider inclusion of an independent design review at an early stage in the post-consent design process for the substations area, including those for Norfolk Vanguard if appropriate. The Applicant has set out its reasons for not involving an independent design review but has</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		<p>committed to amending the DAS to include a design review at an early stage conducted in a local forum [REP13-018].</p> <p>Do you:</p> <p>a) Agree that an early design review should take place?</p> <p>b) If so, do you consider it should be conducted in a local forum or as an independent design review – or both?</p>
Q5.9.5.6	<p>The Applicant; Breckland Council; Necton Parish Council; Holme Hale Parish Council; NSAG; The NFU and LIG; Landowners and Interested Parties with an interest in Necton</p>	<p>Independent Design Review for substations</p> <p>The ExA is consulting on ways potentially to secure the input of an independent design review and invites without prejudice comments on inclusion of wording in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) and/ or the dDCO as follows:</p> <p>DAS [REP7-007,Para 67]</p> <p><i>The Applicant will engage with Breckland Council <u>and at an early stage with an independent design review panel</u> to review the mitigation and landscape proposals and the architecture of the convertor building of the onshore project substation, at the time when further detailed design information is available. This will be undertaken through the production of a Design Guide.</i></p> <p>AND [REP7-007, Appendix 1, first para]</p> <p><i>The Design Guide will be prepared by Norfolk Boreas Limited (the Applicant) and will combine input from specialist consultants <u>and take on board findings as appropriate from the independent design review panel.</u> This part of the Norfolk Boreas project will enable the team to undertake the detailed design of the onshore project substation and ensure that embedded mitigation is integral in this process. The Design Guide will be presented as an A3 document, and will combine text and figures to explain the proposals</i></p> <p>OR inclusion of additional wording at R16(3) to read:</p>

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>"The onshore project substation must be constructed in accordance with the details approved by the relevant planning authority, <u>which must also have been subject to an early independent design review.</u>"</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Both the above.</p>
Q5.9.5.7	The Applicant	<p>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy</p> <p>a) Update the OLEMS to cover the point regarding levels discussed at ISH5 [REP13-016, agenda item 6] and also to refer to liaison with Breckland Council in this regard.</p> <p>Further to the points made at OFH2 and OFH3 (Necton Session) regarding locals' preference for some larger plant material, the ExA considers your response [REP13-014, ref 7], possibly misses the point made. Your response refers to maturity of vegetation, advance planting and the proposed areas of nurse (faster growing) and core (slower growing species). The ExA understands the request from the Necton local community to be for the planting mixes to include some larger tree plant material ("<i>not knee high</i>") at the time of planting and is based in part on their observations of the planting at the Dudgeon substation.</p> <p>b) The ExA welcomes the Applicant's repeated commitment to explore opportunities for advance planting but notes this is not stated in the most recent version of the OLEMS (other than a reference to the potential for Norfolk Vanguard planting to provide this function in Scenario 1) [REP10-014]. You are requested to include the commitment to explore advance planting opportunities in the OLEMS (and/ or the DAS) for the Proposed Development for both scenarios.</p> <p>c) The ExA considers that rather than leaving the matter of size of planting to be agreed as part of the R18(2)(a) submission, it would be helpful to provide a commitment in the OLEMS to a range of sizes of plant material, which would include some larger plant material at the time of planting in the vicinity of the proposed onshore substations. You are requested to provide without prejudice wording for inclusion in</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
		the OLEMS to cover this point, should the ExA be minded to recommend its inclusion to the SoS; or to include appropriate wording in the OLEMS.
Q5.9.5.8	Breckland Council; Broadland DC; North Norfolk DC; Necton Parish Council; Holme Hale Parish Council; NSAG; The NFU and LIG; Landowners and Interested Parties with an interest in Necton	<p>Design and Access Statement and Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy</p> <p>The Applicant will submit an updated DAS and an updated OLEMS at Deadline 14 (25 August 2020) at the same time as responses to these written questions.</p> <p>a) You are requested to submit any comments you may have on the Applicant's updated DAS and/ or the updated OLEMS at Deadline 15 (1 September 2020).</p> <p>b) If you have any comments on the way the Applicant has interpreted the ExA's questions above include these.</p> <p>c) If you consider any wording needs changing provide suggested alternative wording.</p> <p>d) If you think there are ongoing omissions set out what these are and how they can be remedied.</p>
9.6 Good design		
Q5.9.6.1	Breckland Council; Necton PC	<p>Provision for Design Review:</p> <p>Comment on the Applicant's Position Statement Early Involvement of Design Review [REP13-018].</p>
9.7 Matters arising from the accompanied site inspection (ASI) on Thursday 23 January 2020		
	No questions	
10. Marine and Coastal processes		
	No questions	
11. Navigation		
11.0 Marine Navigation and Shipping		
	No questions	

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
11.1	Aviation and Radar	
	No questions	
12.	Onshore construction effects	
Q5.12.0.1	The Applicant	<p>Pre-commencement works</p> <p>The ExA notes the Clarification Note on Pre-commencement Works [REP4-018] which highlights the commitments specific to the pre-commencement works included in the relevant dDCO Requirements. The ExA also notes the diagram in the updated note on requirements and conditions [REP11-004, Annex 1] showing how Management Plans and Pre-commencement Plans interrelate and correspond to particular Requirements.</p> <p>a) Applicant to include this diagram in all relevant outline management plans.</p>
12.1	Cable corridor and ducting	
	No questions	
12.2	Mobilisation areas	
	No questions	
12.3	Noise and Vibration	
	No questions	
12.4	Construction Hours	
	No questions	
13.	Socio-economic effects	
13.0	Skills and Employment Strategy	
	No questions	

ExQ5 11 August 2020**Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020**

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
13.1	Jobs	
	No questions	
13.2	Tourism	
Q5.13.2.1	The Applicant; North Norfolk District Council	The ExA notes the information you have provided regarding the tourism in North Norfolk District largely in the Local Impact Report [REP2-087, Appendix G onwards], and in subsequent submissions. a) NNDC, comment on the Applicant's views [REP13-025, Page 11]. b) Applicant, any further comments to NNDC [REP13-032]. c) The ExA notes that NNDC is determining whether any further evidence can be provided and whether the draft requirement can be further refined. Final positions are sought from both NNDC and the Applicant at D14.
13.3	Land use and Agriculture	
	No questions	
13.4	Public Health	
Q5.13.4.1	The Applicant	Respond to the matters raised in the representation made by Corpusty and Saxthorpe Parish Council.
13.5	Other offshore industries and activities	
	No questions	
14.	Traffic and transportation	
14.0	Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP)	
	No questions	
14.1	Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) for Link 34 (B1145 through Cawston)	
Q5.14.1.1	The Applicant;	Outstanding concerns from Cawston PC

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
	Norfolk County Council; Broadland District Council; Interested Parties	<p>The ExA notes [REP11-016] that NCC is satisfied that the proposed HIS for Link 34 is sufficient to mitigate against the impact arising from the Proposed Development, including the cumulative scenario with Hornsea Project Three. However, the progress with the HIS has not alleviated concerns with residents and Cawston PC [REP13-019]. Concerns remain on matters relating to: on street carparking, risk of accident, effectiveness and compliance with the 20 mph speed limit, risk from wing mirrors, entrance and egress on to the B1145 from driveway, and incremental reduction in cumulative cap of 239 HGVs to manage driver compliance issue.</p> <p>a) In light of these outstanding concerns from the affected community, NCC and the Applicant to consider what further steps and detailed design – highway and public realm – can be secured in the OTMP before the close of this examination to maximise the mitigation provided by the HIS?</p> <p>b) Comments are sought from NCC to the above question, in light of the note of the meeting with Cawston PC and the Applicant [REP13-019].</p> <p>c) Applicant, what was the outcome of the scheduled site visit on 31 July to review the concerns about entrance and egress from the resident’s driveway on to B1145. Other relevant IPs may wish to comment.</p> <p>d) Broadland DC may wish to comment.</p>
Q5.14.1.2	The Applicant; Interested Parties	<p>Impacts of construction traffic on emergency vehicles</p> <p>a) Notwithstanding the reference to the Highway Code in the Driver Induction Packs [REP13-015] highlight specific locations of conflict between HGVs (or two HGVs travelling in opposite directions) with emergency vehicles, particularly emergency vehicles travelling to the care home on Paul Engelhard Way in Cawston [REP13-054].</p> <p>b) What is the implication of such conflicts on emergency response time, and how is it proposed to be resolved in the OTMP?</p>
Q5.14.1.3	The Applicant; Norfolk County Council; Broadland District Council	<p>Additional mitigation</p> <p>a) Respond to the submission [REP13-054] and the specific points raised on Page 1.</p> <p>b) Comments are sought from NCC and Broadland DC.</p>

ExQ5 11 August 2020

Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
Q5.14.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative traffic effects in Cawston</p> <p>a) With reference to Action point 4 [EV14-005] provide an update on how Hornsea Project Three's commitment to adopt the revised HIS that has now successfully been through the road safety audit [REP5-055] could be legally secured in the dDCO for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>b) Can the Applicant provide a likely timescale for the signing of the Design Interaction and Co-Operation Agreement stated in the SoCG with Orsted [REP9-026]. Will the design Interaction and Co-operation agreement include a commitment from Hornsea Project Three to implement the revised HIS for link 34 [REP5-055]?</p>
Q5.14.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Monitoring and enforcement of the HIS</p> <p>It is stated [REP10-016, para 173] in the Specific Cawston Village Monitoring and Intervention Regime that further intervention measures will be agreed with NCC, to be implemented on validation of a driver compliance issue, including a reduction in the cumulative HGV cap (239 HGV movements) by ensuring Norfolk Boreas and Hornsea Project Three traffic demand does not overlap, and incrementally reducing the volume of traffic passing through Cawston from 239 HGV movements through targeted intervention informed by monitoring and consultation with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>a) What do you mean by "<i>to be implemented on validation of a driver compliance issue</i>"?</p> <p>b) Provide any further information on how this monitoring programme would work in practice. Update the OTMP accordingly.</p> <p>c) Could this have a knock-on effect on the duration of the project, in particular the HGV profiles through Cawston, the worst case scenario that has been assessed in the ES or any other ES parameters?</p>
14.2	Oulton	
Q5.14.2.1	The Applicant	<p>Old Railway Gatehouse</p> <p>Confirm the steps that have been made to seek approval from the residents of Old Railway Gatehouse for the proposed additional mitigation [REP10-016]?</p>

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
14.3	Link 69 Little London Road in North Walsham from the B1145 Lyngate Road to an access point 210m east	
	No questions	
14.4	Outline Access Management Plan and Access to Works plan	
	No questions	
15.	Water Resources and Flood Risk	
Q5.15.0.1	The Applicant	Drafting change in OCoCP regarding watercourse crossings: Correct the drafting of the OCoCP para 150 [REP8-003] regarding scheme for each watercourse crossing "...will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation ..." with "...Norfolk County Council, the Environment Agency, relevant ..." drainage "...authorities and ...".
Q5.15.0.2	National Farmers Union (NFU) and Land Interest Group (LIG)	Wording of the OCoCP regarding private agricultural water supplies: Does NFU wish to add anything further in response to the Applicant's representation regarding Private Water Supplies [REP13-015]?
16.	General and cross-topic questions	
16.0	General	
Q5.16.0.1	Breckland Council; Broadland DC; North Norfolk DC; Norfolk CC; Cawston Parish Council; Holme Hale Parish Council; Necton Parish Council; Oulton Parish Council; The NFU; NSAG;	SoS Decisions and letters regarding other NSIPs The Applicant has set out its view on the implications on the Proposed Development of the Norfolk Vanguard decision and the SoS Hornsea Three letter [REP13-025]. Points were also made at ISH5 [EV14-004]. a) Provide the ExA with any views you have which do not accord with the Applicant's opinion as set out in the above document and particularly Appendix 2, which sets out the relevance of the SoS Norfolk Vanguard decision on the Proposed Development, topic by topic. b) Any other matters arising as a result of the SoS Decisions and letters regarding other NSIPs, which you wish to draw to the ExA's attention should be set out here, stating implications and actions you would wish to see.

ExQ5 11 August 2020**Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020**

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
	Mulbarton Parish Council; The Environment Agency; Other IPs may wish to comment	Note: HRA responses do not need to be given here, as there are specific questions elsewhere.
Q5.16.0.2	The Applicant	Implications for the Proposed Development of any decisions and/ or letters on other offshore wind farms Set out any points, not already submitted to this Examination, that you consider would be important and relevant to the SoS decision for the Proposed Development.
Q5.16.0.3	The Applicant; Other Interested Parties	Need As it is now over a year since the application for the Proposed Development was submitted, set out any points additional to those in your application, on the need for the Proposed Development that you consider would be important and relevant to the planning balance case for the SoS decision. Other parties may wish to comment.
Q5.16.0.4	The Applicant	Comments on Deadline 13 submissions There were a number of submissions at Deadline 13 in lieu of attendance at the OFHs in July published under [EV-13] and other submissions, including post hearing submissions under [REP13]. a) Provide responses to these if they raise matters not already addressed in your response to OFHs [REP13-014] and [REP13-015]. b) Provide response to any other matters raised in Deadline 13 submissions, not already addressed elsewhere.
Q5.16.0.5	The Applicant; Interested Parties	Additional information The Applicant and 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.

ExQ5 11 August 2020**Responses due by Deadline 14: Tuesday, 25 August 2020**

ExQ5	Question to:	Question:
16.1	Environmental Statement (ES)	
	No questions	
16.2	Waste management, ground conditions and contamination	
Q5.16.2.1	The Applicant; Breckland Council; The Environment Agency	Securing radiological investigation in OCoCP: Signpost where in the OCoCP a radiological investigation by a specialist contractor in the site area that may have been affected by the 1996 plane crash is secured, as stated in [REP13-015] response to OFH3.