



## **Application by Equinor New Energy Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project**

### **The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (WQ1)**

**Issued on Friday 27 January 2023**

This document sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA) First Written Questions and requests for information (WQ1), in order to facilitate the conduct of the Examination. Responses are due by **Deadline 1, Monday 20 February 2023**.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues in the Rule 6 letter, Annex C [PD-006]. The questions relate to issues as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies. All the post Hearing Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 1 and 2 [EV-003] [EV-005] have been included in WQ1 and these have been highlighted as such.

Column 1 sets out the unique reference number to each question which starts with 'Q1' (indicating that it is from WQ1), followed by an issue number, a sub-heading number and a question number. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. Please provide a substantive response to the questions directed at you, or indicate why the question is not relevant to you. You may also respond to questions that are not directed at you, should the question be relevant to your interests.

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 [sadep@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:sadep@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project' in the subject line of your email.

**Responses are due by Deadline 1, Monday 20 February 2023.**



## List of abbreviations

<b>AADT</b>	Annual Average Daily Traffic
<b>AEoI</b>	Adverse Effect in Integrity
<b>AEZ</b>	Archaeological Exclusion Zone
<b>ALARP</b>	As Low As Reasonably Possible
<b>ALC</b>	Agricultural Land Classification
<b>AONB</b>	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
<b>AP</b>	Affected Persons
<b>ASI</b>	Accompanied Site Inspection
<b>AQMA</b>	Air Quality Management Area
<b>BEIS</b>	Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy
<b>BMV</b>	Best and Most Versatile
<b>BNG</b>	Biodiversity Net Gain
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference
<b>BDC</b>	Broadland District Council
<b>BYR</b>	Blue, Yellow and Red
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition
<b>CA Regulations</b>	The Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010
<b>CA Guidance</b>	Planning Act 2008: guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land



<b>CCA</b>	Climate Change Allowance
<b>CCR2C</b>	Noise Receptor CCR2
<b>CfD</b>	Contract for Difference
<b>CIA</b>	Cumulative Impact Assessment
<b>CIL</b>	Community Infrastructure Levy
<b>CION</b>	Connections and Infrastructure Options Note
<b>CoCP</b>	Code of Construction Practice
<b>CPRE</b>	The Countryside Charity
<b>CNMP</b>	Construction Noise Management Plan
<b>dB</b>	Decibel
<b>dDML</b>	Draft Deemed Marine License
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft Development Consent Order
<b>DEFRA</b>	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
<b>DEP</b>	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
<b>DEL</b>	Dudgeon Extension Limited
<b>DEP-N</b>	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project North
<b>DEP-S</b>	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project South
<b>DMRB</b>	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
<b>DOW</b>	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm
<b>DWPA</b>	Drinking Water Protected Area



<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency
<b>EAG</b>	East Anglia Green
<b>eDNA</b>	Environment Deoxyribonucleic acid
<b>EEAST</b>	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum
<b>EMF</b>	Electric Magnetic Field
<b>EMP</b>	Environment Management Plan
<b>EPUK</b>	Environmental Protection UK
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority
<b>FTE</b>	Full Time Equivalent
<b>FRA</b>	Flood Risk Assessment
<b>FLOWW</b>	Fishing Liaison with Offshore Wind and Wet Renewables Group
<b>GCN</b>	Great Crested Newts
<b>GLVIA3</b>	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3
<b>GVA</b>	Gross Value Added
<b>GWTMZ</b>	Greater Wash Transponder Mandatory Zone
<b>HDD</b>	Horizontal Directional Drilling
<b>HE</b>	Historic England



<b>HGV</b>	Heavy Goods Vehicle
<b>HP3</b>	Hornsea Project 3
<b>IAQM</b>	Institute of Air Quality Management
<b>IFCA</b>	Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities
<b>IP</b>	Interested Parties
<b>ISH</b>	Issue Specific Hearing
<b>ISH</b>	Issue Specific Hearing
<b>km</b>	Kilometre
<b>LA</b>	Local Authority
<b>LHA</b>	Local Highway Authority
<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report
<b>LLFA</b>	Lead Local Flood Authority
<b>LoNI</b>	Letters of No Impediment
<b>LV</b>	Light Vehicle
<b>LVIA</b>	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
<b>m</b>	Metre
<b>MCA</b>	Maritime Coastguard Agency
<b>MCZ</b>	Marine Conservation Zone
<b>MEEB</b>	Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit
<b>MHWS</b>	Mean High Water Springs



<b>MMMP</b>	Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol
<b>MMO</b>	Marine Management Organisation
<b>MoD</b>	Ministry of Defence
<b>NB</b>	Norfolk Boreas
<b>NCAONB</b>	Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
<b>NCC</b>	Norfolk County Council
<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>NFU</b>	National Farmers Union
<b>NH</b>	National Highways
<b>NNDC</b>	North Norfolk District Council
<b>NO<sub>2</sub></b>	Nitrogen Dioxide
<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	Nitrogen Oxides
<b>NPPF</b>	National Planning Policy Framework
<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>NPS EN</b>	National Policy Statement Energy Suite
<b>NR</b>	Network Rail
<b>NRMM</b>	Non-Road Mobile Machinery
<b>NRIDB</b>	Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board
<b>NSER</b>	No Significant Effects Report
<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project



<b>NT</b>	National Trust
<b>NV</b>	Norfolk Vanguard
<b>OFH</b>	Open Floor Hearing
<b>OCoCP</b>	Outline Code of Construction Practice
<b>OCTMP</b>	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
<b>OFH</b>	Open Floor Hearing
<b>OLMP</b>	Outline Landscape Management Plan
<b>OS</b>	Ordnance Survey
<b>OSP</b>	Offshore Platform
<b>OSEP</b>	Outline Skills and Employment Plan
<b>OTN</b>	Offshore Transmission Network
<b>OWF</b>	Offshore Windfarm
<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008
<b>PEMP</b>	Project Environment Management Plan
<b>PPV</b>	Peak Particle Velocity
<b>PRoW</b>	Public Rights of Way
<b>PVA</b>	Population Viability Analysis
<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>RAF</b>	Royal Air Force
<b>RIAA</b>	Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment



<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>RRH</b>	Remote Radar Head
<b>RSPB</b>	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
<b>RVAA</b>	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment
<b>RYB</b>	Red, Yellow and Blue
<b>s</b>	Section of Parliamentary Legislation
<b>SAC</b>	Special Area of Conservation
<b>SEP</b>	Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
<b>SEL</b>	Scira Extension Limited
<b>SLVIA</b>	Seascape and Landscape Visual Impact Assessment
<b>SOCG</b>	Statement of Common Ground
<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>SOW</b>	Sheringham Offshore Windfarm
<b>SNCB</b>	Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies
<b>SNDC</b>	South Norfolk District Council
<b>SPA</b>	Special Protection Area
<b>SPZ</b>	Source Protection Zone
<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>SWMP</b>	Site Waste Management Plan
<b>TA</b>	Transport Assessment





<b>TCPA1990</b>	Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
<b>TP</b>	Temporary Possession
<b>TPO</b>	Tree Preservation Order
<b>TTSA</b>	Traffic and Transport Study Area
<b>USI</b>	Unaccompanied Site Inspection
<b>UXO</b>	Unexploded Ordnance
<b>WFD</b>	Water Framework Directive
<b>WMS</b>	Written Ministerial Statement
<b>WWI</b>	World War One
<b>WWII</b>	World War Two
<b>ZTV</b>	Zones of Theoretical Visibility

## **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 will be updated regularly as the Examination progresses.



<b>Index</b>	
<b>Q1.1. General and Cross-topic Questions.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Q1.1.1 Planning Policy .....	13
Q1.1.2 Planning Permissions .....	13
Q1.1.3 Legislative Framework .....	13
Q1.1.4 Miscellaneous .....	14
<b>Q1.2. Alternatives and need .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Q1.2.1 Selection of Landfall Site.....	15
Q1.2.2 Selection of Substation Site.....	15
Q1.2.3 Viability of the grid connection and progress with other licences.....	17
Q1.2.4 The Need for this type of Energy Infrastructure, and specifically for the Proposed Development .....	18
<b>Q1.3. Benthic ecology, Intertidal, Subtidal and Coastal effects.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Q1.3.1 Effects on Marine Life and Benthic Habitats including through Cable Installation Methods .....	19
Q1.3.2 Impact on subtidal chalk features .....	21
Q1.3.3 Coastal erosion effects and coastal processes .....	21
Q1.3.4 Effects on the Marine Conservation Zone .....	21
<b>Q1.4. Civil and Military Aviation.....</b>	<b>24</b>
Q1.4.1 Effects on Radar and Defence Interests .....	24
Q1.4.2 Proposed Mitigation .....	24
<b>Q1.5. Construction Effects Offshore.....</b>	<b>26</b>
Q1.5.1 Development Scenarios and Rochdale Envelope ....	26
<b>Q1.6. Construction Effects Onshore .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Q1.6.1 Development Scenarios .....	29
Q1.6.2 Approach to Construction, Compounds, Programme, Timing and Methods.....	30
Q1.6.3 Baseline survey and effects of Unexploded Ordinance.....	33
Q1.6.4 Effects of construction works on human health .....	34
Q1.6.5 Effects from emissions on air quality .....	36
Q1.6.6 Adequacy of the Outline Code of Construction Practice .....	38
Q1.6.7 Waste Management.....	39
<b>Q1.7. Commercial Fisheries and Fishing .....</b>	<b>40</b>
Q1.7.1 Effects on Fishing Stocks.....	40
Q1.7.2 Effects on fishing enterprises as a result of navigational or special restrictions .....	40
<b>Q1.8. Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession .....</b>	<b>42</b>
Q1.8.1 Updates on Negotiations .....	42
Q1.8.2 Affected Persons' Site-specific Issues .....	42
Q1.8.3 Special Land.....	43
<b>Q1.9. Cumulative Effects .....</b>	<b>45</b>
Q1.9.1 Scope and Extent.....	45
<b>Q1.10. Design.....</b>	<b>47</b>
Q1.10.1 Design Principles.....	47
Q1.10.2 Design Development Process.....	47
<b>Q1.11. Draft Development Consent Order .....</b>	<b>49</b>
Q1.11.1 General .....	49
Q1.11.2 Definitions .....	50
Q1.11.3 Schedules .....	51
Q1.11.4 Schedules .....	54
Q1.11.5 Requirements .....	55
Q1.11.6 Draft Deemed Marine Licences.....	56
Q1.11.7 Interaction of the dDCO with Other Legislated DCOs, Other Existing Infrastructure and Planned Projects.....	57
<b>Q1.12. Habitats and Ecology Offshore .....</b>	<b>58</b>
Q1.12.1 Effects on Ornithology .....	58



Q1.12.2	Effects on Aquatic Wildlife including Mammals, Fish and Shellfish .....	59	Q1.18.1	Effect on Seascape Character and Views .....	88
<b>Q1.13.</b>	<b>Habitats and Ecology Onshore.....</b>	<b>62</b>	Q1.18.2	Effects During Construction .....	88
Q1.13.1	Effects on European Designated Sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest .....	62	Q1.18.3	Effects on Designated and Historic Landscapes ..	88
Q1.13.2	Effects on Protected and Priority Species.....	62	Q1.18.4	Cumulative Effects .....	89
Q1.13.3	Effects on Ancient Woodland, Trees and Hedgerows .....	63	<b>Q1.19.</b>	<b>Navigation and Shipping .....</b>	<b>91</b>
Q1.13.4	Effects on Rivers and River-Based Wildlife.....	64	Q1.19.1	Navigational Risk and Effect on Navigational Safety .....	91
<b>Q1.14.</b>	<b>Habitats Regulation Assessment.....</b>	<b>66</b>	Q1.19.2	Impact on Radar, Search and Rescue .....	93
Q1.14.1	Effect of the Proposed Development on its own and In-combination with Other Plans and Projects .....	66	<b>Q1.20.</b>	<b>Noise and Vibration.....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Q1.15.</b>	<b>Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage .</b>	<b>74</b>	Q1.20.1	Adequacy of the Assessments for Construction ..	94
<b>Offshore Matters .....</b>	<b>74</b>		Q1.20.2	Construction Effects on Sensitive Receptors .....	95
Q1.15.1	Adequacy of Baseline Surveys and Environmental Information .....	74	Q1.20.3	Cumulative Effects Assessment.....	97
<b>Onshore Matters.....</b>	<b>74</b>		Q1.20.4	Adequacy and Design of Proposed Mitigation .....	98
Q1.15.2	Adequacy of baseline surveys and information... ..	74	<b>Q1.21.</b>	<b>Oil, Gas and Other offshore infrastructure and activities.....</b>	<b>99</b>
Q1.15.3	Effects on Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets .....	75	Q1.21.1	Safety measures.....	99
<b>Q1.16.</b>	<b>Land Use .....</b>	<b>77</b>	Q1.21.2	Effectiveness of Proposed Mitigation .....	99
Q1.16.1	Effect on Agricultural Land and Businesses and Recreational Assets.....	77	<b>Q1.22.</b>	<b>Socio-economics effects.....</b>	<b>100</b>
Q1.16.2	Soils and Soil handling, Ground Conditions, Contamination and Minerals.....	79	Q1.22.1	Effects on recreation, tourism and business.....	100
<b>Q1.17.</b>	<b>Landscape and Visual Effects .....</b>	<b>82</b>	Q1.22.2	Effects on jobs and skills.....	102
Q1.17.1	Effect on Landscape Character and Views.....	82	Q1.22.3	Effects on Individuals and Communities .....	103
Q1.17.2	Effects on designated and historic landscapes, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Ancient Woodlands .....	85	Q1.22.4	Inter-related Effects on Human Health and Community Well-being .....	105
Q1.17.3	Effectiveness of mitigation proposals .....	86	<b>Q1.23.</b>	<b>Traffic and Transport .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Q1.18.</b>	<b>Seascape and Visual Effects .....</b>	<b>88</b>	Q1.23.1	Effects from Construction Vehicles on the Highway Network and Living Conditions .....	106
			Q1.23.2	Traffic Management Proposals and Impacts on the Highway Network .....	107
			Q1.23.3	Cumulative Traffic Effects with Other Local Projects.....	108
			Q1.23.4	Effects on Recreational Routes, such as Public Rights of Way.....	109



Q1.23.5	Suitability of Access Strategy .....	109
Q1.23.6	Effectiveness of Proposed Mitigation Measures ..	110
<b>Q1.24.</b>	<b>Water quality and resources .....</b>	<b>114</b>
Q1.24.1	Effects on Flood Risk and Drainage, including Adequacy of Sequential and Exception Tests .....	114
Q1.24.2	Effects on Water Resources and Water Quality, including Measures to Prevent Pollution of Aquifers ....	118
Q1.24.3	Effects on Rivers, Streams, Canals and Ditches from Proposed Construction Methods and Crossing ....	121
Q1.24.4	Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures.....	122

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.1. General and Cross-topic Questions</b>		
<b>Q1.1.1 Planning Policy</b>		
Q1.1.1.1	Local Authorities	<p><b>Planning Policy</b></p> <p>Set out whether, in your view:</p> <p>a) There are any areas of where the Proposed Development conflicts with the aims and objectives of the designated NPSs, specifically NPS EN1 and NPS EN3;</p> <p>b) The representation of the Local Plans and policies [APP-088] is accurate or, if not, provide updated information;</p> <p>c) Any other policy documents are considered important and relevant to the Examination.</p> <p>d) Applicant, provide a complete summary in tabular form to demonstrate how it is considered the Proposed Development accords with all relevant paragraphs of the designated energy NPSs.</p>
Q1.1.1.2	Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Marine Plans</b></p> <p>Provide a document setting out relevant East Inshore and East Offshore policies and marine plans that apply to the Proposed Development.</p>
<b>Q1.1.2 Planning Permissions</b>		
Q1.1.2.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Planning Permissions</b></p> <p>Please update the Examination as to whether any new permissions have been granted, or new projects pending decision, that require consideration within the cumulative impact assessment.</p>
Q1.1.2.2	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Planning Applications</b></p> <p>Have any proposed works, to date, been subject to planning applications under s78 of the TCPA1990 (as amended) and, if so, where are they and what is their status?</p>
<b>Q1.1.3 Legislative Framework</b>		
Q1.1.3.1	Applicant	<p><b>Energy Security Bill Policy Statements and Draft Regulations</b></p> <p>Provide copy of amendments to the Energy Security Bill Policy Statements and Draft Regulations (13 January 2023) and highlight sections of relevance.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.1.4 Miscellaneous</b>		
Q1.1.4.1	Applicant Interest Parties	<b>Review of Energy NPSs</b> In light of the ongoing review of the energy NPSs, would any aspect of the Proposed Development be in conflict with, or require revision to align with, the revised energy NPSs? The ExA notes that the Applicant's assessment [APP-285, Section 6] but invites any further comments from the Applicant.
Q1.1.4.2	Local Authorities	<b>Availability of Resources for NSIP casework</b> Are you confident that you have, or shortly will have, sufficient resources to deal with the NSIP-related workload that will be associated with the Proposed Development during the examination and recommendations phases and that would be associated with the Proposed Development if the SoS made an order granting development consent?

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.2. Alternatives and need</b>		
<b>Q1.2.1 Selection of Landfall Site</b>		
Q1.2.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Landfall Location Selection Process</b></p> <p>Whilst the ES [APP-089] sets out the reasons why Weybourne was chosen for the proposed landfall location for the cabling, explain why the options were limited to Weybourne, Bacton and Happisburg?</p>
<b>Q1.2.2 Selection of Substation Site</b>		
Q1.2.2.1	Applicant National Grid	<p><b>Grid Connection</b></p> <p>The Applicant has reported on the optioneering process that underpinned the selection process for the wind farm locations, the landfall location and the onsite substation location, commenting that the latter emerged following consultation with National Grid [APP-089] [APP-175]. The ExA seeks clarification, in light of policy and legislative requirements set out in NPS EN-1 Section 4.4 and the EIA Regulations 2017, on the following matters:</p> <p>National Grid</p> <p>a) Signpost in the Application material or submit information to highlight what alternative grid connections, other than Norwich Main, were offered to the Applicant?</p> <p>b) What criteria did you consider in making the connection offer to the Applicant?</p> <p>Applicant and National Grid</p> <p>a) Further explanation is needed to support the nuanced steps in the site selection process [APP-175, Plate 3-1]. For instance, did the identification of the offshore cable corridor, landfall, onshore cable corridor and onshore substation take place concurrently as shown [APP-175, Plate 3-1]?</p> <p>b) Applicant, submit marked on a map all the sites (field 1 to field 5 [APP-175, Table 3-5] and any others) considered for the onshore substation, a comparative assessment of suitability, including the criteria and weighting used for the assessment, with a statement of why each other site was dismissed, and the proposed site selected. In that regard, identify what options 1 to 6 refer to [APP-175, Table 3-1].</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>c) Provide a full flow chart with the sequence of steps taken, and the criteria and weighting that underpinned key decisions. In particular, outline how the MCZ, biodiversity and designated natural and built assets were considered.</p> <p>d) What weight or extent of consideration is given to nature, biodiversity and sites designated for nature conservation when preparing the CION and offer options?</p> <p>e) Given its distance in-land, what factors made Norwich substation the best option for the grid connection?</p> <p>f) Submit the CION and any relevant supporting material. If the CION is an extensive document, provide a summary as well.</p>
Q1.2.2.2	National Grid Applicant	<p><b>Substation Location</b></p> <p>In relation to the proposed substation for the Proposed Development:</p> <p>National Grid</p> <p>a) Are there any concerns from a structural, engineering or technical perspective with regards to the specific location for the proposed substation [AS-005]?</p> <p>b) Are the works you require to upgrade and extend Norwich Main, or to connect and integrate with the Proposed Development adequately, covered within Schedule 1 of the dDCO and the associated Works Plans [APP-011, AS-009]?</p> <p>Applicant</p> <p>e) How will the works for the proposed substation for the Proposed Development interact with, or be separate from, the works for the Hornsea 3 substation taking place in the vicinity and is there any sequential preference in this regard? For instance do the Hornsea Project 3 works to the Norwich Main have to be completed first to create the necessary network into which the Proposed Development would connect?</p>
Q1.2.2.3	Applicant National Grid	<p><b>Walpole Substation</b></p> <p>At OFH1 [EV-009] [EV-010], a number of speakers highlighted that there was spare capacity at the Walpole Substation following the mothballing of Sutton Bridge gas fired power station and the declination of an application for Docking Shoal wind farm to connect. Comment on all aspects of this scenario. If this is the case how did this feature in the assessment of alternatives for the substation selection for the Proposed Development?</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.2.3 Viability of the grid connection and progress with other licences</b>		
Q1.2.3.1	Applicant National Grid	<p><b>Offshore Transmission Network</b></p> <p>a) Explain what an OTN would consist of and what the current policy and industry support for such an approach is.</p> <p>b) Has an OTN has been considered for the Proposed Development? Is an OTN, as described by IPs during representations at OFH1 [EV-009] [EV-010] feasible?</p> <p>c) In light of policy support (if any) discuss how, in your opinion, this can be considered in this Examination.</p>
Q1.2.3.2	Applicant	<p><b>Contracts for Difference</b></p> <p>The Scenarios Statement raises timetables and funding programmes with regards to the delivery of the project and the degree of integration between SEP and DEP [APP-314, Paragraphs 7, 8, 46 and 63]. Clarity is requested on the following:</p> <p>a) The ExA notes that the current regulatory regime does not allow for shared or dependent bids and does not have a mechanism to ensure both projects may be awarded a CfD in the same allocation round [APP-027, Paragraph 66]. Does the Applicant consider the current regulatory regime to be a significant impediment to the delivery of the Proposed Development?</p> <p>b) Is it considered unlikely that the two CfD bids can be submitted and approved within that 7-year timeframe?</p> <p>c) If CfD bids being made in separate rounds is perceived to be a barrier to delivery of the preferred option (concurrent construction with integrated infrastructure), how likely is Scenario 1d (concurrent construction with completely separate infrastructure)?</p> <p>d) What factors relating to the CfD regime must be in place for scenario 1d to be the most likely scenario to happen?</p> <p>e) The ExA notes the Applicant’s key engagement activities throughout the pre-application process relating to the Coordinated Approach to SEP and DEP [APP-314, Table 6-1]. What are the Applicant’s next steps and timescales in relation to the securing CfD for both projects?</p>
Q1.2.3.3	Applicant	<p><b>Co-operation Agreement</b></p> <p>The Scenarios Statement references an agreement between SEL and DEL [APP-314, Paragraph 103]. Will this agreement be presented to the Examination, and should it be a</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		document appearing in the dDCO, given its likely relationship to implementation on the various outline management plans?
<b>Q1.2.4 The Need for this type of Energy Infrastructure, and specifically for the Proposed Development</b>		
Q1.2.4.1	Applicant Interested Parties	<p><b>Need for Offshore Wind farm</b></p> <p>a) The assessment of need for the Proposed Development has been set within the context of the ongoing need for electricity generation in the U.K. [APP-285, Section 4]. However, there are other types of infrastructure that are supported by NPS EN-1 that can meet the need for electricity generation. Justify the need for the specific type of infrastructure (offshore windfarm) for electricity generation as opposed to or alongside other types of infrastructure. And explain, how the Proposed Development specifically satisfies the need for offshore windfarms for electricity generation. Explain in the context of NPS EN-1, including Paragraph 3.2.3: <i>"The weight which is attributed to considerations of need in any given case should be proportionate to the anticipated extent of a project's actual contribution to satisfying the need for a particular type of infrastructure"</i>; and Paragraph 3.3.4: <i>"There are benefits of having a diverse mix of all types of power generation. It means we are not dependent on any one type of generation or one source of fuel or power and so helps to ensure security of supply."</i></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.3. Benthic ecology, Intertidal, Subtidal and Coastal effects</b>		
<b>Q1.3.1 Effects on Marine Life and Benthic Habitats including through Cable Installation Methods</b>		
Q1.3.1.1	Local Authorities Environment Agency Natural England Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Marine Management Organisation	<b>Intertidal and Subtidal areas</b> Are you content with the Applicant's assessment of the adverse effects of the use of long HDD to bring the export cables ashore at landfall [APP-094]? Explain with reasons.
Q1.3.1.2	Natural England	<b>Benthic Ecology Recovery Time</b> Comment on the Applicant's assertion that a full recovery of benthic habitats and communities for SEP and DEP is anticipated within two years of construction [APP-094, Paragraph 164].
Q1.3.1.3	Applicant	<b>Testing Laboratory</b> The MMO state [RR-053, Paragraph 4.2.2]: " <i>The applicant confirmed that they have used Fugro, who are not currently validated by the MMO for sediment analysis. The MMO still have outstanding concerns with this which are discussed further in this representation.</i> " In response to this explain the reasoning for your choice of laboratory used.
Q1.3.1.4	Applicant	<b>Levels of Arsenic</b> The MMO state [RR-053, Paragraph 4.2.4]: " <i>The applicant compares selected Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons ("PAH") congener concentrations to 'OSPAR Background Assessment Concentration ("BAC")' and 'United States Environmental Protection Agency's ("US EPA's") Effects Range-Low ("ERL")', finding that these were not exceeded. As for the assessment of arsenic levels, the chemical analysis methods underpinning the sample contaminants data may not be suitable for them to be compared to these additional guidelines.</i> " In your responses to the RR, respond to this specific point.
Q1.3.1.5	Applicant	<b>Level of Sampling</b>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>The MMO state [RR-053, Paragraph 4.2.6]: <i>"The volume of sediment to be disturbed presented in the ES indeed indicates that the seven samples collected for contaminants analyses underrepresent the volumes of sediment to be disturbed according to OSPAR guidelines for volumes of dredged material, where 7-15 samples are requested for 100,000-500,000m<sup>3</sup> of material."</i></p> <p>In responding to this comment, explain why the samples collected are considered sufficient in the ES.</p>
Q1.3.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Sampling for Particle Size Analysis</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant provide the reasons why the particle size analysis samples were collected separately from the samples used for contaminants analyses, as raised as an issue by the MMO at 4.2.11 of their RR [RR-053].</p>
Q1.3.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Cable Protection in the MCZ</b></p> <p>NE states regarding the MCZ states [RR-063, Appendix G, Paragraph 6,]: <i>"Of particular concern is the area of mixed sediment within the cable corridor, which has a more diverse community. Should cable protection be placed in this location then the conservation objectives to restore/maintain features will not be achieved"</i>. In responding to this point, explain how the conservation objectives of the MCZ can be maintained or restored if cable protection is used in this area.</p>
Q1.3.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effect to MCZ</b></p> <p>NE [RR-063 Appendix G, Paragraph 9 and 10] state that <i>"the O&amp;M phase activities for DEP (and or) SEP combined with DOW, SOW, Hornsea Page 5 Project Three and on-going Oil and Gas impacts will result in lasting habitat change / physical disturbance which will further hinder the conservation objectives of the CSCB MCZ"</i> and that <i>"The risk of, and observed, reduction in designated habitat extent which has occurred and/or is predicted to arise from the above developments has meant that the MCZ is highly likely to be taken further away from its required conservation state in the future."</i> In that regard provide further explanation why the ES (APP-094, Paragraph 333] concludes that the cumulative effects on the MCZ with other projects amounts to only minor adverse significance.</p>
Q1.3.1.9	Natural England Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Micro-Siting</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Are both the MMO and NE content that the use of micro-siting can avoid adverse impacts to Annex I / UK BAP priority habitat <i>S. spinulosa</i> reefs and the UK BAP priority habitat 'peat and clay exposures with piddocks.'
<b>Q1.3.2 Impact on subtidal chalk features</b>		
Q1.3.2.1	Applicant	<b>Effects of HDD Exit Pits</b> NE [RR-063 Appendix G, Paragraph 15] advises against the HDD exits pits being located in an area of subcropping chalk, with concern over cable protection use on chalk features within the MCZ. What alternatives were considered in this regard, and why were they dismissed?
Q1.3.2.2	Natural England Marine Management Organisation	<b>Micro-siting and Chalk Features</b> Are both the MMO and NE content that the use of micro-siting can avoid adverse impacts to chalk features within the MCZ
<b>Q1.3.3 Coastal erosion effects and coastal processes</b>		
Q1.3.3.1	Applicant Natural England	<b>Coastal Impacts</b> It is noted that there would be use of HDD to link the offshore cables with landfall, but is it anticipated that there would be any impact to coastal features such as the cliffs or any other coastal processes?
<b>Q1.3.4 Effects on the Marine Conservation Zone</b>		
Q1.3.4.1	Marine Management Organisation Natural England Norfolk Wildlife Trust East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<b>Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB)</b> The Applicant has proposed planting of oyster beds with the Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) as a MEEB [APP-084]. In this respect: a) Of the options set out in Table 7-1 [APP-083], do you agree with the Applicant's assessment of the feasibility of providing other MEEB? b) If the answer to (a) is no, set out what options are available or preferred instead of oyster bed planting? c) Would the planting of a 1ha oyster bed in itself have ramifications for the composition and quality of the MCZ or would it be a superficial surface element unlikely to upset the balance of the conservation objectives?

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>d) Would the oyster bed (not currently within the MCZ) attract different fish, prey and predator species to the area?</p> <p>e) Would the oyster bed, directly or indirectly, support the food resource for foraging birds?</p> <p>f) What is the likelihood of success of oyster beds establishing in the locality and what confidence can the ExA place upon this MEEB in recommending to the SoS BEIS about discharging their obligations under the MCA?</p>
Q1.3.4.2	Applicant	<p><b>MEEB Interaction with Construction Effects</b></p> <p>Is it correct that oyster bed/ reef restoration would be being undertaken at the same time as offshore construction works [APP-083, Table 8-2] and, if so, would sediment plumes from construction alongside the deposition of cultch have a cumulative effect on water quality and species?</p>
Q1.3.4.3	<p>Natural England Environment Agency Marine Management Organisation Norfolk Wildlife Trust East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</p>	<p><b>MEEB and Sandeels</b></p> <p>Sandeels are considered an important part of the food resource for bird species, including kittiwakes and sandwich terns [APP-069].</p> <p>a) Could sandeel habitat be artificially formed and sustained in the MCZ?</p> <p>b) If so, would that area be afforded protection from the fishing industry due to the designation?</p>
Q1.3.4.4	<p>Applicant Marine Management Organisation</p>	<p><b>Condition Assessment for the Marine Conservation Zone</b></p> <p>In the absence of any official condition assessment, what assumptions can be made with regards to the condition and quality of the MCZ [APP-084] and the desirability for its conservation?</p>
Q1.3.4.5	Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Marine Conservation Zone position statement</b></p> <p>Confirm, in a simple tabular format, whether you are content with the Applicant's assessment of effects, mitigation, MEEB and conclusions regarding the Marine Conservation Zone, or if more work is required. Suggested table headings:</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>Species / Agree methodology (Y/N) / Agree assessment of effects (Y/N) / mitigation suitable (Y/N) / MEEB suitable (Y/N) agree conclusions (Y/N)</p> <p>The table produced will also be requested for the final deadline in the Examination to provide a summary of where outstanding issues, if any, remain. This may form part of the statement of common ground.</p>
--	--	---

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.4. Civil and Military Aviation</b>		
<b>Q1.4.1 Effects on Radar and Defence Interests</b>		
Q1.4.1.1	Applicant Defence Infrastructure Organisation	<b>Aviation and Radar</b> a) Provide here or in the SoCG, an up-to-date position with regards to negotiations with MoD and whether any concern or issues remain to the Proposed Development [APP-101]? b) Has the applicant submitted a mitigation proposal to the DIO/MOD, but if not when will this likely happen? What is the likely timeframe in working towards this mitigation?
Q1.4.1.2	Applicant	<b>RRH Neatishead</b> Along with RRH Trimington, is the Applicant looking to assess and provide mitigation to the radar system based as RRH Neatishead [APP-101]? Explain with reasons.
Q1.4.1.3	Applicant Defence Infrastructure Organisation	<b>RAF Weybourne</b> a) How can the Proposed Development within the statutory safeguarding zone of RAF Weybourne avoid any unacceptably adverse impacts to technical assets? b) Describe what, if any, parameters or restrictions could be incorporated and secured by the dDCO to ensure the safeguarding of the assets at RAF Weybourne.
Q1.4.1.4	National Air Traffic Service	<b>Greater Wash Transponder Mandatory Zone (GWTMZ)</b> The GWTMZ is referenced in your relevant representation [RR-062]. Explain what this is and the implications it has for the Examination of the Proposed Development.
<b>Q1.4.2 Proposed Mitigation</b>		
Q1.4.2.1	Applicant	<b>Aviation Mitigation</b> Provide an update on consultation with Norwich Airport and helicopter operators [APP-101, Paragraph 145] and whether agreements have been reached on the necessary mitigation.
Q1.4.2.2	National Air Traffic Service	<b>Impact on Radar</b> Do you consider that suitable mitigation has been agreed with the Applicant and secured appropriately within the dDCO? Explain with reasons?



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.4.2.3	National Air Traffic Service Norwich Airport Perenco Independent Oil and Gas	<b>Impact to Helicopter Access</b> a) Regarding helicopter access to and from oil and gas offshore platforms (particularly Waveney, Blythe and Elgood), explain with reasoning to support your position, whether suitable mitigation has been planned/agreed with the Applicant and secured appropriately within the dDCO? b) Please explain with reasons what further mitigation would be required. c) Applicant and Perenco, provide reasoning for what you consider to be the safe take off requirements and exclusion areas.
----------	---	---

<b>Q1.5. Construction Effects Offshore</b>		
<b>Q1.5.1 Development Scenarios and Rochdale Envelope</b>		
Q1.5.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Dudgeon Offshore Windfarm (DOW)</b></p> <p>The Applicant has referenced environmental headroom that arises because the original permission for the existing DOW array was not built out to its fullest extent under the terms of a section 36 consent [APP-090, Paragraph 31]. This consent is suggested to be surrendered by virtue of Article 45 of the dDCO [APP-025, Paragraph 148]. Notwithstanding the information in the EM [APP-025, Appendix A], the ExA wish information, with reference to the section 36 consent, on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide the original Electricity Act consent for the existing DOW.</li> <li>b) What was the planned capacity (and number of turbines) for the DOW?</li> <li>c) How many turbines have been built, and how many have not been?</li> <li>d) Is there an Offshore Platform (OSP) existing in the DOW?</li> <li>e) If the answer to d) is yes, is there any unused capacity at this OSP given that the DOW has not been built-out to its full extent?</li> <li>f) If the answer to e) is yes, for what reasons is the Proposed Development of the DEP not connecting to/ able to exploit the capacity at this OSP?</li> <li>g) If only SEP were constructed in isolation, would the outstanding capacity (turbines) at the DOW still be surrendered through this DCO and, if so, where is this explained?</li> <li>h) Would there be any environmental benefit in developing out the section 36 consent and subsequently reducing the number of turbines to be built elsewhere through this dDCO?</li> <li>i) In the hypothetical event that the Proposed Development is consented, what would prohibit the section 36 consent for the DOW being developed out prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development?</li> <li>j) In relation to g) above, could the section 36 consent area 'substitute' for DEP South, for example?</li> </ol> <p>See related question in Habitats Regulation Assessment.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.5.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Dudgeon Extension Project Array Options</b></p> <p>The ES states the worst-case would be full build-out at both DEP-N and DEP-S [APP-090, Table 4.3]. However, no details have been given as to what full build-out comprises nor how the split in the number of turbines between DEP-N and DEP-S has influenced decisions on the worst-case parameters. Explain/ signpost the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) If both the DEP-N and DEP-S sites would be developed, what would the split between turbines be, and how could this be secured in the dDCO (for example, 80% built if DEP-N and 20% in DEP-S or 50% DEP-N and 50% DEP-S)?</li> <li>b) What split/ share of turbines between DEP-N and DEP-S has been used when calculating or determining the worst-case scenarios when considering both being developed and not just DEP-N in isolation?</li> <li>c) If both DEP-N and DEP-S sites are to be developed, why does the OSP need to be in the Northern site as opposed to the Southern site thus further away from the coast and requiring greater cabling to landfall?</li> <li>d) The works plans indicate large zones within which an OSP could be built. Can the location be more specific, based on an optimum location for OSPs within their arrays?</li> <li>e) What factors, including commercial considerations, would influence developing in the North only?</li> <li>f) For DEP, could all 30 turbines be built within DEP-N (in isolation) or within DEP-S (in isolation). If all 30 cannot be built at DEP-S (in isolation), what is the maximum turbine capacity that DEP-S could accommodate?</li> <li>g) The Scenarios Statement [APP-314, Paragraph 114] states: "This will be determined based on a number of technical and commercial factors such as wind yield, wake losses and ground conditions." Explain whether the technical factors are solely those listed in this sentence (or if more, state them) and why these factors are not yet known/ presented in the Examination or included in the Environmental Statement.</li> <li>h) At what point would the Examination (or local authorities if post-consent) be informed whether North is being developed on its own or together with the south, and how would this be legislated for in the dDCO?</li> </ul>
Q1.5.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Lifespan</b></p> <p>The OWF is said to have an operational life span of 40 years, after which it would be decommissioned and removed [APP-090, Table 4.5]. Have you considered repowering/</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		replacement of turbines at this site, thus prolonging the lifetime of the Proposed Development, or would an alternate dDCO be required?
Q1.5.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Cable Corridors</b></p> <p>The ES States that onshore working corridors would be reduced from 60m to 20m in proximity to sensitive features such as hedges. Offshore however, the limits widen from 500m to 1km within the MCZ [APP-088, Paragraph 44]. Provide an explanation of the difference in approach to the proposed working corridors, onshore and offshore, and provide cross-section drawings showing the usage and layout of these proposed construction corridors and justify the extent of land required in each instance.</p>
Q1.5.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Foundation Design Choice</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that the foundation type for the proposed wind turbines is as yet undecided and could be one of: Piled monopile; Suction bucket monopile; Piled jacket; Suction bucket jacket; and Gravity base structure [APP-090, Section 4.4]. While the ExA notes that the ES provides the parameters of the different foundation types [APP-090, Section 4.4.3], it seeks additional information on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Set out in tabular format, the worst-case effects, the benefits of and any other considerations that would determine the suitability of each foundation type.</li> <li>b) When will final choices regarding foundation design be made and is this likely to be during the Examination?</li> <li>c) On the basis of the overview provided in a) above, what assumptions can be made now as to the number / type of each foundation design to be used? Explain with reasons.</li> <li>d) Based on the earlier answers, would there be benefits to using a range of using different foundation designs (i.e. concurrent construction)? Explain with reasons.</li> <li>e) Following on from ISH1 [EV-013] [EV-017], provide technical note regarding foundation types, including commentary to justify why you cannot determine the proposed foundation type(s) during Examination, compared to other developers of proposed OWFs who have been able to provide greater certainty in terms of foundation choice during Examination.</li> </ol>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.6. Construction Effects Onshore</b>		
<b>Q1.6.1 Development Scenarios</b>		
Q1.6.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Selecting the Development Scenario (Including Offshore)</b></p> <p>Further to the discussions at ISH2 [EV-019] [EV-023]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provide a flow chart showing steps leading into the Applicant’s decision on which scenario to proceed with and subsequent steps for consultation/ phasing (from now through to project completion).</li> <li>b) Describe what ability the Applicant has to change direction and select another development scenario after serving notification of the chosen scenario to IPs under Article 9(1).</li> <li>c) If the Applicant can change its mind on Development Scenario, explain how late in the process can it do so.</li> <li>d) If SEP or DEP is to proceed in isolation, should there be a provision in the dDCO that consequentially prevents the remaining project from coming forward at a later date (say 3 or 4 years down the line)?</li> </ul> <p>See related question in the Draft Development Consent Order Section.</p>
Q1.6.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Construction of SEP and DEP in Isolation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Applicant set out at ISH2 [EV-019] [EV-023] that R1 of the dDCO [AS-009] allows a potential overlap in construction crews, working at either end or at different points along the cable corridor in the concurrent scenario. Set out how this element of the concurrent scenario is assessed in the ES.</li> <li>b) If it has not, does the dDCO wording need to be edited in terms of sequencing of works?</li> </ul> <p>See related question in the Draft Development Consent Order Section.</p>
Q1.6.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Effects from Haul Roads</b></p> <p>Following ISH2 [EV-019] [EV-023] respond to the following:</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>a) If it is known that both projects are going ahead (sequentially), why would there be a need to remove haul roads and temporary compounds?</p> <p>b) Would the digging, handling, laying, re-digging and re-handling of the soil resource in a (potentially) short space of time not have an adverse effect on its structure and quality?</p> <p>c) Discuss the effects and benefits that would arise if the haul roads and temporary compounds were left in situ until the whole onshore construction (sequential) was completed, in contrast to being removed between the construction of SEP and DEP?</p>
Q1.6.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Delay</b></p> <p>Is there any merit in delaying the construction period for SEP/DEP to avoid or reduce the extent of cumulative effects arising from concurrent construction with other projects?</p>
Q1.6.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Port</b></p> <p>The ES states that it is expected that the operations and maintenance port to service the Proposed Development would be at Great Yarmouth, but that decisions have not yet been made on this matter [APP-090, Paragraph 4.4.9].</p> <p>a) What other options and alternatives are available other than Great Yarmouth?</p> <p>b) Of these alternatives (including Great Yarmouth), have any been assessed as to the route vessels take and whether that route, in itself, is a worst-case scenario upon various environmental features (marine mammals and offshore ornithology)?</p> <p>c) Will a decision be made on the construction port during the Examination?</p> <p>d) Would Great Yarmouth continue to be the Operations and Maintenance Base, even if not the construction port?</p> <p>e) Would other infrastructure need to be permitted or developed to make the construction port (Great Yarmouth or otherwise) 'ready' for the Proposed Development?</p>
<p><b>Q1.6.2 Approach to Construction, Compounds, Programme, Timing and Methods</b></p>		
Q1.6.2.1	Applicant Environmental Agency	<p><b>Landfall</b></p> <p>a) Potential Sources of Contamination of the Land Quality Desk Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment Report [APP-206, Figure 17.1.5] shows a former sewage works on the line of the cable corridor at landfall. Provide evidence as to where the risks of</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>interaction with the sewage works at landfall are included in the ES and could this affect the use of HDD?</p> <p>b) EA, do you have any concerns with regard to the interaction with the former sewage works?</p>
Q1.6.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Onshore Cable Corridor Width</b></p> <p>The ES states that to minimise the impacts of crossing sensitive features such as hedgerows and watercourses, the working width would be reduced to approximately 20m [APP-090].</p> <p>a) Is this reflected in the order limits?</p> <p>b) Does this include the scenario where SEP and DEP are constructed concurrently?</p> <p>c) If it is possible to reduce the cable corridor to 20 metres in sensitive locations, was this not considered across the whole corridor with top-spoil and sub-soil storage areas at intervals along the corridor?</p>
Q1.6.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Onshore Cable Corridor Width for Trenchless Crossings</b></p> <p>The Order Limits include a 100-metre corridor width where trenchless crossings are proposed to be used [APP-011]. Provide further justification for the need for a 100-metre corridor width and what is it about this technique that requires additional space from a trenched cable corridor where the proposed width would be 60m? Explain with reasons, including providing a plate diagram setting out the layout and requirements for land associated with a HDD compound.</p>
Q1.6.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Approach to Construction Compounds</b></p> <p>a) The ES states that you would need one main construction compound and eight secondary compounds. In addition to the summary provided in the ES [APP-090, Section 4.6.1.6], describe how the number and the locations of the primary and secondary construction compounds were chosen.</p> <p>b) Describe what efforts have been made to minimise their number.</p> <p>c) How have the sizes of each construction compound been estimated?</p>
Q1.6.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Worst-Case and Trenchless Crossings</b></p> <p>The ES states trenchless crossing techniques “such as HDD” would be used [APP-090, Paragraph 5].</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>a) Is the list of trenchless crossing locations exhaustive? Provide a full list of crossing locations and identify the type of crossing proposed at each location.</p> <p>b) How do the different crossing methods compare in terms of effects and what makes HDD the preferred option in some cases?</p> <p>c) Identify at each crossing location if a crossing technique can be secured and committed to with wording in the dDCO [AS-009] or, if flexibility is sought between crossing technique options. Explain with reasons.</p>
Q1.6.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Construction compound for HDD and other forms of Trenchless Crossings</b></p> <p>a) Would other forms of trenchless crossing need a larger, similar or smaller sized compound compared to HDD?</p> <p>b) Can locations be specified and secured, prior to the close of the Examination, within the dDCO for each type of crossing?</p>
Q1.6.2.7	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Compound Assumptions</b></p> <p>The ES sets out that the secondary compounds would be 2,500m<sup>2</sup> but that two of these secondary compounds may be up to 7,500m<sup>2</sup> to accommodate batching of cement bound sand (CBS) [APP-090].</p> <p>a) Which two secondary compounds will be 7,500m<sup>2</sup> in size or have all secondary compounds been assumed to be 7,500m<sup>2</sup>?</p> <p>b) If the latter of those two, how will it be decided which two will be 7,500m<sup>2</sup> in size?</p> <p>c) How has this potential need been secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.6.2.8	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Methods</b></p> <p>The ES sets out that the onshore cable duct will be installed in sections of up to 1km at a time, with a typical construction presence of up to four weeks along each 1km section [APP-090]. Why is this approach the most efficient and does it seek to minimise adverse effects from the construction works?</p>
Q1.6.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Methods</b></p> <p>The ES states that the primary cable installation method would be open cut trenching, with cable ducts installed within the trenches and backfilled with soil. Cables would then be pulled through the pre-laid ducts at a later stage in the construction programme [APP-090].</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Explain why it is preferred to pull the cables through the pre-laid ducts rather than installing the cable at the same time as the ducts are installed.
Q1.6.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Link Boxes</b></p> <p>The project description [APP-090] sets out that link boxes will be placed close to field boundaries wherever possible to allow easy access during operation/maintenance. Should this be secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.6.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>Weybourne Wood Options</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-089, Paragraph 87] states two stretches of HDD would be used to cross underneath Weybourne Woods. The ExA requires more information on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Why was the design option of 2x400m trenchless crossings chosen when it has been stated elsewhere that long HDD could be in excess of 1,000m, thus passing the entire 800m stretch of wood in a single action?</li> <li>b) There would be a joint bay where the two runs of HDD interconnect within the wood. How would this joint bay, and access thereto, be managed or provided for in the dDCO should maintenance need to be undertaken from it?</li> <li>c) During ASI1, a number of trees in proximity to the HDD compound within Weybourne Woods were noted to have orange dotted markings upon them. It is understood that these trees were marked by the Forestry Commission. What is the meaning of these markings and are the trees marked as a consequence, or in relation to, the Proposed Development?</li> </ol>
Q1.6.2.12	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Programme and Contractors</b></p> <p>The Project Environmental Management Plan [APP-297] refers to multiple contractors being utilised across the project. In this respect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How will various contractors be co-ordinated and by whom?</li> <li>b) Will there be contractors working on different parts of the project at the same time (for example, contractors at Weybourne concurrently with contractors at Cawston) and, if so, what are the implications for cumulative impacts assessments?</li> </ol>
<b>Q1.6.3 Baseline survey and effects of Unexploded Ordinance</b>		
Q1.6.3.1	Applicant	<b>Impacts of Detonation</b>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		NE [RR-063, Appendix G, Paragraph 19] states that further information is required in relation to the depth of any crater and the impacts this may have on any sub-cropping chalk, peat and clay, with the detonation of UXO. Can such details be provided for Examination?
<b>Q1.6.4 Effects of construction works on human health</b>		
Q1.6.4.1	Applicant	<b>Potential for Insect Infestation and Emissions of Odour, Steam and Smoke</b> NPS EN-1 at Paragraph 5.6.4 sets out that the Applicant should assess the potential for insect infestation and emissions of odour, steam and smoke to have a detrimental impact on amenity. Where have such effects been assessed?
Q1.6.4.2	Applicant	<b>Adverse Effects of Noise and Air Quality on Human Health</b> The ES concludes that the significance finding for population health in the assessment [APP-114] for both of these matters under all construction scenarios, is that any change due to SEP and DEP would be a low magnitude of change on a receptor of medium to high sensitivity. This represents an impact of minor adverse significance. Based on 'Table 28-13: Indicative EIA health significance matrix' should this be a minor to moderate significance? If so, does this therefore represent a significant effect in EIA terms?
Q1.6.4.3	Applicant	<b>Changing Working Patterns</b> Does the assessment of noise on human health consider changing working patterns with increased numbers of people working from home? If so, how?
Q1.6.4.4	Applicant	<b>Physical Activity Effects</b> The ES [APP-114, Paragraph 255] identifies additional mitigation measures to help minimise the risk of any behavioural change as a result of unexpected or unknown duration changes to access arrangements (such as Public Rights of Way). Where are these secured in the dDCO?
Q1.6.4.5	Applicant	<b>Journey Times and/or Reduced Access Effects</b> The ES [APP-114, Paragraph 268] notes that only small changes in journey times would be expected, largely relating to short delays at certain junctions. The delay from alternative routes range from no delay in travel time (for the majority of routes) to a delay of up to six minutes, what specific evidence supports these assumptions?

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.6.4.6	Applicant	<p><b>Air Quality Effects</b></p> <p>NCC [RR-064] is of the view that adverse effects of air quality should include adverse effects on pregnant women as there is evidence that poor air quality adversely impacts birth weight, and that lung cancer and type 2 diabetes are also key health outcomes related to air quality. How would the inclusion of such matters affect the outcomes of the assessment?</p>
Q1.6.4.7	Applicant	<p><b>Reduced Physical Activity Effects</b></p> <p>NCC [RR-064] has set out that health outcomes related to reduced physical activity should include type 2 diabetes, unhealthy BMI, stroke and musculoskeletal conditions. How would the inclusion of such matters affect the outcomes of the assessment?</p>
Q1.6.4.8	Applicant	<p><b>Interactions</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-114, Table 28-22] shows intra-project cumulative effects for site-specific population groups for all scenarios. Explain why the significance of effects for the vulnerable population is negligible or minor adverse when the significance of effects for the general pollution is minor adverse, who have a lower sensitivity than the vulnerable population.</p>
Q1.6.4.9	Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Mental Health Mitigation</b></p> <p>NCC [RR-064] set out that it would like the Applicant to include further mitigation measures to address any adverse effects on mental health, especially given the potential length of construction works. Is this justified given that NCC agrees that there are unlikely to be any significant, long term adverse health impacts from the proposal compared to baseline conditions. If it is, then how could further mitigation be secured?</p>
Q1.6.4.10	Applicant	<p><b>Well-Being</b></p> <p>At OFH1 [EV-009] [EV-010], the representative for Corpusty and Saxthorpe PC raised formulae can be used to determine the cost of both health and well-being impacts. In relation to this can you set out what data and algorithms have gone into the modelling to date and how this can be quantified into a cost/ benefit analysis.</p>
Q1.6.4.11	Applicant	<p><b>Electric and Magnetic Fields</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		It has been suggested in relevant representations that EMF levels should be secured and monitored. What is the risk that the EMF levels are greater than the Applicant's calculations?
Q1.6.4.12	Applicant	<p><b>Electric and Magnetic Fields - Cable Phase Arrangement</b></p> <p>The EMF Assessment [APP-279] shows that the RYB BYR cable phase arrangement produces less of a magnetic field than a RYB RYB cable phase arrangement. Further, it would also seem that a trefoil cable design results in an EMF of less intensity than a flat cable design. Consequently, to minimise effects of magnetic fields as far as possible, should the Proposed Development adopt a RYB BYR cable phase arrangement with a trefoil cable design in all scenarios? Explain with reasons.</p>
Q1.6.4.13	Applicant	<p><b>AC Corrosion on Pipelines</b></p> <p>The EMF Assessment sets out that all third-party assets will be crossed by the proposed cable circuits at or near 90°, therefore AC corrosion is highly unlikely, and that if crossing angles reduce to below 60°, further investigations will be needed to assess the potential impacts [APP-279, Page 15]. Where is this secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.6.4.14	Norfolk Parishes Movement for an Offshore Transmission Network	<p><b>Details of Organisation</b></p> <p>Please set the membership of your organisation and the 95 parishes for which you represent. In addition, set out which of these parishes are affected by the Proposed Development.</p>
<b>Q1.6.5 Effects from emissions on air quality</b>		
Q1.6.5.1	Applicant	<p><b>Dust Emissions and Fine Particulate Matter Assessment Methodology</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-132] states that "<i>Both Scenario 2 (concurrent construction) and Scenario 3 (sequential construction) have similar potential for generating construction dust and fine particulate matter impacts on receptors, as overall they both cover the maximum footprint of construction works, however the sequential build may result in the same area of land being affected twice, which would affect the duration of impacts. This is not explicitly accounted for within the IAQM assessment methodology</i>".</p> <p>a) Has the duration of potential adverse effects been taken into account in the assessment?</p> <p>b) If so, how?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		c) If not, given the significant timescale difference of the sequential construction scenario compared to the isolation and concurrent scenarios, should it be an important factor in the assessment? Provide justification.
Q1.6.5.2	Applicant	<p><b>Dust Emissions and Fine Particulate Matter Assessment Methodology</b></p> <p>Are the number of receptors thresholds presented in the Construction Phase Dust and Fine Particulate Matter Assessment Methodology [APP-259, Table 22.1.3 and Table 22.1.4] appropriate? Provide justification.</p>
Q1.6.5.3	Applicant	<p><b>Non-Road Mobile Machinery Assessment Methodology</b></p> <p>The assessment [APP-132] refers to 'Defra technical guidance (Defra, 2021a)' that states emissions from NRMM used on construction sites are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality where relevant control and management measures are employed. Provide the full reference of this guidance and a full copy if possible.</p>
Q1.6.5.4	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Road Traffic Emissions Assessment Methodology</b></p> <p>When considering construction road vehicle exhaust emissions, the assessment [APP-132] sets out that "<i>Peak construction flows were not used in the assessment, as peak construction would occur over a 1 or 2 month period (at worst) and using these to derive AADT across a full year would unrealistically inflate the impacts of construction generated traffic. The use of average construction flows was deemed to be robust and more appropriate representation of construction impacts from traffic over an annual period, and aligns with the requirement for use of AADT flows</i>".</p> <p>a) LAs do you agree with this approach? b) Applicant, provide further justification for this approach.</p>
Q1.6.5.5	Applicant	<p><b>Road Traffic Emissions Assessment Methodology</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-132] states: "<i>The sensitive receptor locations were selected based on their proximity to road links affected by SEP and/or DEP and exceeding the screening criteria detailed in Table 22.10, where the potential effect of project-generated traffic emissions on local air pollution would be most significant</i>". Explain further how it was judged where potential effects would be most significant?</p>
Q1.6.5.6	Applicant	<p><b>Air Quality Management Areas</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		The ES [APP-132, Paragraph 157] notes that the statutory designated Railway Road and Gaywood Clock AQMAs in King’s Lynn, declared in 2003 and 2009 respectively for exceedances of the NO2 annual mean, are located as close as 400m from road links likely to be used by project. It is assumed that due to this distance there will be no significant effects. Provide further justification and evidence to support this assertion.
Q1.6.5.7	Applicant	<p><b>Air Quality Cumulative Effects Assessment</b></p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment [APP-132] notes that for both construction phase dust and particulate matter and NRMM that each project will employ mitigation measures to control and manage emissions. Can the Applicant confirm what mitigation measures are secured for each of the other projects in this regard?</p>
Q1.6.5.8	Applicant	<p><b>Air Quality Cumulative Effects Assessment</b></p> <p>Is the cumulative effects assessment for road traffic emissions sufficiently detailed and robust? Are there any road links considered cumulatively with the other projects that would exceed the IAQM and EPUK (2017) criteria, but did not for this Proposed Development alone? If so, which are these and should an assessment of the effect on human receptors be undertaken, similar to that undertaken in Section 22.6.1.3.1.1 of the ES [APP-132]?</p>
<b>Q1.6.6 Adequacy of the Outline Code of Construction Practice</b>		
Q1.6.6.1	Applicant Local Authorities National farmers Union	<p><b>Outline Code of Construction Practice</b></p> <p>The OCoCP [APP-302, Table 1-1] sets out a number of EMPs that will form part of the final CoCP and will be prepared, submit and approved post-consent.</p> <p>a) A pre-construction drainage plan, a scheme to deal with the contamination of any land (including groundwater), a Materials Management Plan, Soil Management Plan, a Site Waste Management Plan, hydro-fraction surveys (for bentonite breakout) and a Construction Surface Water Drainage Plan are all referred to in the main text of the OCoCP but are not included in Table 1-1. Why is this?</p> <p>b) Confirm the status and origin of EMPs listed in Table 1-1.</p> <p>c) The OCoCP refers to Construction Method Statements. What will these include?</p> <p>d) Justify the level of detail and content provided to date within the suite of EMPs.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>e) Is it possible for the ExA to be sure that such EMPs will be successful in mitigating any impacts without seeing more detail?</p> <p>f) Local Authorities and NFU are there any management plans that you consider are crucial to review during the Examination? Explain with reasons.</p>
<b>Q1.6.7 Waste Management</b>		
Q1.6.7.1	Applicant	<p><b>Waste Management</b></p> <p>The OCoCP [APP-302] secures the production of a Site Waste Management Plan.</p> <p>a) It is, however, unclear what this will contain and how it will be ensured that the waste hierarchy will be implemented. Provide further information on this matter.</p> <p>b) Is a Site Waste Management Plan required for operational stage, especially at the onshore substation? Explain with reasons.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.7. Commercial Fisheries and Fishing</b>		
<b>Q1.7.1 Effects on Fishing Stocks</b>		
Q1.7.1.1	East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p><b>Electromagnetic Field</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-098, Paragraph 377] states that no experiments have highlighted significant concerns with EMF and the magnitude of impact of EMFs is generally considered to be low for most marine organisms. What is your stance on this issue?</p>
Q1.7.1.2	East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p><b>Effect to Fish and Shellfish Stocks</b></p> <p>Is there evidence that can be provided as to the effects to fish and shellfish stocks as a result of the Proposed Developments such as that proposed with SEP and DEP?</p>
<b>Q1.7.2 Effects on fishing enterprises as a result of navigational or special restrictions</b>		
Q1.7.2.1	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Trinity House</p> <p>Maritime and Coastguard Agency</p> <p>Natural England</p> <p>East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority</p> <p>Interested Parties</p>	<p><b>Restricted Fishing</b></p> <p>The ES states: <i>"The Applicant considers the most effective way this could be achieved would be to restrict fishing on sandeel, and with respect to prey availability for Sandwich tern, sprat or juvenile herring in UK waters. However, this would need to be implemented either by Defra in the case of sandeel or the relevant Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority (IFCA) in the case of sprat and juvenile herring fisheries within UK inshore waters."</i> [APP-069, Paragraph 127].</p> <p>All</p> <p>a) What is your assessment of the economic effects on fishing communities if such restrictions were imposed?</p> <p>Applicant</p> <p>b) How would DEFRA or the IFCA implement such fishing restrictions?</p> <p>c) How would such restrictions be secured in the dDCO and could the dDCO be able to compel another organisation to enact such restrictions?</p> <p>d) Do the powers of a Development Consent Order allow for the imposition of byelaws or restrictions of the type suggested in the ES?</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.7.2.2	East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p><b>Closed Area Byelaw 2021</b></p> <p>Disclose the full details of the byelaws including the area covered (map) and the restrictions imposed [APP-077, Paragraph 245]. Set out the nature of the impacts if the Proposed Development were to go ahead and the additional area within which restrictions may be imposed.</p>
Q1.7.2.3	East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p><b>Impact to the Potting Fleet</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-098] sets out that there would be moderate adverse impacts (without mitigation) to the UK potting fleet during construction, operation and decommissioning phases of SEP and DEP. Are the 'justifiable disturbance payments' sufficient to mitigate for these impacts?</p>
	Applicant	<p><b>Potting Fleet Mitigation</b></p> <p>Provide an update on the negotiations currently progressing with the justifiable disturbance payments for the UK potting fleet.</p>
Q1.7.2.4	Applicant East Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	<p><b>Restrictions to Fishing within Operational OWFs</b></p> <p>Clarify the extent of any restrictions on fishing fleets within the wind farm areas once they are operational and whether the existence of the turbines would result in any significant impingement or practical difficulties on fishing activities in these areas?</p>
Q1.7.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Fish/Shellfish Processors</b></p> <p>Clarify if adverse effects of the Proposed Development have been assessed and would be mitigated the impact not only for those working on the fishing fleets but also local businesses that may be significantly adversely impacted if fishing activity is reduced for a substantial amount of time, such as those in fish/ shellfish processing businesses?</p>
Q1.7.2.6	Jonas Seafood	<p><b>Fish/Shellfish Processors</b></p> <p>Following comments at the ISH1 [EV-014] [EV-018], can you provide more clarification on the potential impacts to your business, along with your view as to why your business would be uniquely affected? Are there other similar businesses to Jonas Seafood that would be similarly affected?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.8. Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession</b>		
<b>Q1.8.1 Updates on Negotiations</b>		
Q1.8.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>CA Schedule</b></p> <p>a) Complete the CA Schedule found in Annex A. The ExA has seen the summary of landowner negotiations [APP-028, Appendix 2], and requests the information be presented in the format set out in Annex A, and updated at the relevant Examination Deadlines.</p> <p>b) Confirm the CA schedule provides an update on all affected persons and plots included in the Book of reference.</p>
Q1.8.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Book of Reference</b></p> <p>Re-submit the BoR:</p> <p>a) clearly identifying each Part of the BoR as specified in the CA Guidance and regulation 7 of the APFP Regulations 2009 in table headings and contents table; and</p> <p>b) with the top two rows of the table headings repeated on each page.</p>
Q1.8.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Responses to Relevant Representations</b></p> <p>a) When responding to RRs relating to CA or TP matters, identify the relevant plot numbers as marked on Land Plans [AS-002] [AS-003] [AS-004].</p> <p>b) When responding to RRs that suggest alternatives to specific aspects of the Proposed Development, provide further justification in line with CA guidance that for the relevant plots of land all reasonable alternatives to CA, including modifications to the Proposed Development, have been explored.</p> <p>c) When responding to Relevant Representations [RR-078] [RR-042] [RR-043] that have concerns relating to blight, provide Applicant’s specific consideration in relation to those concerns for each of the scenarios that could be allowed under the dDCO.</p>
<b>Q1.8.2 Affected Persons’ Site-specific Issues</b>		
Q1.8.2.1	Chris Tansley Susie Tansley	<p><b>Suggested Mitigation</b></p> <p>Outline here or in your Written Representation, the positive suggestions for the protection of wildlife and ways to mitigate the effects that the Proposed Development construction process would have on the properties built on your land [RR-022] [RR-112].</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.8.2.2	Christopher Hughes	<p><b>Restrictive Covenants</b></p> <p>Outline here or in your Written Representation, the restrictive covenants relevant to your property and related effects of the Proposed Development [RR-023].</p>
Q1.8.2.3	Outer Dowsing Offshore Wind	<p><b>Project Interactions</b></p> <p>In any future submissions to this Examination, provide a plan of your project, highlighting potential spatial interactions with the Proposed Development.</p>
Q1.8.2.4	<p>Applicant</p> <p>North Norfolk District Council</p> <p>Yvonne Odrowaz-Pieniazek</p>	<p><b>Protected Characteristics</b></p> <p>a) Applicant, further to the ASI [EV-004], the ExA believes one or more residents of the Old Orchard House may have protected characteristics in line with s4 of the Equality Act 2010 [RR-124]. Explain what special consideration has been given.</p> <p>b) Applicant and NNDC, to confirm (without specifying any personal details) if protected characteristics of s4 of the Equality Act 2010 would trigger the Public Sector Equality Duty.</p> <p>c) Yvonne Odrowaz-Pieniazek, provide any further information or evidence that you may have to demonstrate that the exposure to EMF may be greater than the calculations provided by the Applicant.</p>
Q1.8.2.5	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Affected Persons represented by Savills and Bidwells</p>	<p><b>Term</b></p> <p>Several Affected Persons [too numerous to list] represented by Savills and Bidwells and the NFU seek clarification why the term would be in perpetuity as opposed to 99 years, which parties state has typically been the term in other made DCOs.</p> <p>a) Explain what you mean with reference to Application documents in the Examination Library.</p> <p>b) Provide comparative examples referenced in your RR.</p> <p>c) Elaborate on how this affects you specifically.</p> <p>d) Applicant may respond.</p>
<b>Q1.8.3 Special Land</b>		
Q1.8.3.1	Applicant	<p><b>Public Open Space</b></p> <p>Further to your justification [APP-028, Section 12.4], provide any evidence of agreement that have been reached with the Affected Persons in relation to plots 01-001, 01-002, 01-</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		003, 01-004, 01-005, 01-006, 01-007, 01-008, 01-009, 01-010, 01-011, 01-012, 01-013, 17-001 and 23-001. You may tabulate your response.
Q1.8.3.2	Applicant National Trust	<p><b>National Trust Land</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that while negotiations are ongoing, NT has pending concerns in relation to the CA of its inalienable land at Weybourne wood.</p> <p>a) Applicant and NT, outline in your SoCG the milestones and associated timescales (in relation to this Examination) of how these negotiations are likely to progress and conclude.</p> <p>b) NT, do you see any major impediment to reaching a voluntary agreement with the applicant?</p>
Q1.8.3.3	Applicant	<p><b>Crown Land</b></p> <p>a) Outline the steps taken so far with the Crown Estate Commissioners, the SoS for Defence, the Forestry Commission, the SoS for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and the SoS for Transport for their consent to the inclusion of the Crown land as required for the Proposed Development.</p> <p>b) Outline the milestones and associated timescales (in relation to this Examination) of how these discussions are likely to progress and conclude.</p> <p>c) Provide evidence where possible.</p>
Q1.8.3.4	Applicant	<p><b>Statutory Undertaker Land</b></p> <p>The ExA has seen the Current Status of Statutory Undertaker Negotiations [APP-028, Appendix 3], and requests the table include additional information, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory Undertaker name and Nature of the undertaking;</li> <li>• Land/rights affected (including all plot numbers from the BoR);</li> <li>• How are they a Statutory Undertaker (relevant legislation);</li> <li>• If s127 and/or if s138 engaged in each case;</li> <li>• Status of discussions including protective provisions and/or commercial agreement;</li> <li>• Estimate of the timescale for securing agreement;</li> <li>• Envisaged impediments to the securing of such agreements; and</li> <li>• Any other relevant information that is relevant for Examination.</li> </ul>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.9. Cumulative Effects</b>		
<b>Q1.9.1 Scope and Extent</b>		
Q1.9.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Approach to Cumulative Effects Assessment</b></p> <p>In many subject areas within the ES, it is assumed that other projects will mitigate their own impacts through secured mitigation to reach a conclusion that there would be no significant cumulative impacts, without any further consideration of the interaction with the Proposed Development. Justify this approach to cumulative effects assessment, and corresponding mitigation with reference to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17.</p>
Q1.9.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Norfolk Boreas Wind Farm Project</b></p> <p>In many of the ES topic areas this project is identified as being one that could cumulatively interact with the Proposed Development. However, it is not always clear in the ES how the project has been taken into account in the cumulative effects assessment for the various onshore topics. With the exception of Traffic and Transport (which is covered elsewhere), explain in detail how the Norfolk Boreas Wind Farm Project has been taken into account for all onshore topics.</p>
Q1.9.1.3	Applicant Yare Power Limited Novus Renewable Services Ltd Orsted Hornsea 4	<p><b>Battery Storage</b></p> <p>For all named parties, in relation to [RR-071] and [RR-123]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Show on an annotated plan drawing the extent of overlap between the Order limits for the Proposed Development and any planning permissions granted for battery storage in the vicinity of Norwich Main substation.</li> <li>b) Set out an annotated plan drawing the routes or positions of any extant grid connections between those storage apparatus and Norwich Main.</li> </ol> <p>Applicant</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Explain what measures are in place, in the ES and the dDCO, to prevent interference with, or the sterilisation of land associated to, the battery storage facilities.</li> </ol>
Q1.9.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects and Piling</b></p> <p>The worst-case scenarios (for construction works such as piling) suggest the worst-case would be for simultaneous piling at SEP and DEP (1 pile at each). However, could there be</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		a scenario of greater adverse effect where, if DEP-S to be built-out as well, that there could be three simultaneous piles at SEP, DEP-N and DEP-S?
Q1.9.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>East Anglia Green</b></p> <p>Several written and oral submissions [too numerous to list], make reference to the EAG project, and state that there is functional interdependence between EAG and the Proposed Development, and should be considered together and cumulatively. It has been further suggested that the Proposed Development could not go ahead without EAG first in place.</p> <p>a) Set out what is known about the EAG project and its relationship with the Proposed Development.</p> <p>b) Explain, or signpost, where in the ES consideration has been given to EAG and any cumulative effects.</p> <p>c) What is your response to suggestion that there is a need for a single combined NSIP being formed between EAG and the Proposed Development?</p> <p>d) Comment on the assertion that without EAG in place, it is premature to consider that the Proposed Development would deliver any public benefit when its generated electricity may not be able to be connected into the grid as it currently stands?</p> <p>e) If there is not adequate capacity within the existing onshore electricity transmission and distribution system, without EAG in place, does this represent an impediment to the delivery of the Proposed Development?</p>
Q1.9.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Cable Corridor Routes</b></p> <p>Provide a plan (or series of plans) showing the Proposed Development onshore cable corridor route alongside the onshore cable corridor routes of all other wind farm projects (NV, NB, HP3) that could result in cumulative effects.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.10. Design</b>		
<b>Q1.10.1 Design Principles</b>		
Q1.10.1.1	Applicant Local Authorities Statutory Bodies Interested Parties	<p><b>Suitability and Adequacy of the Applicant’s Approach to Design</b></p> <p>a) Has the Applicant satisfied the requirements set out in NPS EN-1 Section 4.5 in relation to sensitivity to place and contributing to the quality of the area in which the infrastructure would be located?</p> <p>b) Clarify, with reasons, whether you believe that design outcomes relating to proposed elements of infrastructure, structure and buildings proposed within the order limits, flood risk, landscape and ecology are sufficiently well developed within the application documents.</p> <p>c) Confirm, with reasons, whether you believe that noise mitigation measures and construction structures related to the construction compound should also be considered as part of the Applicant’s approach to design. Applicant may respond.</p>
Q1.10.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Proposed Design Principles for the Onshore Substation (all scenarios)</b></p> <p>The SoS needs to be satisfied that the Proposed Development is (having regard to regulatory and other constraints), as attractive, durable, adaptable and as sustainable as it can be. Taking the onshore substation, since it would be the element of the Proposed Development with the greatest visual impact on land in the operational phase; how has the Applicant provided the information necessary to satisfy the SoS of these criteria for each of the scenarios proposed?</p>
Q1.10.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Proposed Design Principles for the Onshore Substation (all scenarios)</b></p> <p>Set out the elements of the onshore substation’s scale, mass and fabric where the Applicant has the opportunity to exercise greater design choice and outline (with additional visual information) the design approach taken to ensure that these elements, when taken together with the whole of the substation proposal, or proposals, would provide both a sense of identity and an improvement to the surrounding environment.</p>
<b>Q1.10.2 Design Development Process</b>		
Q1.10.2.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<b>Design Development Process</b>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

	<p>Statutory Bodies Interested Parties</p>	<p>a) Provide further detail of the structured framework within which the Applicant has carried out its design process to date, giving detail of the key milestones which have been reached within that process and setting out which elements of the overall design have been fixed at this stage.</p> <p>b) Set out the main stages of the remainder of the design process required to fully develop the Applicant’s design of the Proposed Development in the event that its application is granted Development Consent, giving an indication of expected deliverables and timescales wherever possible and indicate how this process will be secured within the draft DCO.</p> <p>c) Provide an outline description of the design professional disciplines that have contributed to the Applicant’s design process to date.</p> <p>d) Set in further detail how the Applicant’s design principles – established in its Design and Access Statement [APP-287] – are secured within the draft DCO</p>
<p>Q1.10.2.2</p>	<p>Applicant Local Authorities Statutory Bodies Interested Parties</p>	<p><b>Design Review</b></p> <p>Comment, with reasons, if the Applicant should seek independent design review advice in line with the policy recommendation in NPS, Paragraph 4.5.5.</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.11. Draft Development Consent Order</b>		
<b>Q1.11.1 General</b>		
The questions here relate to the dDCO Revision B [AS-009] and EM Revision B [AS-012]. All other documents referenced in the following questions have been identified with EL references.		
Q1.11.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Template and Best Practice Guidance</b></p> <p>a) Confirm that the submitted dDCO has been drafted using the Statutory Instrument template.</p> <p>b) Confirm that the submitted dDCO and EM follows best practice drafting guidance from the Planning Inspectorate set out in Advice Note 15, providing in tabular format, brief explanation of how each aspect of Advice Note 15 has been addressed.</p>
Q1.11.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Precedence for Two Undertakers</b></p> <p>Provide precedence where there are two undertakers for the purposes on an Order for development consent [AS-012, Section 1.2].</p>
Q1.11.1.3	Applicant Discharging Authorities	<p><b>Discharging Requirements and Conditions</b></p> <p>Applicant, provide a list or table of specifically named authorities and undertakers that are relevant in the dDCO for each and every reference to the following. Please list separately, instances where any of the following, for example 'local authority', refers to different body or bodies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• highway authority</li> <li>• lead local flood authority</li> <li>• relevant planning authority</li> <li>• local planning authority</li> <li>• street authority</li> <li>• drainage authority</li> <li>• sewerage undertaker</li> <li>• local authority</li> <li>• acquiring authority</li> <li>• public authority</li> </ul>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crown authority</li> <li>• approving authority</li> </ul>
Q1.11.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Offshore Transmission Owner</b></p> <p>With reference to the Cable Statement [APP-283, Paragraph 44], please describe in greater detail the role that an Offshore Transmission Owner may play in the delivery of the Proposed Development and what provisions for that role are secured through the dDCO.</p>
<b>Q1.11.2 Definitions</b>		
Q1.11.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Authorised development and Authorised Project</b></p> <p>Consider including in the EM an explanation for the distinction between authorised Development and authorised project.</p>
Q1.11.2.2	Applicant Local Authorities Interested Parties	<p><b>Commence</b></p> <p>a) How would the activities currently excluded in the definition of commence be controlled, monitored and mitigated, given the CoCP would not be approved and enforceable (in line with R19) when the works excluded from the definition of commence may need to take place?</p> <p>b) Local Authorities, do you have concerns about works being delivered without any controls, in particular activities such as diversion and laying of services, the erection of any temporary means of enclosure, and the erection of welfare facilities?</p> <p>c) Local Authorities, are there other activities excluded from the definition of commence that you consider should be controlled through a management plan? Explain with reasons.</p> <p>d) Applicant and Local Authorities, is there a need for a definition for pre-commencement works and an accompanying management plan?</p> <p>e) Are there any concerns from any party about the scope, breadth and definition of commencement with the Order or its accompanying dDMLs? If so, explain what they are and the implications that you use the ExA to take account of.</p>
Q1.11.2.3	Applicant Interested Parties	<p><b>Maintain</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Justify if the drafting " <i>to the extent assessed in the environmental statement</i> " is an adequate bar in the definition of maintain to limit maintenance activities authorised under the dDCO and the dDMLs to those that are assessed within the ES.
Q1.11.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Horizontal Directional Drilling Compound</b></p> <p>The definition of horizontal directional drilling compound includes construction site associated with other trenchless construction techniques. Is this definition too broad and should the construction site associated with other trenchless construction techniques have a bespoke definition?</p>
<b>Q1.11.3 Schedules</b>		
Q1.11.3.1	Applicant	<p><b>Article 3 – Development consent granted by Order</b></p> <p>In relation to the wording and implications of Article 3 [AS-009], please advise on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) With Equinor as the Applicant, what role would they have post-consent and why would they not be listed as an undertaker?</li> <li>b) If maintenance is required on a joint transmission scenario, who would the responsible undertaker be for the purposes of enforcement?</li> <li>c) In the case of sequential or concurrent working scenarios, is there a clear chain of command?</li> </ol>
Q1.11.3.2	Applicant Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Article 5 – Benefit of Order</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) MMO, elaborate on the risk that you have identified [RR-053] with regards to collaboration between two different asset holders working in the same area if transfer of benefits were to happen?</li> <li>b) MMO, provide proposed drafting for a collaboration condition, identifying a relevant precedence.</li> <li>c) Would the procedure set out in Article 5 be applicable in full if, for example, DEL decided to step down as an undertaker of its own project and transfer the rights to develop DEP to SEL?</li> </ol> <p>Following on from the discussion at ISH1 [EV-013] [EV-017]:</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>a) Applicant, what mechanisms are in place to ensure that two different undertakers and two different asset holders (generation assets (Schedules 10 and 11) and two transmission assets) working in the same area would collaborate together, especially if transfer of benefit were to happen.</p> <p>b) Applicant, how can the collaboration be secured in the dDCO? Without prejudice, provide suitable drafting.</p>
Q1.11.3.3	Natural England Environment Agency Affected Persons	<p><b>Article 6 – Disapplication and modification of legislative provisions</b></p> <p>a) EA, are there any concerns regarding the scope of the provisions sought to be modified or disapplied?</p> <p>b) Do Affected Persons have any concerns regarding the disapplication of the provisions of the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 relating to the temporary possession of land as proposed in Article 6(1)(e)?</p>
Q1.11.3.4	Applicant	<p><b>Article 10 – Temporary stopping up of streets and Schedule 5 – Streets to be temporarily stopped up</b></p> <p>This schedule sets out roads to be ‘temporarily stopped up.’ The stopping up of a road takes away the public’s right to pass and repass (regardless of mode of transport). However, the EM [AS-012, Paragraph 63] implies that pedestrian access is to be maintained during temporary stop ups. To this extent, is ‘stopping up’ the right terminology here, or would a road closure (enforced by a Traffic Regulation Order) prohibiting vehicular traffic only be more appropriate?</p>
Q1.11.3.5	Applicant	<p><b>Article 12 – Access to works</b></p> <p>The wording in the EM [AS-012, Paragraphs 68 to 69] conveys a broader meaning than the drafting in the dDCO. Reconsider the wording in the EM, including adding a reference to Schedule 6.</p>
Q1.11.3.6	Applicant Affected Persons	<p><b>Article 16 – Authority to survey and investigate land</b></p> <p>a) Applicant to consider if the notice in Article 16(2) should include an indication of the work required, given the nature of work to make trail holes and dig trenches can be intrusive and require preparation for the Affected Person.</p> <p>b) Provide suitable amendments to the drafting to secure the provision.</p> <p>c) Affected persons, specify in what ways you would be impacted by these provisions.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.11.3.7	Applicant	<p><b>Article 18 – Compulsory acquisition of land</b></p> <p>a) Should Articles 18(1) and 18(2) specify the specific scenarios when consent from the other undertaker would be needed?</p> <p>b) Confirm that the land required for only SEP or DEP is the entire extent of the Order limits.</p> <p>c) If so, then the wording “so much of the Order land as is required” suggests that the land required for only SEP or DEP might be different and lesser than the entire extent of the Order limits. Consider re-drafting and providing a clearer explanation in the EM [AS-012, Paragraphs 80 to 83].</p>
Q1.11.3.8	Applicant	<p><b>Article 20 – Compulsory acquisition of rights</b></p> <p>While the ExA notes the explanation in the EM [AS-012, Paragraphs 88], the scope of Article 20 (1) and 20(2) is too broad because it does not specify that the provision only applies to the plots listed in Schedule 7.</p> <p>a) What is the risk that the provision in this Article could mean that the undertakers would have an unrestricted right to impose undefined new rights over any of the Order land, not just the plots listed in Schedule 7, and including over land for TP only?</p> <p>b) Provide suitable alternative wording.</p>
Q1.11.3.9	Applicant Affected Persons	<p><b>Article 26 – Temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised project</b></p> <p>a) Affected Persons, is the provision in Article 26(2) for 14 days’ notice period adequate to prepare for Temporary Possession of your land? Applicant may respond.</p> <p>b) Applicant, what are the implications to your construction programme and viability of the Proposed Development if the notice period was increased?</p> <p>c) Applicant, justify the need for the provision in 26(8)(a).</p> <p>d) Applicant, provide justification and explanation if the interaction between the provisions in Article 26(8)(a), and Article 20(1) and 20(2) would allow the creation of permanent rights under over land which is intended for Temporary Possession only.</p> <p>e) Affected Persons, whose land is listed in Schedule 9, are you aware and were you consulted on the basis that your land is sought for Temporary Possession but the Applicant would have the ability to create undefined new rights over your land? Applicant may respond.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		f) Applicant, what are the implications of removing the provision in 26(8)(a) from the dDCO? Respond on the basis of precedence from recent made DCOs.
Q1.11.3.10	Applicant	<b>Article 35 – Trees subject to tree preservation orders</b> What process would occur, and with whom, to inform the ‘reasonable belief’ of the Applicant that a TPO tree obstructs or interferes with the Proposed Development?
Q1.11.3.11	Applicant	<b>Article 38 - Certification of plans and documents, etc.</b> What does the Environmental Statement in 38(1)(b) consists of? Should the title be more descriptive?
Q1.11.3.12	Applicant Interest Parties	<b>Article 45 – Modification of DOW section 36 consent</b> a) Article 45, is a novel provision in this dDCO, and the ExA is seeking input from parties if they have concerns or support for the provision and drafting, and implications for future applications for development consent. Applicant may respond. b) Applicant, submit into Examination, further details of Riverside Energy Park Order 2020 that has been referred to as precedence, including a brief description of the relevant context.
<b>Q1.11.4 Schedules</b>		
Q1.11.4.1	Applicant	<b>Schedule 1 – Authorised Development</b> Consider specifying that the grid coordinates for the part of the authorised development, which is seaward of MHWS, is relevant for all scenarios.
Q1.11.4.2	Discharging Authorities	<b>Further Associated Development</b> Are you satisfied that all instances of further associated development in connection with Work Nos. 1B to 7B, Work Nos. 8B to 22B, Work Nos. 3C, 4C, 5C and 7C and Work Nos. 8C, 9C, 12C, 15C, 16C and 17C are controlled adequately by the provisions in the dDCO?
Q1.11.4.3	Discharging Authorities	<b>Ancillary Works</b> Are you satisfied that all instances of ancillary works are controlled adequately by the provisions in the dDCO?
Q1.11.4.4	Applicant	<b>Accuracy of coordinates</b>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Provide a means by which you can cross-check the accuracy of the coordinates in Schedule 1.
Q1.11.4.5	Discharging Authorities	<p><b>Accuracy of all Schedules</b></p> <p>Check the Schedules in the dDCO for accuracy and provide the ExA with suggested corrections and amendments.</p>
<b>Q1.11.5 Requirements</b>		
Q1.11.5.1	Applicant National Farmers Union	<p><b>Requirement 1 – Time limits</b></p> <p>a) Applicant, what changes would you need to make in light of your response to questions in Construction Effects Onshore?</p> <p>b) NFU, specify which landowners are affected by the seven years time limit for commencing the authorised development and in what way.</p>
Q1.11.5.2	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 9 – Scenarios and Phases of authorised development</b></p> <p>a) What changes would you need to make to R9(1), in light of your response to questions in Construction Effects Offshore?</p> <p>b) The ExA believes that for enforcement purpose Table 1-1 from the EM should be included in R9 so it is clear which works are applicable to each scenario. Applicant to comment, providing reasons.</p> <p>c) R9(2) and (3) state that the undertaker would seek approval for the written scheme setting out the phases of construction; and then states that the scheme may subsequently be amended from time to time. Would approval be needed for such amendments? Explain with reasons.</p> <p>d) Is there a contradiction between R9(4) and R9(2) and (3), where (2) and (3) state that the scheme may subsequently be amended from time to time, but (4) states that each scheme must be implemented as notified?</p> <p>e) Consider consistency in language and using “written scheme” in all instances?</p> <p>f) Should “written scheme” be defined in Article 2?</p>
Q1.11.5.3	Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 10 – Detailed design parameters onshore</b></p> <p>a) What are the criteria in the ES or secured in the dDCO that the relevant planning authority can rely on for testing or assessing the details in R10(4), in order to give approval?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		b) In that regard, Applicant to consider securing the design and vision documents [APP-287] [APP-312] [APP-313] through R10.
Q1.11.5.4		<p><b>Requirement 17 – Operational Drainage Plan</b></p> <p>It has been suggested in RRs that R17 should include a mechanism to secure the management and maintenance of drainage systems.</p> <p>a) Does the Applicant agree?</p> <p>b) If so, provide a revised form of wording to include such matters in R17.</p>
Q1.11.5.5	Applicant Ministry of Defence	<p><b>Requirement 27 - Ministry of Defence surveillance operations</b></p> <p>a) Outline here or in your SoCG the milestones and associated timescales (in relation to this Examination) of how these discussions are likely to progress and conclude.</p> <p>b) Provide evidence where possible.</p> <p>c) Outline the implications for the ExA’s recommendation to the SoS, of not reaching agreement before the close of Examination.</p>
Q1.11.5.6	Applicant NATS	<p><b>Requirement 28 - Cromer and Claxby Primary Surveillance Radar</b></p> <p>a) Outline here or in your SoCG the milestones and associated timescales (in relation to this Examination) of how these discussions are likely to progress and conclude.</p> <p>b) Provide evidence where possible.</p> <p>c) Outline the implications for the ExA’s recommendation to the SoS, of not reaching agreement before the close of Examination.</p>
<b>Q1.11.6 Draft Deemed Marine Licences</b>		
Q1.11.6.1	Applicant Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Timeframes for determinations</b></p> <p>a) MMO, concern has been raised regarding a four-month lead-in period for review and decisions from the MMO on detailed submissions. Set out what periods for consultation would be reasonably achievable, and in line with other made OWF DCOs.</p> <p>b) Applicant, what are the implications to construction programme and viability of providing additional time, as requested by MMO for the discharge of approvals.</p>
Q1.11.6.2	Applicant Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Outline Offshore Operation and Maintenance Plan</b></p> <p>The ExA are concerned regarding the ‘amber’ items highlighted within the Relevant Representation [RR-053], particularly that additional licences may be required “if</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		proposed works exceed those assessed within the ES or described within the DCO.” What is the likelihood / probability of the works falling outside of the scope of the DCO or causing greater effects than assessed as the worst-case scenario in the ES?
<b>Q1.11.7 Interaction of the dDCO with Other Legislated DCOs, Other Existing Infrastructure and Planned Projects</b>		
Q1.11.7.1	Applicant Vattenfall RWE Renewables Orsted Hornsa Project 3 National Highways Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Hillside Parks Ltd v Snowdonia National Park Authority (the Hillside Judgement)</b></p> <p>The ExA acknowledge the above judgement relates to a non-Development Consent Order case. However, it occurs to the ExA that the principles of the judgement may be applicable for the Proposed Development given the level of interaction of the scheme with other existing consented DCOs, including land subject of compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The ability to modify the initial permission in the DCO context is based on the specific power in section 120 of the Planning Act 2008. In this respect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) would any existing consented DCO need to be modified or amended by the Proposed Development?</li> <li>b) would any existing consented DCO be prejudiced in the ability to be implemented, either through works or land take, to the extent it could not come forward in accordance with its terms and management plans?</li> <li>c) provide any other views on the relevance, or otherwise, of the judgement upon this project.</li> </ul>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.12. Habitats and Ecology Offshore</b>		
<b>Q1.12.1 Effects on Ornithology</b>		
Q1.12.1.1	Natural England Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<p><b>Quality of Data</b></p> <p>There are instances within the ES [APP-097, Paragraphs 172, 240, 313] where the Applicant raises issues with data and the approach taken to using it. In these respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Are you concerned that, in several places, the Applicant has stated “it was not considered possible to produce reliable and precise design-based density estimates for offshore ornithology receptors for DEP-N and DEP-S, only DEP as a whole” and, if so, do you consider that this undermines the Applicant’s conclusions on the significance of adverse effects?</li> <li>b) Is it appropriate and proportionate for the Applicant to have relied upon written sources to gather data across the export cable corridor rather than undertaking baseline ‘on-site’ surveys?</li> <li>c) The Applicant acknowledges departing from Natural England’s suggested mortality rates, because such rates are higher. Do you consider there to be sufficient justification for this departure and if not, why not?</li> <li>d) Are you content with the approach undertaken with regards to assessing the overall effects of the Proposed Development considered alongside other projects?</li> </ul>
Q1.12.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Population Viability Analysis</b></p> <p>Explain why PVAs have not been run for scenarios where the turbines at DEP are all installed in DEP-N, given for sandwich terns the development of DEP-N alone has been assessed to represent a worst-case scenario [APP-097, paragraph 550].</p>
Q1.12.1.3	Natural England Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	<p><b>Use of a Scientific Study</b></p> <p>In Relevant Representation [RR-083], in relation to studies on seabird activity, it states that the study undertaken by Cook in 2021 has not been adopted by SNCBs and therefore cannot be relied upon for its data on collision risk modelling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Are the findings of Cook 2021 currently disputed?</li> <li>b) What is the process of adoption for a scientific paper and is there a timescale in which such an evidence base would be either adopted or rebuked (reported on)?</li> </ul>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		c) What would be an appropriate equivalent evidence base from which evidence could be relied upon that you say the Applicant should have referred to instead?
Q1.12.1.4	Natural England	<p><b>Project Environment Management Plan and Red-throated divers</b></p> <p>A number of mitigation measures for red-throated diver are listed in the PEMP [APP-297, Section 5.1].</p> <p>a) Comment on the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>b) Comment on the Applicant’s conclusion on the residual effects as assessed in the ES.</p> <p>c) What further measures do you think could be implemented to mitigate the adverse effects upon the species?</p>
Q1.12.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Red-throated Diver</b></p> <p>In Table 11-4 [APP-097], one of the mitigation measures listed is to avoid rafting birds when travelling from the port. Would the port of Great Yarmouth increase or decrease the likelihood of engaging with rafting birds compared to other port options being considered?</p>
<b>Q1.12.2 Effects on Aquatic Wildlife including Mammals, Fish and Shellfish</b>		
Q1.12.2.1	Natural England	<p><b>Published Guidance</b></p> <p>Update the ExA on any recently published guidance documents by Natural England that are applicable to the Proposed Development, setting out whether the Proposed Development complies with or goes against such guidance.</p>
Q1.12.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Underwater Noise</b></p> <p>Explain the assumption that the shift from using gear boxes to direct drive technology is expected to reduce the sound level by 10dB [APP-096, paragraph 595]. Is there any evidence to support this?</p>
Q1.12.2.3	Applicant Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Herring Spawning and Underwater Noise</b></p> <p>Would a seasonal piling restriction to mitigate underwater noise and vibration effects on herring be an effective form of mitigation and, if so, is there any evidence to help define an appropriate and informed exclusion period for such works?</p>
Q1.12.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Cable Crossings and Electro-Magnetic Fields</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>The ES states that loose rock dumping would be avoided to prevent small fish and shellfish being exposed to higher levels of EMF along the offshore cable corridor [APP-095, Paragraph 393]. Where cable crossings are to occur:</p> <p>a) Would there be a cumulative (augmented) magnetic field from multiple cables and, if so, does this dissipate over a greater distance?</p> <p>b) What measures would be in place to prevent small fish and shellfish being at risk to higher exposure in the vicinity of these cable crossings?</p> <p>c) If cable burial was not achieved and cable protection used, how would concrete mattresses or rock bags be effective in limiting exposure of EMF to the aquatic environment?</p>
Q1.12.2.5	<p>Applicant Marine Management Organisation Natural England</p>	<p><b>Recreational Activity</b></p> <p>It is known that recreational boat trips take place from Blakeney to view seals along the North Norfolk Coast.</p> <p>a) What would the impacts be on recreational boat trips from the Proposed Development?</p> <p>b) Would there be a cumulative effect upon seals arising from construction/ maintenance vessels for the Proposed Development and the continued recreational tourist boat trips?</p>
Q1.12.2.6	<p>Marine Management Organisation</p>	<p><b>Marine Mammals Position Statement</b></p> <p>Confirm, in a simple tabular format, whether you are content with the Applicant's assessment of effects, mitigation and conclusions regarding harbour porpoise, minke whale, white-beaked dolphin, grey seal and harbour seal, or if more work is required. Suggested table headings:</p> <p>Species / Agree methodology (Y/N) / Agree assessment of effects (Y/N) / mitigation suitable (Y/N) / agree conclusions (Y/N)</p> <p>The table produced will also be requested for the final deadline in the Examination to provide a summary of where outstanding issues, if any, remain.</p>
Q1.12.2.7	<p>Natural England</p>	<p><b>Scope of the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol</b></p> <p>Your relevant representation [RR-063] states the Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol, does not provide any mitigation for disturbance. The Applicant said at ISH1 [EV-012] [EV-016] that this document does not serve the purpose of setting out mitigation in relation to disturbance and no other examples apparently do this. Do you have any examples of</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		MMMPs that do provide mitigation for disturbance or what content, in particular, would you expect / wish to see contained in the MMMP?
--	--	--

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.13. Habitats and Ecology Onshore</b>		
<b>Q1.13.1 Effects on European Designated Sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest</b>		
Q1.13.1.1	Local Authorities Environment Agency Natural England	<b>Air Quality and Screening of Ecological Sites</b> Can you confirm if the approach to the selection of all the relevant European sites, the scopes of the in-combination assessment, the assessments and the conclusions reached by the Applicant is acceptable [APP-108, paragraph 138 (though not limited to that paragraph only)].
<b>Q1.13.2 Effects on Protected and Priority Species</b>		
Q1.13.2.1	Applicant Interested Parties	<b>Great Crested Newts</b> The Applicant reports that 15 ponds were inaccessible due to landowner access limitations and a further four ponds were inaccessible due to terrain [APP-106, Paragraph 132]. a) Do you consider that the omission of surveys at these 19 ponds (11% of the total ponds studied) has any impact on the reliability of GCN eDNA results and, if so, what are the implications for the ExA to take into account? b) Do you consider there to be any impediments that would prevent the Applicant from obtaining a full District Level Licence?
Q1.13.2.2	Natural England Environment Agency	<b>Construction Sites and Compounds</b> ES reports that bat species rely on watercourses for foraging and commuting corridors [APP-106]. For HDD crossings of watercourses, these are to be set a minimum of 9m back from the riverbanks and the compounds would be subject to minimal artificial lighting. Would the 9m setback be sufficient to avoid noise and light disturbance to bat species (and their prey) or should further mitigation be explored by siting such compounds further away given HDD cable lengths can extend approximately up to 1,000m?
Q1.13.2.3	Natural England	<b>Letters of No Impediment</b> LoNI are appended to the Planning Statement in respect of badgers and bats [APP-285]. Are there any outstanding LoNI that are likely to be forthcoming during the Examination?
Q1.13.2.4	Applicant	<b>Weybourne Cliffs</b>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	It is identified that populations of sand martins nest within the cliffs [APP-106]. Would noise and vibration from the landfall construction operations, with particular regard to vibrations from the HDD, have any effect upon the integrity of the cliffs or the living conditions of the sand martins such that nesting could be abandoned?
Q1.13.2.5	Applicant	<b>Reptiles</b> SNDC request that if reptile translocation is required, details are provided to a suitable receptor site and such site is secured for the future [AS-034]. What are your comments regarding this?
Q1.13.2.6	Natural England	<b>Pink-Footed Goose</b> Are there any fundamental concerns regarding this species that warrants either more information or the submission of a mitigation plan during the course of the Examination [APP-106]?
<b>Q1.13.3 Effects on Ancient Woodland, Trees and Hedgerows</b>		
Q1.13.3.1	Applicant	<b>Ancient Woodland</b> a) Direct impacts are said to be avoided through use of HDD [APP-112]. How deep would the HDD trench need to be in order to avoid direct impacts on the roots for trees within ancient woodland? b) Is it appropriate to assign ancient woodland and general woodland habitat in the same medium sensitivity rating? c) What effect, if any, would bentonite breakout have upon ancient woodland species? d) In respect of c) above, would the Applicant have sufficient access rights to walk through the affected woodland atop the pathway of the HDD drills to make inspections and remedy any such breakout?
Q1.13.3.2	Applicant	<b>Presentation of Information</b> The large exceedances shown in Tables 22.47 and 22.53 [APP-108] are dismissed because <i>"only a small percentage of impacts at almost all sites is due to the contribution from SEP and DEP together concurrently. Furthermore, as previously discussed, impacts from SEP and DEP would be experienced only during construction."</i> ES Chapter 22 suggests that where affected designated sites were above the 1% Critical Load, they were assessed in ES Chapter 20 [APP-106].

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>It is not readily clear to the ExA which paragraphs or sections of ES Chapter 20 explicitly deal with this, and it does not appear explicitly in the summary tables/ list of impacts at the end of that chapter.</p> <p>The Applicant is therefore requested to signpost/ set out which parts of ES Chapter 20 directly address the effects of NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub> on ecological receptors and set out the mitigations for this. In addition, the Applicant should set out clearly and conclusively whether designated ecological assets would suffer degradation or eutrophication as a result of exposure to NO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub> arising from the Proposed Development in isolation or in-combination with other projects.</p>
Q1.13.3.3	South Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Moveable Hedgerows</b></p> <p>Provide more details on the nature and extent of 'moveable hedgerow' infrastructure [AS-034] and provide any evidence as to their effectiveness.</p>
Q1.13.3.4	South Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Management Plans</b></p> <p>There is a request that final management plans secure a number of measures over which the Council is concerned, such as floodlighting, generators etc [RR-034]. Do you consider that the current suite of plans and requirements adequately cover these measures and, if so, what amendments or additions would give you reassurance that appropriate mitigation was being utilised?</p>
<b>Q1.13.4 Effects on Rivers and River-Based Wildlife</b>		
Q1.13.4.1	Environment Agency Natural England	<p><b>Watercourse Fish Surveys</b></p> <p>Do you have any concerns regarding the Applicant's approach and data collection, and the implications for the ExA to take into account [APP-106, Paragraph 165].</p>
Q1.13.4.2	Environment Agency Applicant	<p><b>Chalk-based Rivers</b></p> <p>For rivers, it is said HDD crossings (or equivalent trenchless technique) would be a minimum of 2m deep under the riverbed [APP-106, paragraph 268]. Knowing that some watercourses, such as the River Wensum, are chalk-based rivers and that the EA [RR-032] notes that rivers Tud, Tiffey and Yare are also classed as chalk streams, would this require a much deeper drill route to be explored to avoid the chalk reserve?</p>
Q1.13.4.3	Environment Agency	<p><b>River Crossings</b></p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

	Natural England	The effects of vibration on sensitive receptors are said to be negligible at distances in excess of 100m [APP-106, Table 20-17]. Given that the drill for HDD under watercourses would only be 2m below each respective riverbed, are there any likely effects upon fish or aquatic animal species from vibration causing displacement or fatality?
Q1.13.4.4	Applicant	<b>Signal Crayfish</b> The EA has requested extra attention to biosecurity due to the mobility of signal crayfish, proposing a 'Check, Clean, Dry' measure [RR-032]. Will that measure be adopted and in which management plan will this appear?

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.14. Habitats Regulation Assessment</b>		
<b>Q1.14.1 Effect of the Proposed Development on its own and In-combination with Other Plans and Projects</b>		
Q1.14.1.1	Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>Controlling in-combination impacts on the integrity of the Southern North Sea SAC</b></p> <p>What level of confidence does the MMO have that the proposed Southern North Sea SAC site integrity plan for this project, when considered alongside controls in Marine Licence conditions attached to other projects that might affect the harbour porpoise interest feature in-combination, would provide it with sufficient control over the timing and nature of noisy activities across the various projects to ensure that the relevant in-combination disturbance impact thresholds would not be breached? In the event that a number of noisy activities from various concurrent projects became likely, would it be the MMO's intention to use these controls to ensure that no threshold was breached, and, if so, how?</p>
Q1.14.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment parameters [APP-059]</b></p> <p>a) The RIAA [Section 6.2.1.2] states the effects on species in the River Wensum have been ruled out due to use of trenchless techniques. Has consideration been given to potential bentonite breakout (assuming the use thereof) and, if not, could consideration of this change or alter either the screening matrices or the effects predicted upon said species?</p> <p>b) With reference to table 7.5, why is the worst-case in the first box not representative of the full development potential (53 turbines/ conical foundations) as it is in Table 8-13?</p> <p>c) In relation to the development of DEP, why is no differentiation made between the DEP-N option versus the DEP-N and DEP-S option?</p> <p>d) In relation to c) above, is the Applicant's position that the worst-case for DEP (regardless of whether N and S are developed) remains the same?</p> <p>e) Does the in-combination assessment reported in Table 8-50 change in respect of DEP if a proportion of turbines (10%, 20%, 50%) are developed in the DEP-S area?</p>
Q1.14.1.3	Natural England Marine Management Organisation	<p><b>RIAA, Screening and Outstanding Matters</b></p> <p>a) Are the screening matrices in the RIAA [APP-059] acceptable or do further features/sites need to be included?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>b) An explanation, with evidence as appropriate, as to whether you agree or disagree with the conclusions stated in paragraphs 105 and 106 of the RIAA presented by the Applicant.</p> <p>c) Provide an update on benthic SACs and whether the concerns raised in respect of the DOW have been addressed sufficiently by the Applicant either in advance of the Proposed Development being submitted or through the ES and HRA Reports [APP-059, Table 7-1].</p>
Q1.14.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>RIAA and Sandwich Terns</b></p> <p>With reference to the RIAA [APP-059]:</p> <p>a) Does this feature have a favourable conservation status in respect of any of the relevant European sites considered as part of the assessment?</p> <p>b) Does paragraph 977 assume DEP-N in isolation or both DEP-N and DEP-S?</p> <p>c) Is it correct that Table 9-12 shows projects including DEP-N are the worst-case scenarios and, if so, would a greater quantum of development at DEP-S offer greater protection for the species?</p> <p>d) Given the variables presented in paragraphs 1004 to 1010, is it fair to say there is a great deal of scientific doubt as to the extent of the effects on the species (notwithstanding recognition that an adverse effect cannot be ruled out for this at Greater Wash SPA, North Norfolk Coast SPA and North Norfolk Ramsar Site)?</p>
Q1.14.1.5	Natural England	<p><b>RIAA and Gannet</b></p> <p>You indicated in the relevant representation [RR-063] that gannet could potentially be excluded from receiving compensation providing that there were no significant changes to collision and displacement modelling results.</p> <p>a) Describe what you consider would constitute significant changes to the modelling that would change your view on the necessity for the compensation?</p> <p>b) Describe and explain why, having determined a significant adverse impact on gannet at the EIA scale, you are content that an AEoI can be excluded for the species?</p> <p>c) Would you advise the Applicant, and indeed the ExA, that compensation for gannet should be removed from the Applicant's compensation documents at the close of the Examination, assuming of course that the position remains the same?</p>
Q1.14.1.6	Natural England	<p><b>RIAA, Ornithology and DEP-N</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>At ISH1 [EV-011] [EV-015], the Applicant stated the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, reduce, mitigate had been followed during the formulation of the 'red line boundary' (i.e. Order limits) thus informing the extent of the application sought. Consequently, there was no need for DEP-N to be reconsidered under this mitigation hierarchy and no need for DEP-N to be sterilised or removed from the dDCO as a result (as suggested in your relevant representation [RR-063].</p> <p>a) What is your response? b) Why is DEP-N deemed to be in conflict with the mitigation hierarchy?</p>
Q1.14.1.7	Natural England	<p><b>The Case for Derogation and Compensatory Measures</b></p> <p>In relation to comments made in the Relevant Representation [RR-063]:</p> <p>a) Elaborate on the reasons why it is considered that compensation works on the Farne Islands (in the form of predator exclusion, reduced human disturbance, flood protection and/ or vegetation control [APP-066, Section 3.5]) do not "provide meaningful compensation."</p> <p>b) The RSPB has suggested the robustness of bird populations to mortality has decreased following the outbreak of avian influenza [RR-083]. How would you respond to this and what, if any, evidence can be relied upon to demonstrate against this assertion, notwithstanding Relevant Representation [RR-063, Appendix B2]?</p> <p>c) Why is compensation at Loch Ryan in Scotland, a not insignificant distance away, acceptable in this instance [EV-011] [EV-015]?</p>
Q1.14.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Targeted Consultation on the Derogation Case and Potential Compensation Measures</b></p> <p>Is the Applicant content that the targeted consultation on the derogation case and potential compensation measures has been sufficient to satisfy all of the consultation requirements of the relevant legislation? Please systematically relate the answer to those requirements. Would anything further be necessary?</p>
Q1.14.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Securing any Derogation Case and Compensatory Measures through a DCO</b></p> <p>a) Could the Applicant clarify how any derogation case and compensatory measures would be secured through any DCO should the SoS's HRA demonstrate that they were necessary to address residual AEOI that could not be excluded beyond a reasonable scientific doubt?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>b) Provide final, without prejudice compensation measures through a Requirement in the dDCO, to be activated only if the SoS finds AEoI?</p> <p>c) Alternatively, submit a version of the dDCO with the necessary provisions to address the SoS's potential finding of AEoI?</p>
Q1.14.1.10	Applicant Natural England RSPB	<p><b>Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard DCO Decisions</b></p> <p>Do the SoS's HRAs and decisions on the Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard projects affect the process or conclusions of the HRA undertaken for this Proposed Development by the Applicant, including the deliverability and timing of the proposed compensation measures, especially in relation to the kittiwake interest feature of the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA?</p>
Q1.14.1.11	Natural England	<p><b>Offshore Artificial Nests</b></p> <p>In relation to the proposed creation of artificial nests offshore [APP-065]:</p> <p>a) Explain whether these are floating features or permanent fixtures (i.e. requiring to be affixed to the seabed).</p> <p>b) Explain how far away from the impacted colonies the artificial nests should be.</p> <p>c) Explain how far away from any offshore wind turbine the artificial nests should be.</p> <p>d) Explain how far away from any primary shipping routes the artificial nests should be.</p> <p>e) Explain, with evidence where possible, the effectiveness of providing such a compensatory measure and why it represents betterment over an onshore nesting site.</p> <p>f) Could NE explain its view [RR-063] that further onshore artificial nesting structures for kittiwake are unlikely to result in sufficient benefits to provide adequate compensation. Nest for nest, why does it consider that offshore nesting structures might provide a higher level of compensation than onshore nesting structures?</p> <p>g) Kittiwakes are known for being exclusively cliff-nesting gulls. In that case, what confidence can be had in the success of offshore nesting sites?</p>
Q1.14.1.12	Natural England	<p><b>Increasing Prey Supply for Sandwich Terns and Kittiwakes</b></p> <p>[RR-063] suggests increasing prey supply and availability may be of benefit to the affected species.</p> <p>a) Identify specifically the prey that would need to be increased and what quantities are anticipated to be enough to support the relevant bird species</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>b) Explain the preferred habitat for this prey and whether this exists in enough abundance near to the Proposed Development to support both existing and additional prey numbers</p> <p>c) Could artificial habitat be created for these species by the Applicant and, if this is possible, is this something that could be provided as MEEB within the MCZ?</p>
Q1.14.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Level of Detail and Confidence in Compensation Measures</b></p> <p>In its Relevant Representation [RR-063], NE raises concerns that, in the absence of specific locations and delivery mechanisms being identified for guillemot and razorbill, the confidence that any of the proposed compensation measures can or will be secured is significantly reduced.</p> <p>a) Given the lack of refinement of possible sites for the proposed compensation measures, how reliable is the HRA, derogation case and compensation proposals?</p> <p>b) Is there any evidence to support the assertion that bycatch compensation measures are effective and can be relied upon as a compensation measure?</p>
Q1.14.1.14	Natural England	<p><b>Maximum Parameters, Rochdale Envelope and HRA</b></p> <p>If the Applicant committed to reducing the scope of the Rochdale Envelope:</p> <p>a) Would this provide greater certainty to the conclusions of the HRA and RIAA?</p> <p>b) Would any downwards reductions to parameters have any implications for the conclusions of the HRA, or would these be suitably covered by the existing documentation?</p> <p>c) Set out fully the reasons why DEP-N should be excluded from the dDCO and, if the ExA were to agree, what the consequential implications would be for the HRA and RIAA.</p>
Q1.14.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Other OWF</b></p> <p>The RIAA, states that other OWF will need to produce their own respective SIP [APP-059, paragraph 503].</p> <p>a) Is there a possibility of cross-coordination of a joint SIP between various entities?</p> <p>b) Given the suggestion that restrictions on simultaneous piling could be applied on other OWF, do Protective Provisions need to be drafted to regulate this or how else would this be agreed/ secured?</p>
Q1.14.1.16	East Suffolk Council	<p><b>Kittiwake Compensation and Strategic Approach</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Explain what your expectations are with regards to establishing a strategic position on the requirement for kittiwake compensation. Is this specific to your District or something that can be produced to contribute directly to this Examination?
Q1.14.1.17	Applicant	<p><b>European Site Citations</b></p> <p>NE's [RR-063] notes that the formal citations and conservation objectives for European sites are live documents that are updated on a regular basis to incorporate the most up to date evidence. Nevertheless, it is important that the documents on which the Examination concludes are 'fixed' before its completion, so that the SoS and others are aware of the version used. Could the Applicant confirm an arrangement for ensuring that this is the case and how the appropriate information would be provided in Examination.</p>
Q1.14.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Assumptions Regarding Headroom</b></p> <p>Although there is reference to releasing headroom by not implementing the existing s36 consent, the following needs clarifying:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The ES suggest that the possibility of as-built capacity at OWF being exploited would result in the decommissioning and rebuilding of the existing OWF to their consented designs (or older turbine models being installed) [APP-097, paragraphs 680 to 687]. Both of these scenarios are reported as being 'unrealistic.' If that is the case, and the DOW could not be fully developed in accordance with the s36 consent, what weight or worth is the 'headroom' in the DOW when considering the Proposed Development?</li> <li>b) The ExA understands headroom (crudely) to be that, if DOW was built-out in full, 100% of wildlife would be affected but, with the DOW only built to 80%, only 80% of wildlife would be affected. Then the difference of 20% of affected wildlife could 'passover' to be affected by the SEP/DEP turbines. Is that, in essence what the Applicant's case rests on?</li> <li>c) Signpost where the headroom concept has been assessed in the ES and where its effects have been taken into account in determining impacts on the environment.</li> <li>d) Provide any necessary quantification in relation to how headroom has been calculated and how it has been taken into account within the ES assessments (if it has).</li> </ol> <p>See related question in Construction Effects Offshore.</p>
Q1.14.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Red-Throated Diver Clarification</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

	Natural England Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Norfolk Wildlife Trust	The RSPB has raised concern that the Applicant has not taken fully into account the conservation objectives for red-throated diver [RR-083]. NE has also raised concerns for this species, but it is not clear to the ExA whether both organisations consider an AEoI on red-throated diver can be ruled out. Can the position be clarified?
Q1.14.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Marine Recovery Fund</b></p> <p>a) Is there any more up-to-date information regarding the Government’s intention to establish a Marine Recovery Fund?</p> <p>b) Is it premature to consider relying on the availability of this fund to support the derogation case since it will not be available until late 2023, if at all?</p> <p>c) What weight, if any, can the ExA put on the potential future presence of the Marine Recovery Fund given that it may be unlikely to become enacted legislation prior to the current DCO application being determined?</p> <p>d) How is the level of contribution for the fund to be determined and by whom?</p> <p>e) When is the trigger for paying this contribution and how is this accounted for in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.14.1.21	Natural England RSPB Marine Management Organisation Norfolk Wildlife Trust	<p><b>Marine Recovery Fund</b></p> <p>The Applicant has set out compensatory measures for those species/ features identified as where an AEoI cannot be ruled out. The Applicant has stated however, that it may not implement such compensatory measures if the ‘Marine Recovery Fund’ (or equivalent) is introduced by the Government.</p> <p>a) Is it appropriate for the Applicant to substitute in a contribution towards a strategic compensation fund as opposed to proactively implementing its own proposed package of physical and proactive compensatory measures (bearing in mind the fund does not yet exist)?</p> <p>b) Would there be any guarantees that the contribution to the fund would be directed specifically towards compensating for the adverse effects of the Proposed Development on sandwich terns and kittiwakes?</p> <p>c) From what you know of the fund, is it purely to be directed to whatever project the Government allocates as needing attention rather than project specific?</p>
Q1.14.1.22	Applicant	<b>Nature Recovery Zone</b>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Provide an update whether any meaningful exploration of the nature recovery zone option has taken place since June 2022 and/ or is this likely to result in any conclusions within the Examination period.
Q1.14.1.23	Natural England	<p><b>Loch Ryan</b></p> <p>NPS EN-1 5.3.7 says that where significant harm cannot be avoided, appropriate compensation measures should be sought. You have stated that the current scale of compensation is not yet clearly defined, but that the Applicant should be ambitious. In the context of the national policy, to what extent should compensation be guided by ambition and is there a requirement for compensation to provide betterment or be in excess of that which is being lost?</p>
Q1.14.1.24	Applicant East Suffolk Council	<p><b>Compensation Measures for Kittiwake</b></p> <p>a) Further to the discussion at ISH1 [EV-011] [EV-015], provide evidence and communication from Gateshead Council to demonstrate the suitability and availability of existing compensation measures for kittiwake within its region, indicating process and timescales for securing appropriate sites.</p> <p>b) East Suffolk Council to confirm, at this stage, whether there would be spare capacity for kittiwake compensation measures resulting from other agreed projects, and the possibility of the Applicant 'buying into' that compensation.</p>
Q1.14.1.25	Applicant	<p><b>Bycatch Reduction Measures</b></p> <p>Further to the discussion at ISH1 [EV-011] [EV-015], provide further detail to demonstrate the feasibility of bycatch reduction measures represent an effective compensatory measure.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.15. Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</b>		
<b>Offshore Matters</b>		
<b>Q1.15.1 Adequacy of Baseline Surveys and Environmental Information</b>		
Q1.15.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Intertidal Zone, HDD and the Historic Environment</b></p> <p>Confirm how deep the HDD ducting would be laid under the intertidal zone and why, at the depth proposed, it is unlikely to have a direct effect on buried archaeology [APP-100, paragraph 220].</p>
Q1.15.1.2	Historic England	<p><b>AEZs within the Offshore Temporary Works Area</b></p> <p>Do you consider any modifications are required to the AEZ limits set out in the ES [APP-100, Table 14-27], or that additional AEZs are required around other identified assets?</p>
Q1.15.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Geotechnical Work</b></p> <p>HE has set out that geotechnical work has only been undertaken so far within the export cable corridor [RR-041]. Provide justification as to why such work has not been undertaken within the array areas.</p>
Q1.15.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Gravity Based Structure</b></p> <p>Define the excavation depth and levelling requirements for installing 43 gravity-based structures [RR-041].</p>
<b>Onshore Matters</b>		
<b>Q1.15.2 Adequacy of baseline surveys and information</b>		
Q1.15.2.1	Historic England	<p><b>Outline Written Scheme of Investigation</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied that the OWSI, and its accompaniments, provides sufficient protection for unknown heritage/ archaeological assets with appropriate mitigation in place to preserve such assets?</p>
Q1.15.2.2	Applicant Historic England	<p><b>Swannington</b></p> <p>The village of Swannington contains numerous heritage assets including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Margarets Church (Grade I)</li> </ul>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swannington Hall (Grade II*)</li> <li>• Swannington Hall Barn (Grade II)</li> <li>• The Old Rectory (Grade II)</li> </ul> <p>(list non-exhaustive)</p> <p>Sheet 21/40 of the Works Plans shows a construction access being taken from the end of Church Lane down to Swannington 'From Farm to Fork.' The ExA interpret this that HGVs would drive into Swannington via link 138/139, east along Church Lane, past each of the aforementioned heritage assets, in order to reach the construction access (<i>the ExA note that Church Lane itself is not identified as a link in the Traffic and Transport Figures</i>).</p> <p>a) If this is not the case (i.e. the wrong interpretation), explain why there is a construction access shown, what its purpose is and how construction vehicles would access it; or</p> <p>b) If the ExA's assumption is correct, provide justification for there being no assessment of the impacts upon these heritage assets within either ES Chapters 21 or 23 [APP-107], [APP-109].</p>
<b>Q1.15.3 Effects on Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets</b>		
Q1.15.3.1	Applicant National Trust	<p><b>Archaeological Features at Sheringham Park and Weybourne Woods</b></p> <p>With the aid of a plan/ diagram, please set out the broad locations of known medieval, post-medieval, WWI, WWII and barrow features that are referenced in your Relevant Representation [RR-061]. State whether you consider impacts upon these features from the Proposed Development would be direct or indirect.</p>
Q1.15.3.2	South Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Ketteringham Hall Park</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that you consider Ketteringham Hall Park as a non-designated asset [AS-034]. Set out in full your position on the significance of the asset and the features that contribute to its significance and setting. In accordance with paragraph 203 of the NPPF, set out the scale and nature of the harm anticipated and weigh this against the public benefits of the proposal.</p>
Q1.15.3.3	Broadland District Council	<p><b>Honingham Hall Park</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that you consider Honingham Hall Park as a non-designated asset [AS-033]. Set out in full your position on the significance of the asset and the features that</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		contribute to its significance and setting. In accordance with paragraph 203 of the NPPF, set out the scale and nature of the harm anticipated and weigh this against the public benefits of the proposal.
--	--	--

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.16. Land Use</b>		
<b>Q1.16.1 Effect on Agricultural Land and Businesses and Recreational Assets</b>		
Q1.16.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>How have the thresholds for loss of agricultural land set out in Table 19-7: Definition of Magnitude for Land use, Agriculture and Recreation Receptor of the assessment [APP-105] been derived?</p>
Q1.16.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Temporary Loss of Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-105] finds that the sensitivity of the receptor, in accordance with Table 19-6, is considered to be medium in order to reflect the dominance of ALC Grade 3 land. Does this however underplay pockets of ALC Grade 2 land where sensitivity would be classed as high in accordance with Table 19-6?</p>
Q1.16.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Impact to Agri-environment Schemes (Construction and Cumulative)</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-105] notes that the impact on specific agreements will only be known once the landowner agreements are in place, confirming the extent and duration of impacts to specific land parcels. Further to discussions at ISH2 [EV-020] [EV-024], provide information in terms of what work is being done to reach such agreements and what confidence can the ExA have that any impacts can be suitably mitigated or compensated?</p>
Q1.16.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Impact to Agri-environment Schemes</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-105] sets out “<i>Where impacts to an agreement cannot be avoided, the affected landowners and /or occupier will be consulted to enable them to liaise with the Rural Payments Agency. This will include compensation provisions to reimburse a landowner and/or occupiers financial losses, where appropriate</i>”. Where are such measures secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.16.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Temporary Loss of Land for Agricultural</b></p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment [APP-105] finds that following the completion of the construction phase for each of the identified projects and implementation of mitigation measures to restore land to its previous use, the predicted cumulative impact significance to minor adverse during the construction phase. However, the residual impact for all SEP and DEP scenarios is considered to be of moderate adverse significance for the Proposed</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Development alone. Explain fully how this position has been arrived at and what criteria has been used to reach this conclusion.
Q1.16.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Monitoring Requirements</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-105] notes that monitoring is proposed for land use, agriculture and recreation via the OLMP [APP-303]. However, little or no reference is made in the OLMP with regard to such matters. Why is this?</p>
Q1.16.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Amount of Agricultural Land Affected</b></p> <p>Is the amount of agricultural land permanently and temporarily affected (acres/hectares) set out within the ES? Provide this information if not already within published documentation.</p>
Q1.16.1.8	Applicant National Farmers Union	<p><b>Individual Farms and Farm Economics</b></p> <p>It is not clear, from ES [APP-105] [APP-113], the actual specific impact on each individual farmstead along the cable corridor. Please set out, in tabular format:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The name of each farm affected by the cable corridor and construction accesses.</li> <li>The amount of land within each farm holding.</li> <li>The amount of land to be taken temporarily or permanently from each holding (expressed in both physical size and as a % of the original holding).</li> <li>The type of impact on each farm operation and business.</li> </ol>
Q1.16.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Disruption to Users of Inland Recreational Assets</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-105] finds that for all construction scenarios the implementation of identified air quality, noise, traffic and/or visual mitigation would reduce the magnitude of impact on any affected recreational assets from low to negligible and reduce the residual impact to minor adverse significance. However, for some of these subjects there are findings of minor adverse residual impacts. Therefore, is such a blanket assumption justified?</p>
Q1.16.1.10	Applicant National Farmers Union	<p><b>Written Ministerial Statement</b></p> <p>On 6 December 2022, Rt Hon Michael Gove made a WMS in which he signalled Government's intentions to further change the planning system. It is noted there is reference to further protection being given towards important agricultural land for food production.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>a) The WMS is capable of being a material planning consideration and therefore the ExA requests the Applicant to submit a copy into the Examination.</p> <p>b) In light of this, does the Applicant or National Farmers Union have any comments on the compliance of the Proposed Development with the WMS?</p>
<b>Q1.16.2 Soils and Soil handling, Ground Conditions, Contamination and Minerals</b>		
Q1.16.2.1	Applicant National Farmers Union	<p><b>Soil Heating</b></p> <p>Is there evidence to demonstrate whether or not the heating of soil, due to its proximity to the cables, damages the soil quality or harms the yields of crops that may be grown on it (above the cables)?</p>
Q1.16.2.2	National Farmers Union	<p><b>Soil Management Plan</b></p> <p>a) Is the draft content of the proposed Soil Management Plan [APP-302] sufficient.</p> <p>b) Does the content give you confidence that adverse effects would be minimise as far as reasonably possible?</p>
Q1.16.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Drainage (Construction)</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-105] notes that in accordance with Table 19-7: Definition of Magnitude for Land use, Agriculture and Recreation Receptor, there is a medium magnitude of effect as &gt;20ha of soil is temporarily unsuitable for agriculture. The assessment then considers mitigation and lowers the magnitude of effect to low. However, given &gt;20ha of soil would still be temporarily unsuitable for agriculture following mitigation, is this justified?</p>
Q1.16.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Agricultural Software</b></p> <p>Concern was raised by the NFU in their Section 42 response that EMFs could affect agricultural software such as Soil Sense Technology. What is the Applicant's reply?</p>
Q1.16.2.5	Applicant Environment Agency Local Authorities	<p><b>Contaminated Land – Approach</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103] notes that potential areas of contamination cannot be avoided. This includes areas such as the disused airfield at Brandiston, railways lines (both historical and active) former pits and historic tanks. The assessment also identifies that targeted ground investigations may be required.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>a) What options were considered in the optioneering stage to avoid areas of potential contamination (i.e. why did the onshore cable corridor have to go through Brandiston Airfield)? This was not specifically mentioned in ES Chapter 3.</p> <p>b) Are the Order limits and cable corridor widths such that any dense areas of contamination within these areas could be bypassed, by micro-siting the cables away from them (i.e. if there is an aeroplane fuel leak contained in one part of the cable corridor that could be diverted around)?</p> <p>c) Are the EA and LAs content that targeted ground investigations have not yet been undertaken and would be subject to post-consent processes?</p>
Q1.16.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Contaminated Land – Operational Impacts</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103] sets out that maintenance workers that are required to undertake ground excavations or enter confined spaces, such as the onshore substation, during the operation of SEP and DEP would be provided with information regarding the nature of ground conditions within each area so that they can develop site and task specific risk assessment and method statements and implement their recommendations. Where is this secured?</p>
Q1.16.2.7	Applicant	<p><b>Contaminated Land – Construction Mitigation</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103] notes that the final CoCP will be informed by the findings of pre-construction site investigation and include an assessment of the potential risks to human health and controlled waters receptors from SEP and/or DEP. Where are the pre-construction investigations secured?</p>
Q1.16.2.8	Applicant	<p><b>Contamination Land Mitigation - Built Environment</b></p> <p>Mitigation for impacts on the built environment includes the reduction of construction activities in proximity to commercial, residential properties and the school where possible. However, where this isn't possible pre-construction site characterisation works in areas identified as potential sources of contamination may be required. Explain how reduced construction activities can be achieved along the cable corridor and where are such measures secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.16.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Minerals – Sterilisation</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103] notes that the Proposed Development has the potential to sterilise the resources present within the narrow linear route of the onshore cable corridor during</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		construction and in all cases, where the onshore cable corridor intersects a Mineral Safeguarding Area only part of each area is impacted and not the whole protected area. However, could the presence of the cable affect the viability of wider areas to be feasibly worked, sterilising needed resource for many years?
Q1.16.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Minerals – Mitigation</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103] notes that for the onshore study area, mitigation measures would include consultation with NCC Mineral Planning Authority regarding the practicality and viability of extraction of mineral resources present within the works footprint and the production of a Mineral Resource Assessment where necessary. Where are such measures secured?</p>
Q1.16.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>Gases and Vapours</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103] notes that risks to construction workers in relation to ground gas and vapours would be mitigated by the use of appropriate working methods incorporated within the CoCP and use of PPE. Further, it also sets out that should unexpected sources of ground gas be identified prior to or during construction works, a ground investigation will be undertaken to characterise ground conditions and assessment of potential risks. Where in the OCoCP are such measures secured?</p>
Q1.16.2.12	Environment Agency Natural England	<p><b>Nitrate Vulnerable Zones</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103, Paragraphs 81 and 82] identify that the Proposed Development does not have any direct overlaps with any geological SSSIs, and as such no impacts are anticipated so no further assessment is undertaken by the Applicant. Do you consider this appropriate, or should potential indirect impacts be assessed?</p>
Q1.16.2.13	Applicant	<p><b>Monitoring</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-103] identifies that groundwater and ground gas monitoring may be required as part of any targeted ground investigations that may be required in order to determine the site characteristics and if they pose a potential risk to human health, groundwater and surface water receptors identified within this chapter. Where is this secured?</p>

<b>Q1.17. Landscape and Visual Effects</b>		
<b>Q1.17.1 Effect on Landscape Character and Views</b>		
Q1.17.1.1	Local Authorities	<p><b>LVIA Methodology</b></p> <p>The ES states that the LVIA was undertaken both in accordance with GLVIA3 and with direct input from local authorities as to the location and frequency of viewpoint analysis [APP-112].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) In this context, can you confirm that the selection of receptors (and their sensitivity) is reasonable and that there are no outstanding concerns regarding the process that the Applicant undertook (notwithstanding you may disagree with its results and conclusions).</li> <li>b) Are you satisfied with the study areas adopted by the Applicant for the onshore substation and the landfall site?</li> <li>c) If not, please set out the reasons for this position and indicate what additional areas should be included and the reasons why these areas should be included.</li> </ol>
Q1.17.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Substation Landscape Design</b></p> <p>There are two options for the size of the proposed substation (3.25ha for a single project or 6ha if both projects come forward) [APP-090]. For each option:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Explain the extent of landscaping required to be planted to mitigate the visual effects of the Proposed Development (with reference to lands plans and the BoR as appropriate).</li> <li>b) Set out how the various elements (buildings and apparatus) would be arranged within each substation layout in the interests of minimising visual effects.</li> <li>c) Clarify whether it is anticipated that the landscape proposals would fully mitigate the visual effects of the onshore substation elements of the Proposed Development.</li> <li>d) If the adverse effects are not yet understood for some areas, given the flexibility to develop either size substation, what reliance can the ExA or SoS place on the outcomes of the LVIA?</li> <li>e) Is it appropriate to suggest that the 3D models used in the visualisations give an indication of what the substation 'could' or 'might' look like (rather than 'will') as all details are subject to post consent approvals?</li> </ol>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.17.1.3	Interested Parties	<p><b>Lighting Columns</b></p> <p>Do you have any comments regarding the appearance of the proposed 30m-high lighting columns, and should these columns have been considered in the modelling of the ZTVs [APP-156]?</p>
Q1.17.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Lightning Masts</b></p> <p>It is not apparent to the ExA whether lightning masts to protect apparatus at the onshore substation have been factored into the modelling of the ZTV [APP-156].</p> <p>a) Explain, with signposting to examination documents wherever possible, how lighting columns and lightning masts have been assessed in the LVIA, in relation to both daytime and night-time views?</p> <p>b) At what range does the Applicant consider the lighting columns and lightning masts would be visible?</p>
Q1.17.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Rooftop Plant and Equipment</b></p> <p>Would there be any cooling apparatus or similar equipment installed upon the roofs of the buildings proposed under the Order? If so, have these been taken into account in the LVIA?</p>
Q1.17.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Scope of the ES and LVIA</b></p> <p>Did the LVIA [APP-112] include an assessment of sequential views, for instance relating to users of the PRoW network? If so, please provide signposting to this information? If not, please explain why this information was not included in the LVIA.</p>
Q1.17.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Telescopic Cranes</b></p> <p>There is no reference in the ES [APP-112] to the use of telescopic cranes for constructing the onshore substation.</p> <p>a) Can the ExA assume from this that none are required and none are to be used?</p> <p>b) If these are going to be used, show how and where they are taken into account in the LVIA and reported in the ES.</p>
Q1.17.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>HDD Compounds</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant explain how landscape and visual impacts arising from HDD compounds have been assessed?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.17.1.9	Local Authorities The Applicant	<p><b>Residential Receptors</b></p> <p>The Applicant notes that a RVAA has not been undertaken because the nearest receptors would fall below the relevant threshold [APP-112, paragraphs 117-120].</p> <p>a) LAs, is this a reasonable approach?</p> <p>d) LAs, what weight should be given to private views from residential properties in the Examination, in the ExA’s considerations and in the SoS’s decision? Applicant may respond.</p>
Q1.17.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Energy Balancing Infrastructure</b></p> <p>There are proposals for infrastructure to the west of the onshore substation by the Hornsea Project 3 made DCO, which come with associated landscape mitigation proposals.</p> <p>a) To what extent would the Proposed Development be relying on the landscape mitigation associated with Hornsea Project 3</p> <p>b) If so, is this a pragmatic approach given the construction programme or the potential that the other project may not proceed?</p>
Q1.17.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Removal of Existing Trees and Hedgerows, Replanting and Management</b></p> <p>a) Clarify how processes for agreeing tree and hedgerow removal, replanting, aftercare and management and maintenance are undertaken. Refer to the involvement of LAs, NE and landowners, including the undertaker.</p> <p>b) Provide a plan showing the extent of the woodland/ trees to be removed under the various scenarios (single project or both projects proceeding). Is it anticipated that there may be trees other than in the woodland areas or hedgerows described which would be removed in any Scenario?</p> <p>c) What is the Applicant’s proposed ratio for tree and hedgerow replacement?</p> <p>d) Provide an outline Arboricultural Management Strategy (AMS) or signposting to documents in the examination which provide the information that would otherwise be contained within an outline AMS. Alternatively, explain with reasons why this information should not be submitted to the Examination.</p> <p>e) Set out how the removal of existing trees and hedgerows and the extent of any replanting are adequately controlled and secured within the draft DCO [AS-009]</p> <p>f) Provide further explanation to clarify the Applicant’s proposed approach to replanting of hedgerows in areas near to where trees are to be felled.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.17.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Tree and Hedgerow Replacement</b></p> <p>NPS EN-1 (paras 5.3.15 and 5.3.18) points to making opportunity for beneficial biodiversity, enhancing existing habitats and creating new habitats of value. Explain how the landscape design for the Proposed Development recreates and replaces any ecological connections severed by construction of the onshore project substation and onshore cable corridor and whether there would be less connectivity than the baseline condition.</p>
Q1.17.1.13	Interested Parties	<p><b>The Applicant's Assessment of Effects within its LVIA Documents</b></p> <p>Please set out, or provide signposting to where you have set out, any areas of disagreement with the Applicant's baselines, methodologies and assessment of effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures within its Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-112]. If no areas of disagreement exist, please indicate this with reasons explaining why you believe the application documents provide satisfactory information on this topic.</p>
<p><b>Q1.17.2 Effects on designated and historic landscapes, including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Ancient Woodlands</b></p>		
Q1.17.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>AONB and Construction Programme</b></p> <p>Please detail the length of time (anticipated) that construction activities would be taking place within the North Norfolk AONB related to each of the proposed scenarios [APP-314].</p>
Q1.17.2.2	The Countryside Charity (CPRE) Norfolk Norfolk County Council North Norfolk District Council Norfolk Wildlife Trust	<p><b>AONB</b></p> <p>Do you consider that the Proposed Development prejudices the special qualities of the affected AONB and, if so, state which ones and why conflict is considered to arise?</p>
Q1.17.2.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Ringland Covert</b></p> <p>The Woodland Trust in their [RR-115] have identified "Ringland Covert" as an area of Ancient Woodland which will be subject to likely direct loss and/or detrimental impact to facilitate the proposed cabling works.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>a) Provide clarification on the impact of the Proposed Development on this specific area of woodland.</p> <p>b) Confirm that the Applicant has confidence that the statement within the Applicant's Arboricultural Report [APP-228] which notes that there are no records of ancient trees or ancient woodlands found within the DCO boundary remains accurate.</p>
<p><b>Q1.17.3 Effectiveness of mitigation proposals</b></p>		
Q1.17.3.1	Applicant	<p><b>Opportunities for Enhancement</b></p> <p>Within the areas of proposed landscape planting at the substation site, have opportunities been explored to provide new pathways or routes to improve user experience and recreation within the countryside?</p>
Q1.17.3.2	Applicant	<p><b>Attlebridge Main Compound</b></p> <p>It would appear from the ES [APP-112, Paragraphs 286, 295 and 296], that there are no specific intentions to provide landscape mitigation for the Attlebridge compound on the basis it is a temporary feature.</p> <p>a) is this interpretation correct or, if not, signpost where specific mitigation would take place to reduce the visual impression of the compound within the landscape?</p> <p>b) if the interpretation is correct, do you think it appropriate to have such a significant construction feature in the landscape without dedicated visual mitigation, given that it could well be in place for 48 months (4 years)?</p>
Q1.17.3.3	Applicant	<p><b>Embedded Mitigation</b></p> <p>Pages 57 to 68 of GLVIA refers to standard mitigation measures and there should be no assumptions made in relation to standard practice, requiring evidence that it can be secured through a consent. Can the Applicant point to where this has been taken into account? In doing so, does the Applicant believe that it would be useful to separate primary, standard and secondary mitigation in line with GLVIA, referring to how 'embedded' mitigation and best practice working methods are dealt with there?</p>
Q1.17.3.4	Local Authorities	<p><b>Extent of Mitigation</b></p> <p>Would the mitigation planting illustrated by the Applicant be effective in reducing the magnitude and significance of the visual effect of the Proposed Development? If not, why not? What other steps should be considered in order to provide the necessary change in</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		magnitude and significance of the visual effect of the onshore substation buildings and/ or structures?
Q1.17.3.5	Applicant	<b>Extent of Mitigation</b> For the onshore substation, set out clearly the extent to which the proposed visual mitigation reduces the visibility of the substation (expressed as a % if practicable) and whether, in light of this, the landscape planting would be beneficial as to justify compulsory acquisition / temporary possession of land.
Q1.17.3.6	Local Authorities Interested Parties	<b>Outline Landscape Management Plan</b> Are you satisfied that the details of location, number, species, size and density of proposed planting around the onshore substation need not be considered during the Examination [APP-303]?
Q1.17.3.7	Applicant	<b>Monitoring of Mitigation Planting</b> Provide further detail, or signposting which indicates where further detail is provided, which clarifies what – if any – remedial action would be implemented as a result of the proposed monitoring. If no remedial action is to be implemented, please explain why not.

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.18. Seascape and Visual Effects</b>		
<b>Q1.18.1 Effect on Seascape Character and Views</b>		
Q1.18.1.1	Local Authorities	<p><b>SLVIA Methodology</b></p> <p>The ES states that the SLVIA was undertaken both in accordance with direct input from local authorities as to the location and frequency of viewpoint analysis [APP-111]. In this context, can you confirm that the receptors (and their sensitivity) are reasonable and that there are no outstanding concerns regarding the process that the Applicant undertook (notwithstanding you may disagree with its results and conclusions).</p>
Q1.18.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Colour Scheme</b></p> <p>Have any alternatives been considered to the colour scheme to be applied to the wind turbine generators? Would any other colour make the turbines more recessive?</p>
<b>Q1.18.2 Effects During Construction</b>		
Q1.18.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Landfall and HDD</b></p> <p>Explain to the ExA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The approximate duration of construction works to create landfall (offshore works and onshore works combined).</li> <li>b) The approximate distance to shore that the HDD exit pits would emerge (offshore) and therefore the distance a jack-up vessel would be away from the shore.</li> <li>c) The timing of these construction works in the construction programme (including the months when such activity would be undertaken).</li> </ol>
Q1.18.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Effects at DEP</b></p> <p>Explain whether the conclusion that 'no significant effects have been identified for DEP' means reference to DEP-North, DEP-South, or both [APP-111, Paragraph 547].</p>
<b>Q1.18.3 Effects on Designated and Historic Landscapes</b>		
Q1.18.3.1	The Applicant Local Authorities, Interested Parties	<p><b>The Existing Baseline and its Effect on the Statutory Purpose of the NCAONB</b></p> <p>NE states that the existing OWF installations have a compromising effect on the statutory purpose of the NCAONB [RR-063]. Respond, with reasoning.</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.18.3.2	Local Authorities,	<b>The Extent of Additional Harm to the NCAONB</b> What is your assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the NCAONB in EIA terms?
Q1.18.3.3	The Applicant Local Authorities, Interested Parties	<b>Cumulative Impact Assessment</b> Should a CIA be undertaken in order to inform the EIA to ensure that the impact of SEP and DEP on the statutory purpose of the NCAONB, in the context of the existing OWF, can be made?
Q1.18.3.4	The Applicant Natural England	<b>Agreement between Parties</b> Set out, in further detail, the specific factors which might prevent agreement being reached on Seascape matters and outline what proposals you can bring forward which could enable agreement to be reached during the course of the examination.
Q1.18.3.5	Local Authorities	<b>Tourism and Coastal Footpaths</b> Is there any evidence to suggest that the construction of offshore wind turbines, and their cumulative seascape impact, has impaired, prejudiced or resulted in the loss of tourism activities/ enjoyment along the North Norfolk coast?
Q1.18.3.6	Historic England Norfolk County Council North Norfolk District Council	<b>North Norfolk Heritage Coast</b> Explain your respective positions on the qualities and significance of the Heritage Coast, particularly the stretch within which the Proposed Development would be theoretically and actually visible. Set out where you consider harms would occur and what, if anything, could be done to minimise the harm or improve the visitor experience.
Q1.18.3.7	Historic England Norfolk County Council North Norfolk District Council	<b>Aviation Lighting</b> Would you wish to see revisions to the quantum aviation lighting across both the Proposed Development together with the existing extent of the SOW and DOW, to minimise it where possible, so as to minimise night-time effects on the historic seascape?
<b>Q1.18.4 Cumulative Effects</b>		
Q1.18.4.1	Local Authorities Interested Parties	<b>Cumulative Effects</b> Are you satisfied with the list of projects included in the assessment of potential cumulative landscape and visual effects? If not, identify those projects that you believe should be included and indicate why you believe that they should be included.

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.18.4.2	Applicant	<p><b>Turbine Height and Power</b></p> <p>The Proposed Development would allow for up to 53 turbines. If, however, each turbine was of a greater power generation, the numbers of turbines would reduce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Would it be right to say that the lower power generators would be small structures?</li><li>b) If lower power turbines were opted for, would they still have the 30m air gap clearance between the blade tip and the HAT?</li><li>c) Would there be any appreciable difference in height between turbines of a different power output?</li><li>d) If the answer to c) above is yes, although there would be implications for offshore ornithology, would the lower height turbines be the 'best-case' for seascape impacts?</li></ul>
-----------	-----------	---

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.19. Navigation and Shipping</b>		
<b>Q1.19.1 Navigational Risk and Effect on Navigational Safety</b>		
Q1.19.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Working Vessels</b></p> <p>There are references throughout the ES, but for the purposes of identification this question focuses on paragraph 452 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-096], that deal with vessels during concurrent construction. In paragraph 452 it states: <i>"The assessment is based on up to 25 vessels on both sites at the same time (equating to an impact area of 0.75km<sup>2</sup> (impact area of &lt;0.03km<sup>2</sup> per vessel (Table 10-65) multiplied by 25 vessels))"</i></p> <p>Should this read 'a total of 25 vessels across both sites'? Otherwise, the plain reading of it appears that 25 vessels on SEP and on DEP equating to 50 vessels at the same time?</p>
Q1.19.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Disturbance Payments</b></p> <p>Paragraph 399 [APP-098] is incorrectly sourced/ referenced. Please amend and also provide details whether the FLOWW guidance (and justifiable disturbance payments) are factored into the funding statement for the Proposed Development and if there needs to be a securing of this process within the dDCO.</p>
Q1.19.1.3	Applicant Trinity House Maritime and Coastguard Agency	<p><b>Vessels and Electro-Magnetic Fields</b></p> <p>Within ES Chapter 13 [APP-099], there is no clear reference or assessment as to the potential impact of EMF upon navigation and magnetic compasses, for example. In respect of this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Can the Applicant explain why the assessment has not been undertaken or signpost as to where this may have taken place?</li> <li>b) Can Trinity House and MCA set out whether there is a real risk of effects of EMF upon navigating ships and/ or what measures sailors employ to counteract any effect on their navigation equipment.</li> </ol>
Q1.19.1.4	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	<p><b>Risk Mitigation for Fishing Vessels</b></p> <p>Is the Outline Fisheries Co-existence and Liaison Plan [APP-295] as drafted sufficient to mitigate risk to fishing vessels in the vicinity of service vessels working on the Proposed Development?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.19.1.5	Maritime and Coastguard Agency	<p><b>Operational Safety Zone for Accommodation Structures</b></p> <p>Confirm if you are satisfied with the proposed operational safety zones around offshore accommodation structures and if not, why not and what dimension would you want to be secured?</p>
Q1.19.1.6	Trinity House Maritime Coastguard Agency UK Chamber of Shipping Interested Parties	<p><b>Marine Vessel Safety and Navigational Risk Assessment</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied that the Proposed Development, subject to implementation of management plans and the level of mitigation proposed by the Applicant, reduces navigational risks and safety hazards to 'as low as reasonably possible' (ALARP)? If not, what more needs to be done to give you reassurance?</p>
Q1.19.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Impact on Ports</b></p> <p>Explain whether the NPS for Ports is important and relevant in respect of the Proposed Development and, where necessary, set out how the Proposed Development is compliant with the policies contained therein.</p>
Q1.19.1.8	Trinity House Maritime Coastguard Agency UK Chamber of Shipping	<p><b>Water Depths over Cables</b></p> <p>Is it sufficient that the Applicant would consult with the MCA and Trinity House in any instances where water depths are reduced by more than 5% as a result of external cable protection to determine whether additional mitigation is necessary to ensure the safety of passing vessels? Furthermore, what type or form of mitigation would this likely be if necessary?</p>
Q1.19.1.9	UK Chamber of Shipping	<p><b>Deviation of Routes for Vessels</b></p> <p>Chapter 13 of the ES [APP-099] states that "<i>In terms of main routes, deviations would be required for six out of the 14 main routes identified within the study area assuming both SEP and DEP are constructed, with a maximum 4% change in route length.</i>" Do you agree with the 4% as a likely worst-case scenario for deviation of existing routes as a result of the construction of DEP and SEP, and if so, what would be the impacts of this to the shipping industry that uses this area.</p>
Q1.19.1.10	Applicant	<p><b>Navigational Management Plan</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Further to the discussions at ISH1, respond to the points raised by Trinity House with regards to the provision of a navigational management plan, forming a separate entity to the 'Aid to Navigation Plan' and how this would be secured through the dDMLs.
<b>Q1.19.2 Impact on Radar, Search and Rescue</b>		
Q1.19.2.1	Maritime and Coastguard Agency Trinity House UK Chamber of Shipping	<b>Layout Principles for Search and Rescue</b> Are you satisfied that the dDMLs contained within the dDCO would secure the necessary commitments to enable safe and practical search and rescue operations? If not, what additional wording/ drafting would you wish to see inserted?

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.20. Noise and Vibration</b>		
<b>Q1.20.1 Adequacy of the Assessments for Construction</b>		
Q1.20.1.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<b>Methodology – Baseline Noise Survey</b> The ES [APP-109, Paragraph 51] states that the baseline survey methodology was agreed with BDC. Large parts of the cable corridor, landfall and the substation are located in other local authority areas (NNDC and SNDC). Do NCC, NNDC and SNDC agree with the scope and extent of the baseline survey?
Q1.20.1.2	Applicant Local Authorities	<b>Methodology - Baseline Noise Assumptions</b> a) What is the justification for not undertaking baseline noise surveys at sensitive receptors along the onshore cable route and assuming a Category A threshold value [APP-109]? b) Further, explain why no surveys were undertaken in proximity to the main construction compound at Attlebridge. c) Is it possible that actual baseline levels at the sensitive receptors could be lower than assumed? d) If so, what impact would this have on the assessment?
Q1.20.1.3	Applicant	<b>Main Construction Compound</b> It was put to the Applicant at ISH2 [EV-020] [EV-024], in relation to the Attlebridge main compound noise assessment, that 8 years is not a temporary period and the use of construction noise standards rather than operational noise standards would be more appropriate. Respond to these suggestions.
Q1.20.1.4	Local Authorities	<b>Methodologies – Noise and Vibration</b> Do NCC, NNDC, SNDC and BDC agree with the Construction Phase Noise, Road Traffic Noise Assessment and Construction Phase Vibration Assessment Methodologies adopted in the ES [APP-109], including the predicted construction noise and vibration levels?
Q1.20.1.5	Applicant	<b>Methodology – Construction Traffic Vibrations Assumptions</b> The assessment of vibration impacts due to construction traffic using public roads has been excluded from the assessment scope, noting that DMRB LA111 states " <i>a maintained road surface will be free of irregularities as part of project design and under general</i>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<i>maintenance, so operational vibration will not have the potential to lead to significant adverse effects". The ExA observed on the USI [EV-001] visit that many of the roads that would be used by HGVs are rural in nature with irregularities in the road surface. Is this position therefore justified?</i>
Q1.20.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology – Identification of Sensitive Receptors</b></p> <p>The Applicant accepted at ISH2 [EV-020] [EV-024] that not all sensitive receptors (residential properties) that will be affected by construction works along the cable corridor have been identified and assessed in the ES.</p> <p>a) Provide justification for this.</p> <p>b) Set out how mitigation for such omitted properties will be secured if they are not identified or assessed in any of the application documentation.</p>
<b>Q1.20.2 Construction Effects on Sensitive Receptors</b>		
Q1.20.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Cable Corridor</b></p> <p>For construction works along the cable corridor (i.e. installation of temporary access tracks and work areas and cable duct and installation) a number of moderate and major adverse effects to sensitive receptors are identified in Table 23-24 of the ES [APP-109]. The ES [APP-109] sets out that these are linear in nature and are expected to be undertaken in 1km sections, requiring a construction presence for up to 4 weeks per section. The ES [APP-109] also notes that for these linear activities, to identify the impact duration, it is necessary to calculate the maximum distance from the activity to the sensitive receptor at which it could cause an exceedance of the Threshold Value.</p> <p>a) How have these distances [APP-109, Paragraph 153] been calculated and where is this set out?</p> <p>b) Would such distances not depend on the site-specific nature of the area?</p>
Q1.20.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Cable Corridor</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-109, Paragraph 154] sets out that to identify whether a significant effect is likely to occur, it is necessary to establish the length of time the works will be less than the maximum distance from each sensitive receptor. The ES [APP-109, Paragraph 155] uses an example of one activity as a worse case 'cable duct and installation works'. The assessment finds that the exceedance of the Threshold Value at a receptor would only last</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		for one week and therefore highly unlikely to exceed the Threshold Value for more than 40 days in any 6-month period or 10 days in any 15. The ES [APP-109, Paragraph 155] then concludes that the identified moderate and major adverse impacts due to construction works along the cable corridor route are considered not significant. Further to discussions at ISH2 [EV-020] [EV-024], provide additional justification in terms of whether such an approach ignores the likelihood of different construction activities being undertaken straight after one another resulting in noise levels over the Threshold Value for 10 days or more in any 15 day period?
Q1.20.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Traffic at Link 137</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-109, Paragraph 187] finds that mitigation measures are required for construction traffic flows on link 137 in order to ensure additional traffic does not result in a change in the basic noise level of 3dB or more for a period of 40 or more days in any 6-month period. It is set out that this is secured through the OCoCP [APP-302]. Where is this secured in the OCoCP?</p>
Q1.20.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Traffic at Links 58 and 90</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-109, Paragraph 182] sets out that the significance of impacts on these links (58 and 90) are considered no worse than moderate adverse i.e. not significant. In other subject matters in the ES, moderate adverse has been considered as significant. Why it is different here?</p>
Q1.20.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Operational</b></p> <p>a) The ES [APP-109] finds that it is necessary to define operational noise level limits which will need to be complied with by the original equipment manufacturer, based on predictive noise modelling and assessment to be undertaken during the detailed design phase. It is set out that compliance with these limits is secured by R21 - Control of Noise During Operational Phase. R21 does not include any specified noise levels. Explain why this is the case?</p> <p>b) Further, the need to incorporate noise mitigation measures around some components within the substation is referred to in the ES. Where are these measures specifically secured?</p>
Q1.20.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Vibration Assessment</b></p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		The ES [APP-109] sets out that the predicted PPV levels are between 10 and 15 mm.s <sup>-1</sup> at receptor CCR9. How was this calculated and has there been an assessment for all other sensitive receptors?
Q1.20.2.7	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Vibration Effects</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-109] notes that to control the risk of vibration-induced cosmetic damage to no greater than 5%, any vibratory compaction should be at least 8m from a residential property. Given some receptors are within this distance, does such mitigation need to be secured and specifically referred to in the noise and vibration section of the OCoCP [APP-302], along with all of potential mitigation measures set out in Paragraph 212 of the ES [APP-109]?</p>
Q1.20.2.8	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Vibration Effects</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-109] concludes that, ground compaction is only likely to be within 48m of any sensitive receptors for less than one day and that such a short duration of exposure means that vibration impacts on human receptors due to ground compaction will be no greater than minor adverse significance i.e. not significant.</p> <p>a) Is there any guidance that supports taking duration into account?</p> <p>b) Does this overlook the level/ intensity of vibration experienced at each receptor?</p>
<b>Q1.20.3 Cumulative Effects Assessment</b>		
Q1.20.3.1	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Noise Assessment Scenarios</b></p> <p>What is the difference between the '2025 Factored Base versus 2025 Factored Base + Peak Construction SEP/DEP concurrent plus NV and HOW03' and '2025 Factored Base + Peak Construction SEP/DEP concurrent versus 2025 Factored Base + Peak Construction Tandem (SEP/DEP concurrent) plus NV and HOW03' scenarios [APP-109]?</p>
Q1.20.3.2	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Noise Potential Impacts</b></p> <p>Where have the figures/findings in Sections 23.7.3.3.1, 23.7.3.3.2 and 23.7.3.3.4 of the ES [APP-109] been derived, as they do not reflect the results of Tables 23.2.5 and 23.2.6 of the Road Traffic Noise Assessment [APP-265] in terms of number of links assessed or magnitude of effects?</p>
Q1.20.3.3	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Noise Impacts at Landfall</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Is reliance on mitigation from Hornsea Project Three OWF and this project sufficient to ensure that no significant adverse effects would occur? Is there a need for a commitment to ensure that works do not take place at the same time?
<b>Q1.20.4 Adequacy and Design of Proposed Mitigation</b>		
Q1.20.4.1	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Adequacy of Proposed Onshore Mitigation</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-109] finds that there are many sensitive receptors where moderate or major adverse impacts during construction activities are identified, including the night-time period from trenchless crossing works. In some cases (as shown in [APP-266, Table 23.3.4]), the exceedance of the threshold is significant. The ES [APP-109] sets out a number of generic mitigation measures, including the use of a CNMP.</p> <p>a) Applicant, set out the typical noise level reduction that such generic mitigation measures could feasibly achieve.</p> <p>b) Receptor CCR2C has an anticipated noise level for trenchless crossings of 89db (one of the highest examples). Based on Table 23-11: Construction Noise Magnitude of Effect Criteria of the ES [APP-109] to ensure no significant effect there would need to be no greater than 50db during the night time period. A reduction of 39db would therefore be required from the proposed mitigation. Provide a detailed mitigation scheme for receptor CCR2C to demonstrate this can be realistically achieved.</p>
Q1.20.4.2	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Construction Traffic</b></p> <p>Within the ES [APP-109] is it appropriate to apply the parameters of duration of effects set out in BS 5228-1 (40 days in any 6-month period)? Also, where in BS 5228-1 is this set out?</p>
Q1.20.4.3	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Monitoring Operational Noise</b></p> <p>To be effective should dDCO R21 be explicit about where monitoring should be done, such as the onshore substation? Provide revised wording if so.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.21. Oil, Gas and Other offshore infrastructure and activities</b>		
<b>Q1.21.1 Safety measures</b>		
Q1.21.1.1	Applicant Statutory Undertakers	<b>Diagrams</b> Provide maps and diagrams showing the extent, path and location of all offshore infrastructure assets within 2km of the Proposed Development. Where there is overlap with the Order limits, denote this with a light pink shading. Where there is an overlap that causes concern or potential conflict (for example, with exclusion zones), denote these with a darker red shading. This exercise will assist in identifying where concerns are and the degree of interaction between various projects.
Q1.21.1.2	Statutory Undertakers Interested Parties	<b>Protective Provisions</b> Set out clearly, if these are not already covered within the schedules to the dDCO, the specific protective provisions you would require in order to be satisfied that the infrastructure and assets you own/ operate would be safe and secure. Provide reasoning behind each of the specified provisions.
<b>Q1.21.2 Effectiveness of Proposed Mitigation</b>		
Q1.21.2.1	Applicant	<b>Mitigation Options</b> ES Chapter 16 [APP-102], paragraphs 95 (16.6.1.1.4) and 142 (16.6.2.1.4) sets out 'additional mitigation options.' How are these to be consulted upon, selected and secured within the dDCO, within either the Protective Provisions or the suite of management plans?
Q1.21.2.2	Applicant	<b>Cable Crossings</b> Update the Examination on negotiations with undertakers on the design and feasibility of providing cable crossings over other cables and pipes on the sea bed.

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.22. Socio-economics effects</b>		
<b>Q1.22.1 Effects on recreation, tourism and business</b>		
Q1.22.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Change in Demographics</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Paragraph 131] sets out that given the type of accommodation that would typically be used by these construction workers it is assumed that these workers will not compete with and displace homeless people and their families. What is the justification for this assumption, and could both not compete for B&amp;B or hotel bedspaces?</p>
Q1.22.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Change in Demographics</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Paragraph 132] refers to the Visit England (Visit England, 2022) latest data on occupancy rates for May 2022 and shows that room occupancy rates in the East of England are currently at an average of 79% during 2022 (compared to pre pandemic levels of 78% during 2019).</p> <p>a) Does this represent the worst-case scenario?</p> <p>b) Can the applicant provide room occupancy data for the summer period, including the school holidays?</p>
Q1.22.1.3	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects – Change in Demographics</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Section 27.7.3.5] considers the cumulative impacts with other projects on the change in demographics during construction. This focuses largely on the workforce required for the Sizewell C project. How many bedspaces are likely to be required cumulatively from the relevant projects and are there likely to be sufficient bedspaces in the area?</p>
Q1.22.1.4	Norfolk County Council Norfolk District Council	<p><b>Tourist Income</b></p> <p>In respect of the tourism assets on offer:</p> <p>a) Explain the main forms of tourism within Norfolk and, if possible, specifically in the areas where the Proposed Development would be located.</p> <p>b) Explain the revenue that is derived from tourists visiting Weybourne Beach.</p> <p>c) Explain how construction works, particularly road closures and traffic management measures, deter or otherwise impinge on a tourist’s desire to visit and explore Norfolk.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.22.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Visual Impact of Offshore Works on Volume and Value of Tourism Activity</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113] finds a magnitude of effect of negligible (construction, operation and cumulative), which is largely based on a limited amount of research examining the relationship between the visual impacts of OWF and their construction upon tourism activity and the associated visitor economy. In these circumstances, should a precautionary approach be taken, and can a negligible effect be justified?</p>
Q1.22.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Impact of Onshore Works on Volume and Value of Tourism Activity</b></p> <p>Given the findings of other assessments in the ES (such as Landscape and Visual Impact, Noise and Vibration and Traffic and Transport) can findings of a negligible magnitude of effect at the 'Landfall and cable corridor within the North Norfolk AONB' and the 'Main onshore cable corridor from the North Norfolk AONB to the substation' be justified?</p>
Q1.22.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Impact of Onshore Works on Volume and Value of Tourism Activity</b></p> <p>What is the justification for the ES [APP-113] finding that the main onshore cable corridor from the North Norfolk AONB to the substation has a sensitivity of receptor of medium? Provide further commentary on this matter.</p>
Q1.22.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Impacts of Onshore Works on Volume and Value of Tourism Activity</b></p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment [APP-113] for onshore works on volume and value of tourism activity sets out that this project, Hornsea Project Three, Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas (who's construction activity would overlap) would all have minor adverse impacts in their own right. Consequently, is the cumulative effects assessment's overall finding that there would be a minor adverse cumulative effect justified?</p>
Q1.22.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Woodlands Farm and Swannington 'From Farm to Fork'</b></p> <p>During the USI [EV-001], the ExA travelled along the single track lane to the premises of Swannington 'From Farm to Fork'. The works plans [AS-005, Sheet 21/40] show the road and several farm tracks being utilised as construction accesses. Whilst explaining the necessity for these tracks, can the Applicant set out the duration of works within the vicinity and the likely impacts upon the business in terms of customer access, deliveries and general farm/ sales operations.</p>
Q1.22.1.10	Lighthouse Development Consulting and	<p><b>Interaction with Solar Farm</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

	Applicant	<p>Works 12A/B or 12C involve the laying of cables within proximity to the permitted solar farm. Your relevant representation [RR-051] suggests cables should be laid via HDD at a depth of 10-20m.</p> <p>a) What is the justification for this suggested depth and what subterranean infrastructure is being laid as part of the solar farm apparatus?</p> <p>b) Applicant, provide details of the proposed HDD depth underneath the solar farm.</p>
<b>Q1.22.2 Effects on jobs and skills</b>		
Q1.22.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology – Magnitude of Effect</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Table 27.8] sets out the criteria for assessing magnitude of effect related to economic and employment receptors. It is noted that the ranges set out in the table are based on professional judgement, and are informed by experience from other, similar projects.</p> <p>a) What has informed these professional judgements?</p> <p>b) What other projects are the ones referred to?</p> <p>c) Are the criteria justified and do they allow the benefits associated with the varying construction scenarios (including local or UK based port options) to be fully appreciated?</p>
Q1.22.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology – Accommodation Assumptions</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113] at several points sets out that under the worst-case scenario, it is assumed that half of all (i.e. 330) non-East Anglia-based workers would require accommodation within the study area. What is the justification for this assumption?</p>
Q1.22.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Economic and Employment Benefits – Port Option</b></p> <p>It is clear in the ES [APP-113] that the local port option would secure much greater economic benefits and employment opportunities from the project in the East Anglia area. In order to maximise local benefits would the Applicant be content for this to be secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.22.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Economic Benefits – Scenarios</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Table 27.14] sets out that if there were to be concurrent or sequential construction of SEP and DEP there would be £7 million GVA generated per annum (in the East Anglia area) during operation. The table also shows that in isolation DEP would</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		generate £5.8 million GVA and SEP £5.3 million GVA. In isolation the total GVA generated across the two projects would be £11.1 million. Why does GVA generated drop so significantly if both SEP and DEP are in operation at the same time?
Q1.22.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Employment</b></p> <p>Where have the figures set out in the ES [APP-113, Paragraph 186] been derived, as they do not reflect those set out in Table 27.15?</p>
Q1.22.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Change in Demographics</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Paragraph 130] sets out that: "<i>SEP and DEPs Offshore installation, foundation, wind turbines, cable, offshore substation workers will stay on the respective installation vessels. As will also be the case for the commissioning team (who will stay on the service operation vessel)</i>". Is this secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.22.2.7	Applicant	<p><b>Outline Skills and Employment Plan</b></p> <p>Where have the figures in the Paragraph 24 of the OSEP [APP-310] been derived, as they do not reflect those in the Table 27.15 of the ES [APP-113]?</p>
Q1.22.2.8	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Outline Skills and Employment Plan</b></p> <p>The OSEP [APP-310] sets out that the Applicant intends to work with the relevant sector and local authority bodies to help secure economic benefits of the OWF to the local area and identifies a number of general outline commitment examples. Is the OSEP currently sufficient to ensure local socio-economic benefits are secured and maximised, and are firmer commitments and targets for local employment and skills/training needed, particularly to realise the potential benefits set out in the ES [APP-113]?</p>
<b>Q1.22.3 Effects on Individuals and Communities</b>		
Q1.22.3.1	Applicant	<p><b>Determination of Project Benefits</b></p> <p>The ExA consider that the benefits set out in the Planning Statement represent the maximum implementation of the Proposed Development (i.e. if SEP and DEP were developed in full). However, the dDCO [AS-009] allows for either project to be developed in isolation. Therefore:</p> <p>a) Would it be appropriate to say any benefits from the scheme would be halved if only one project went ahead?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>b) Would it be appropriate to say the benefits would be reduced if only the minimum number of turbines was constructed (bottom of the ranges)?</p> <p>c) In a situation where only one project went ahead, with the minimum number of turbines being provided, that could be argued to be the worst-case scenario in terms of delivering benefits. At what point, therefore, would the Applicant consider that the benefits would not outweigh the adverse effects?</p> <p>d) It is implied (for example in Paragraph 1008 of the RIAA) that none of the consented OWF are being built to their build-out capacity and design. The DOW itself is said not to have been fully constructed. To this extent, what confidence can the ExA have that the current Proposed Development would be fully built out and what weight can the ExA place on the scheme's benefits when there appears a likelihood the full capacity of the project may not be realised?</p>
Q1.22.3.2	Local Authorities	<p><b>Development Consent Obligations</b></p> <p>NNDC [RR-069] reference potential community benefits being secured through an obligation. Describe to the Examination the nature and extent of any benefits you consider are necessary relative to the impacts of the Proposed Development, setting out how these comply with the CIL Regulations and the justification for them.</p>
Q1.22.3.3	Applicant	<p><b>Disturbance to Social, Community and Healthcare Infrastructure</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Paragraph 147] notes that the sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as high. However, Paragraph 146 concluded that the receptor had a medium sensitivity. Please can the applicant confirm which is correct?</p>
Q1.22.3.4	Applicant	<p><b>Disturbance to Healthcare Infrastructure</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-113, Paragraph 143] notes that using benchmark estimates of 1,800 patient registrations per one FTE GP (developed by the London Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU), 2019), it is estimated that the additional 330 non-East Anglia-based workers would generate demand for 0.2 FTE GP during construction and 0.1 FTE GP during operation within the study area. What is the justification for the project not providing a contribution to meeting these increased demands?</p>
Q1.22.3.5	Applicant	<p><b>Disturbance to Social, Community and Healthcare Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Where have the figures set out in Paragraph 204 of the ES [APP-113] been derived, as they do not reflect those set out in Table 27.15?</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.22.3.6	Applicant	<b>Potential Cumulative Impacts – Disturbance to Social, Community and Healthcare Infrastructure</b> Can the applicant provide further details on the likely impact of the projects cumulatively with other relevant projects on healthcare such as demand for GP FTE?
Q1.22.3.7	Applicant	<b>Potential Cumulative Impacts – Disturbance to Social, Community and Healthcare Infrastructure</b> The cumulative effects assessment [APP-113] finds minor adverse impacts for disturbance to social, community and health infrastructure for both the construction and operation phase. Given the far greater number of workers associated with construction for this scheme than operation and given this is likely to be the same for the other relevant projects, can the finding of the same level of adverse effect be justified?
<b>Q1.22.4 Inter-related Effects on Human Health and Community Well-being</b>		
Q1.22.4.1	Applicant	<b>Community Fund/ Compensation</b> The ExA understands that the existing OWF have established community funds. The ES [APP-113] does not propose such a fund in this case as mitigation. It has been suggested by several interested parties that one should be provided to off-set any impacts on local communities. Why is this project different to the existing OWF in this regard?

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.23. Traffic and Transport</b>		
<b>Q1.23.1 Effects from Construction Vehicles on the Highway Network and Living Conditions</b>		
Q1.23.1.1	Applicant Norfolk County Council	<b>Methodology – Summer Peak</b> The ES [APP-110, Table 24-10] includes links that have ‘summer peak’ sensitive periods. The ExA asked the Applicant at ISH2 [EV-020] [EV-024] what had been done to assess summer peaks. The Applicant and NCC set out that they were in discussions about ‘sensitivity checking’ on such matters. Provide an update on these discussions.
Q1.23.1.2	Applicant	<b>Methodology – Movement Assumptions</b> The ES [APP-110] sets out in several places that in order to consider a worst-case scenario, the peak demand hour flows include the assumption that employees (LVs) will arrive and depart within a single hour and that HGV movements would be one-tenth of the daily demand. a) Would there not likely be a peak of HGV traffic in the am period to deliver materials needed for that day? b) If so, are the assumptions used for HGVs justified?
Q1.23.1.3	National Highways Norfolk County Council	<b>Methodology – Trip Generation and Construction Traffic Assignment</b> Are the Highway Authorities content with the methodology and forecasts for trip generation and construction traffic assignment?
Q1.23.1.4	Applicant Norfolk County Council	<b>Potential Impacts – Driver Delay (Capacity)</b> The ES [APP-110, Table 24-43] shows that there are increases in traffic above 10% (considered to be within daily fluctuations) for numerous links (9, 11, 14, 15, 49, 51, 54, 56, 59, 72, 73, 79 and 98). Some of the traffic increases are up to 32% on what are already deemed to be sensitive roads by NCC. a) Is the judgement of a low magnitude of effect on these links justified? b) Do NCC have any concerns in this regard?
Q1.23.1.5	Applicant	<b>Potential Impacts – Driver Delay (Capacity)</b> The ES [APP-110, Paragraph 534] suggests that proposed mitigation for links 7, 9 and 11 (limiting peak HGV movements) would by definition reduce the peak HGV movements on

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>links 14 and 15, as HGV traffic travelling to links 7, 9 and 11 from Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth pass via these links.</p> <p>a) Having regard to the study area, would HGVs travel along links 15, 14, 13 and then 12 instead to reach the Weybourne area?</p> <p>b) If so, is this assumption justified?</p>
Q1.23.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Driver Delay (Capacity)</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-110, Paragraph 539] proposes that vehicle movements via links 72, 73, 79 and 98 are capped to not exceed those proposed for SEP or DEP in isolation. However, this does not appear to have been secured in the OCTMP [APP-301]. What is the reason for this?</p>
Q1.23.1.7	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Impacts – Driver Delay (Highway Constraints)</b></p> <p>What is the justification for a low magnitude of effect for Link 8 in the concurrent scenario [APP-110, Table 24-45], when it was judged to be of medium magnitude for the isolation scenario [APP-110, Table 24-44] where there would be less traffic?</p>
Q1.23.1.8	Oulton Parish Council	<p><b>Oulton</b></p> <p>At OFH1 [EV-009] [EV-010], Oulton Parish Council set out that it is concerned about traffic on the local roads around Oulton. Provide a description and a map if possible, showing the specific areas of concern.</p>
Q1.23.1.9	Cawston Parish Council	<p><b>Cawston</b></p> <p>Cawston Parish Council at OFH1 [EV-009] [EV-010] referred to transport evidence and photos that were provided to the examinations of previous OWF projects. Provide copies of any of relevance to the Proposed Development.</p>
<p><b>Q1.23.2 Traffic Management Proposals and Impacts on the Highway Network</b></p>		
Q1.23.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology – Magnitude of Effects</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-110, Table 24-13] sets out the magnitude of effects for each potential effect. Is the lack of any defined thresholds for driver delay (capacity and highway constraints) for low to high effects justified?</p>
Q1.23.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology – TA</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		The TA [APP-268, Table 2] shows that some of the data sources date back to 2017. Can these be considered representative of the current highway network?
Q1.23.2.3	Norfolk County Council	<p><b>The A140</b></p> <p>In proximity to the entrance into Mangreen Road and the location of the substation, the ExA noted signage regarding a "Bridge Safety Scheme", and this appeared to be speed related. Could the exact nature of the safety scheme be described and, subsequently, whether the Proposed Development would have any implications or adverse effects in this regard?</p>
<p><b>Q1.23.3 Cumulative Traffic Effects with Other Local Projects</b></p>		
Q1.23.3.1	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects - Construction Compounds</b></p> <p>Explain, with the use of maps as necessary, the location of the main and secondary construction compounds for Hornsea Project 3, Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard, showing their proximity to those compounds suggested for the Proposed Development.</p>
Q1.23.3.2	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects Methodology – Norfolk Boreas OWF</b></p> <p>The Norfolk Boreas OWF is listed as one that could act cumulatively with this project [APP-110, Paragraph 574]. However, the cumulative assessment link screening [APP-110, Table 24-54] does not include the development. At ISH2 [EV-020] [EV-024] the Applicant set out that this is because Norfolk Vanguard project will lay ducts for the Norfolk Boreas project. Confirm, with supporting evidence, that all construction traffic from the Norfolk Boreas project has been taken into account in the cumulative effects assessment for traffic and transport.</p>
Q1.23.3.3	Applicant National Highways	<p><b>Cumulative Effects Methodology – Highway Schemes</b></p> <p>It is noted in the cumulative effects methodology [APP-110, Paragraphs 148-150] that the identified highway improvement schemes are all currently scheduled to be complete by 2025 and as such there may be no overlap with the construction phase of SEP and DEP. Is this still anticipated to be the case for all highway schemes?</p>
Q1.23.3.4	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects – Assessment</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-110, Table 24-51 (Impact 5)] under rationale sets out that there may be cumulative effects possible at links 9, 11, 53, 54, 56 and 59, where the magnitude of effect is greater than negligible. Explain why only those links have been referenced when</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		the ES [APP-110, Paragraph 526] identifies that links 14, 15, 49, 51, 72, 73, 79 and 98 also would have a magnitude of effect is greater than negligible?
Q1.23.3.5	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects – Assessment</b></p> <p>Explain why the figures in ES [APP-110] Table 24-54 for links 47, 80 and 90 do not match those in ES [APP-110] Table 24-20?</p>
Q1.23.3.6	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects – Cross project co-operation</b></p> <p>A proposed mitigation to minimise the effects of construction traffic in the ES [APP-110] is to agree a 'cap' on vehicle movements on some links. This requires agreement with other existing consented NSIP projects.</p> <p>a) Is there any evidence before the Examination that negotiations/ discussions are ongoing or likely to reach a positive conclusion?</p> <p>b) What weight should the ExA be giving to this mitigation when it relies on third parties to secure the measure?</p> <p>c) At ISH2 [EV-020] [EV-024] the Applicant set out that if the other NSIP projects would not 'share' their cap on the affected links with them that construction traffic would need to be diverted to other routes. Provide evidence to show this is feasible.</p>
Q1.23.3.7	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects – A1067 at Attlebridge</b></p> <p>Vattenfall [RR-119] has noted that the A1067 (the main route serving the preferred DEP/SEP main construction compound location) is also a road link for construction traffic for Norfolk Vanguard and have raised concern whether assessment of cumulative traffic impacts on the A1067 has taken this into account. The ExA note that Link 80 considers such cumulative movements. However, are there any other links along the A1067 which will be affected by traffic from both projects?</p>
<b>Q1.23.4 Effects on Recreational Routes, such as Public Rights of Way</b>		
Q1.23.4.1	Applicant	<p><b>Pedestrian Delay Assessment</b></p> <p>Provide Appendix 24.3 - Pedestrian Delay Assessment [APP-271] with all figures showing. Some columns have '#VALUE!' throughout.</p>
<b>Q1.23.5 Suitability of Access Strategy</b>		

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.23.5.1	National Highways	<p><b>Abnormal Indivisible Loads</b></p> <p>NH (responsible for the A47) have not been able to structurally confirm the route for abnormal indivisible loads [APP-270] as there are two structures of concern (Scarning Bridge and a culvert located between Kings Lynn and Swaffham). It is set out that NH is still reviewing these structures to establish if the route can be cleared. What is the up-to-date position on this?</p>
Q1.23.5.2	Applicant	<p><b>Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Explain the rationale behind the number of accesses required during construction and how these have been minimised as far as possible?</p>
Q1.23.5.3	Applicant	<p><b>Access Strategy</b></p> <p>The Access to Works Plans [AS-006] include 'Early Works Accesses' what are these and will they have any potential highway effects? Further, why can't the locations of the construction work accesses be used?</p>
Q1.23.5.4	Applicant	<p><b>Access Strategy – Substation</b></p> <p>Is there any update on the likely arrangements for access to the substation?</p>
Q1.23.5.5	Applicant	<p><b>Access Strategy</b></p> <p>Is leaving detailed design of the required accesses to the CTMP appropriate and what likelihood is there that a suitable design with adequate visibility splays can be achieved within the order limits or the public highway in all cases?</p>
Q1.23.5.6	Applicant	<p><b>East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust</b></p> <p>The Trust [RR-029] is concerned that information to determine the traffic and transport effects arising from the construction phase of the Proposed Development and the likely impact on EEAST's operational capacity, efficiency and resources (including the likely highway disruption and delay) is currently absent from the application documentation and its related mitigation measures.</p> <p>a) Have you done any modelling or assessment to determine delays?</p> <p>b) Are further discussions between the parties taking place and what is the scope of any potential mitigation measures that might be being considered (if any)?</p>
<p><b>Q1.23.6 Effectiveness of Proposed Mitigation Measures</b></p>		

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.23.6.1	Applicant National Highways Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Mitigation – A47</b></p> <p>The TA [APP-268] identifies significant impacts on two junctions of the A47 that fall within the study area. Both of these junctions are proposed to be removed by highway improvement schemes.</p> <p>a) What is the latest position on these improvement projects (A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Development Consent Order and A47-A11 Thickthorn Junction Development Consent Order) and are they still forecast to be completed before the construction of the Proposed Development starts?</p> <p>b) Should they not be delivered are the mitigation measures set out in the OCTMP sufficient as a 'fallback' to ensure there are not any significant impacts on the road network?</p> <p>c) If the improvement works under either of the DCOs were to be delayed and occur concurrently with the onshore construction programme of this project, would the OCTMP for the Proposed Development, taken together with other OCTMP, provide adequate 'fallback' mitigation for the cumulative effects of both projects on the road network?</p> <p>d) Further to b) and c) above, what confidence can the ExA have that adequate mitigation measures are available and achievable in these scenarios?</p>
Q1.23.6.2	Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation – Controls on HGV Routes</b></p> <p>The OCTMP [APP-301] sets out that there will be no HGV traffic through: Attlebridge, Barford, Blind Lane, Cantley Road, Cawston, Horsford, Oulton and Weston Longville. How are the measures set out within the OCTMP [APP-301] sufficient to ensure that this does not occur?</p>
Q1.23.6.3	Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation – Traffic Limits</b></p> <p>To reduce some identified impacts the ES [APP-110] sets out that peak daily HGV and LV demand on several links should not exceed the forecast average daily demand.</p> <p>a) What affect would this have on construction practices and timeframes?</p> <p>b) Further, would some HGVs be re-routed on to other nearby roads potentially increasing impacts on those links?</p>
Q1.23.6.4	Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation – Highway Constraints</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		Where there would be the potential for significant effects, the ES [APP-110, Table 24-48] states that mitigation options would include creating or widening passing places. What work has been done to consider whether this is likely to be possible at each link and whether such land would be within the highway boundary?
Q1.23.6.5	Applicant	<b>Mitigation – Link 61</b> The ES [APP-110, Table 24-33] sets out that Link 61 should have a limit on LVs imposed (average peak hour demand) to mitigate impacts on amenity. What is the justification for not requiring a HGV trip limit on this link?
Q1.23.6.6	Applicant	<b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan / dDCO</b> The OCTMP [APP-301] refers to the potential need to undertake highway improvements under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended). In order for such works are appropriately secured should this be referred to within the dDCO itself?
Q1.23.6.7	Applicant	<b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> The OCTMP [APP-301] sets out at Table A1.1 peak vehicle trips per link. Why do many of the figures not match those in Table 24-19 and Table 24-20 of the ES, including some that require limits (Links 84 and 90)?
Q1.23.6.8	Applicant	<b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> The OCTMP [APP-301] sets out at Table A1.1 peak vehicle trips per link. Should the figures for 'All' for Link 7 match those for HGVs, as no LVs are forecast to use the link?
Q1.23.6.9	Applicant	<b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> The OCTMP [APP-301] sets out at Table A1.1 peak vehicle trips per link. For Link 61 the 'All vehicle' limits are higher than the HGV limits. Is this an error?
Q1.23.6.10	Applicant	<b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> The OCTMP [APP-301] sets out at Table A1.1 peak vehicle trips per link. The overall caps for HGVs are different in each scenario for Link 90. What is the reason for this?
Q1.23.6.11	National Rail (Network Rail)	<b>Protection of Railway Assets</b> The Proposed Development comes into close proximity to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The North Norfolk Railway at Sheringham/ Weybourne;</li> </ul>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The line into Norwich north of Ketteringham; and</li> <li>• The line into Norwich running adjacent to the A140.</li> </ul> <p>a) In each instance, do you consider a sufficient distance/ margin/ offset has been provided between the edge of the construction works and the edge of the railway embankments/ tracks?</p> <p>b) If not, explain why and what is required to reassure that railway assets would not be adversely affected.</p>
Q1.23.6.12	Applicant	<p><b>Harbour Revision Order</b></p> <p>In the OCTMP [APP-301, Paragraph 13], the following is written:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant is currently considering ports suitable for the construction base for the offshore elements of SEP and DEP, but no decision has been made at the time of writing over which to utilise. As such, the DCO application for SEP and DEP does not seek development consent for activities at potential construction ports. Where necessary, any such development activity would be subject to separate consent(s) such as a planning permission or a Harbour Revision Order and would therefore be subject to a separate Transport Assessment and/or CTMP."</i></p> <p>Explain:</p> <p>a) Should the construction traffic associated with port activities not be factored into the ES?</p> <p>b) How would a Harbour Revision Order be applied for and in what way would this interact with the Development Consent Order sought?</p> <p>c) If traffic going to a port is subject of a separate consent, transport assessment and CTMP, should this not feature in the cumulative effects assessment?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

<b>Q1.24. Water quality and resources</b>		
<b>Q1.24.1 Effects on Flood Risk and Drainage, including Adequacy of Sequential and Exception Tests</b>		
Q1.24.1.1	Applicant	<p><b>Revisions to Planning Practice Guidance</b></p> <p>As discussed at ISH2 [EV-021] [EV-025], on 25 August 2022, significant updates were made to guidance on flood risk and coastal change within the Planning Practice Guidance. Provide a note setting out what implications this has for the submitted FRA [AS-014] and if necessary provide a revised FRA or an addendum, with a summary of key changes.</p>
Q1.24.1.2	Applicant	<p><b>Flood Zone and Vulnerability Classification</b></p> <p>Table 18.2.4 of the FRA [AS-014] appears to be missing the headings. Provide a revised version with the headings in place.</p>
Q1.24.1.3	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Sequential Test</b></p> <p>As discussed at ISH2 [EV-021] [EV-025], the FRA [AS-014] does not appear to apply the sequential test before considering the exception test.</p> <p>a) Applicant, demonstrate how the sequential test has been met and whether any areas of flood risk encountered by the Proposed Development at landfall, the cable corridor and the onshore substation could have feasibly been avoided.</p> <p>b) What is the view of the EA on this matter?</p>
Q1.24.1.4	Applicant	<p><b>Substation Footprint Siting</b></p> <p>Several of the drawings in the FRA [AS-014], most notably Plate 3: 1 in 100 Year Plus 40% for Climate Change Extent in Comparison with the Onshore Substation Layout and those within the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Technical Note [APP-211], show the proposed footprint of the substation falling slightly within the overland flow pathway. Why can this area not be avoided all together?</p>
Q1.24.1.5	Applicant	<p><b>Substation Modelling - Climate Change Allowances</b></p> <p>NCC [RR-064] notes that in Plates 2 to 5 (Pages 69-72) of the FRA [AS-014], the surface water hydraulic modelling results are not consistent with the latest national guidance for climate change allowances. Please provide updated modelling to incorporate the latest climate change allowances.</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.24.1.6	Applicant	<p><b>Substation Drainage</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014] sets out that <i>“As part of the assessment undertaken to date, the scope for using infiltration as the primary option for the surface water drainage continues to be investigated. Initial results from the soakaway testing indicated relatively poor infiltration capacity. However, the geophysical surveys and supplementary ground investigation has found there may be areas of the onshore substation site with relatively good infiltration capacity and these locations are subject to further ongoing investigation”</i>.</p> <p>The Applicant has advised [AS-036] that after further investigations it is now likely to be possible to utilise infiltration directly into the shallow granular zone for drainage. Provide further information on the findings of the investigations and in relation to what discussions have taken place with the EA and NCC on this matter.</p>
Q1.24.1.7	Environment Agency	<p><b>Groundwater Flooding – Substation Site</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 312] notes the substation site as having a 25% to 50% susceptibility to groundwater flood risk. In the same document, at Paragraph 399, it is said that there is a low risk based upon information obtained to date. Would you agree?</p>
Q1.24.1.8	Applicant	<p><b>Groundwater Flooding</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 399] refers to ongoing groundwater monitoring. Can the most recent monitoring data be provided to the Examination (if not already included in the ES).</p>
Q1.24.1.9	Applicant	<p><b>Temporary Compounds Surface Water Drainage</b></p> <p>The Proposed Development includes numerous temporary construction compounds. To ensure that drainage matters are suitably considered, should drainage strategies for each temporary construction compound be agreed with the EA and NCC?</p>
Q1.24.1.10	Environment Agency	<p><b>Surface Water Drainage</b></p> <p>With reference to the FRA [AS-014, Paragraphs 400 – 402] confirm whether the EA is, or is not, content that sufficient drainage information and mitigation is before the Examination to reassure the ExA that the approach to surface water drainage is sound?</p>
Q1.24.1.11	Applicant	<p><b>Receptor Sensitivity</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		The ES [APP-104, Table 18-7] sets out that in terms of flood risk, land with between 1 and 100 residential properties or more than 10 industrial premises is considered to be of a medium sensitivity? Provide further justification for this threshold?
Q1.24.1.12	Applicant	<p><b>Magnitude of Effects – Ordinary Watercourses</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-104, Table 18-14] identifies the magnitude of effect resulting from trenched crossings of ordinary watercourses. The EA [RR-032] raise concern that the assessment does not appear to assess the magnitude of flood risk effects resulting from trenched crossings of ordinary watercourses that are in Fluvial Flood Zones 2 and 3a. What is the applicant’s reply and explain further how the thresholds in Table 18-14 were derived?</p>
Q1.24.1.13	Applicant	<p><b>Magnitude of Effects</b></p> <p>With regard to the ES [APP-104, Table 18-8], what does possible failure of sequential or exception test mean in practice?</p>
Q1.24.1.14	Applicant	<p><b>Significance of Effects</b></p> <p>In the ES [APP-104, Table 18-10] is the introduction of a ‘no impact’ classification justified, is it supported by the overall methodology set out in the ES [APP-091] and is there any other ES topic that contains such a category?</p>
Q1.24.1.15	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Construction Impacts – Direct Disturbance of Surface Water Bodies</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-104] finds that there would be a negligible magnitude of effect on the River Glaven, River Bure, River Yare, River Tiffey and the Intwood Stream from trenched crossings. Table 18-8 sets out that to be considered a negligible magnitude there should be ‘no effect on usability, risk or value’. The ES [APP-104, Paragraph 105], when considering such matters, identifies: <i>“It is likely that in-channel vegetation would be removed in the localised area of trenching, and the structure of the bed and banks of the watercourse would be disturbed. This would temporarily affect the habitat quality and geomorphology and may therefore impact the health of the wider catchment due to the cumulative effect of more than one watercourse within the catchment suffering degradation. However, this effect will be very localised to the affected watercourses and, with reinstatement, would be temporary”</i>. Is a finding of negligible magnitude therefore justified and is a finding (in many cases) of no effect after mitigation realistic?</p>
Q1.24.1.16	Applicant	<p><b>Watercourse at Little Barningham</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		The EA [RR-032] raise concern specifically regarding the ordinary watercourse crossing at Little Barningham (PRoW003) and the potential increase of flood risk to several homes arising from the use of a trenched crossing technique. Can such a crossing be undertaken without increasing flood risk elsewhere?
Q1.24.1.17	Environment Agency	<p><b>Spring Beck Chalk Stream</b></p> <p>The upper reaches of this water feature are within a small natural flood management scheme. Set out in detail the nature and requirements of this scheme, its ultimate purpose and what effects, if unmitigated, the Proposed Development could have on the operation of the scheme.</p>
Q1.24.1.18	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Construction Impacts – Changes to Surface and Groundwater Flows and Flood Risk</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-104, Paragraphs 148 and 149] set out that the magnitude of effects as a result of the construction of SEP or DEP in isolation or concurrently range from negligible to medium related to the number of watercourse crossings and the area of land affected. However, there are no medium magnitude of effects identified in the related Table 18-24 and Table 18-25. Confirm which is correct.</p>
Q1.24.1.19	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Construction Impacts - Changes to Surface and Groundwater Flows and Flood Risk</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-104, Paragraphs 159 and 161] set out that after mitigation the magnitude of effect would be negligible, representing an impact of minor adverse or negligible significance. However, corresponding Tables 18-24 and 18-25 show many as 'no impact'.</p> <p>a) Confirm which is correct.</p> <p>b) Further, can the risk of changes to surface and groundwater flows and flood risk be completely ruled out?</p> <p>c) If not, can a finding of no impact be justified?</p>
Q1.24.1.20	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Operational Impacts - Changes to Surface and Groundwater Flows and Flood Risk</b></p> <p>In the ES [APP-104], is basing the magnitude of effect solely on the area of maximum area of permanent development in each water body catchment justified? What thresholds</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		were used to distinguish between, high, medium, low and negligible and how were these derived?
Q1.24.1.21	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Operational Impacts - Changes to Surface and Groundwater Flows and Flood Risk</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-104, Table 18-30 and Table 18-31] both show that for groundwater bodies (North Norfolk Chalk and Broadland Rivers Chalk and Crag) there would be minor adverse impact significance before mitigation and no impact after mitigation.</p> <p>a) What mitigation would be put in place, as there is no reference to this in the ES?</p> <p>b) Can the risk of changes to surface and groundwater flows and flood risk be completely ruled out?</p> <p>c) If not, can a finding of no impact be justified?</p>
Q1.24.1.22	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Construction Effects – Changes to Surface and Groundwater Flows and Flood Risk</b></p> <p>Where have the residual impacts for SEP and DEP in the ES [APP-104, Table 18-37] been derived, as they do not always match those shown in Table 18-24 and Table 18-25? Confirm which are correct.</p>
<b>Q1.24.2 Effects on Water Resources and Water Quality, including Measures to Prevent Pollution of Aquifers</b>		
Q1.24.2.1	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Magic Maps</b></p> <p>With reference to Paragraphs 70 and 81 of ES [APP-104], can the magic maps (or the data/ or a polygon on a map matching that of the magic map) be submitted to the Examination to give a visual representation of what is being described here?</p>
Q1.24.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Construction Impacts - Increased Sediment Supply and Supply of Contaminants to Surface and Groundwaters</b></p> <p>Is basing the magnitude of effect in the ES [APP-104, Table 18-19] solely on the area of exposed ground per catchment during construction justified, how were the thresholds derived and what other matters could factor into such considerations?</p>
Q1.24.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Potential Construction Impacts – Increased Sediment Supply and Supply of Contaminants to Surface and Groundwaters</b></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		The ES [APP-104] finds that in many cases after mitigation measures are applied that the magnitude of effect alters from negligible to no impact. Can the risk of increased sediment supply and supply of contaminants to surface and groundwaters be completely ruled out? If not, can a finding of no impact be justified?
Q1.24.2.4	Applicant	<b>Potential Construction Impacts – Increased Sediment Supply</b> The residual impact findings for Swannington Beck in the ES [APP-104, Paragraphs 131 and 132] do not match those in Tables 18-20 and 18-21. Confirm which are correct.
Q1.24.2.5	Applicant	<b>Potential Construction Impacts – Supply of Contaminants to Surface and Groundwaters</b> The residual impact findings for Swannington Beck in the ES [APP-104, Paragraphs 142 and 143] do not match those in Tables 18-22 and 18-23. Confirm which are correct.
Q1.24.2.6	Applicant	<b>Potential Operational Impacts – Supply of Contaminants to Surface and Groundwater</b> Is basing the magnitude of effect in the assessment [APP-104] solely on the area of maximum area of permanent development in each water body catchment justified? What thresholds were used to distinguish between, high, medium, low and negligible and how were these derived?
Q1.24.2.7	Applicant	<b>Potential Operational Impacts – Supply of Contaminants to Surface and Groundwater</b> The ES [APP-104] finds that in many cases after mitigation measures are applied that the magnitude of effect alters from negligible to no impact. However, can the risk of increased supply of contaminants to surface and groundwaters be completely ruled out during operation at these receptors? If not, can a finding of no impact be justified?
Q1.24.2.8	Applicant	<b>Cumulative Construction Impacts – Increased Supply of Sediment</b> Where have the residual impacts for SEP and DEP in the ES [APP-104, Table 18-35] been derived, as they do not match those shown in Table 18-20 and Table 18-21? Confirm which are correct.
Q1.24.2.9	Applicant	<b>Cumulative Construction Impacts – Increased Supply of Sediment</b> The ES [APP-104] lists residual impacts for SEP and DEP and those for relevant projects along with mitigation measures that would be implemented for the other schemes, but it

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		does not then always assess what the impact of the combined project would be (For example: Hornsea Project Three). Does this represent a robust assessment?
Q1.24.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Construction Impacts – Supply of Contaminants</b></p> <p>Where have the residual impacts for SEP and DEP in the ES [APP-104, Table 18-36] been derived, as they do not match those shown in Table 18-22 and Table 18-23? Confirm which are correct.</p>
Q1.24.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Operational Impacts – Supply of Contaminants</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-104, Paragraph 219] sets out for Hornsea Project 3 that it is considered that operational processes would have a minor adverse impact in the catchments of the River Tas and Intwood Stream which contain the substation for both Hornsea Project 3 and SEP and DEP, whereas SEP and DEP residual impacts would be negligible. However, Table 18-28 and Table 18-29 identify that SEP and DEP would have a minor adverse impact on the River Tas and Intwood Stream. Confirm which is correct.</p>
Q1.24.2.12	Environment Agency	<p><b>Water Framework Directive</b></p> <p>For both onshore and offshore WFD water bodies, are the EA satisfied with the Applicant's assessments and conclusions from the ES, or are there any areas of concern?</p>
Q1.24.2.13	Applicant	<p><b>Water Framework Directive Waters and Bentonite</b></p> <p>With regards the ES [APP-093, Paragraph 121]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How have you concluded that 25m<sup>3</sup> bentonite loss would occur, given that bentonite breakout is, in itself, an uncontrolled accident?</li> <li>b) How far is the HDD site from the WFD water bodies and bathing areas?</li> <li>c) Would the plume of any suspended bentonite be visible from, or be swept into the region of, the WFD bathing waters?</li> </ol>
Q1.24.2.14	Applicant	<p><b>Marine Disposal Site</b></p> <p>Figure 1 of the Disposal Site Characterisation Report [APP-300] identifies those materials 'won' from the installation process would be disposed of within the confines of the respective OWF construction locations. In the ES [APP-088, Paragraph 23], there is reference to the Cromer Knoll area (and shallow areas) being excluded from the boundary of the DEP North site. How would disposal (and associated plumes of material being carried as suspended sediment) affect these excluded areas?</p>



**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

Q1.24.2.15	Applicant	<p><b>Source Protection Zone 2</b></p> <p>There is a written commitment in the ES [APP-104, Paragraph 83] that there will not be any intrusive works within SPZ2. Signpost where this specific measure is provided for in the dDCO and its suite of management plans.</p>
Q1.24.2.16	Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board	<p><b>Area of Authority</b></p> <p>Within your RR [RR-067] it is identified that the Proposed Development partially falls within an area of your jurisdiction. By way of a map or diagram, please set out where NRIDB's authority extends to and, by way of annotation, which watercourses are within the body's jurisdiction.</p>
Q1.24.2.17	Applicant Interested Parties	<p><b>Private Water Supplies</b></p> <p>Is it justified to address impacts on private water supplies post-consent? If so and further, how is this secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.24.2.18	Applicant	<p><b>Drinking Water Protected Areas</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-104, Paragraph 70] notes that the onshore cable corridor passes through a surface water DWPA towards its southern extent. DWPAs are designated under the WFD where raw water is extracted from rivers and reservoirs and therefore requires additional protection to ensure it is not polluted. What has been done to ensure this?</p>
<p><b>Q1.24.3 Effects on Rivers, Streams, Canals and Ditches from Proposed Construction Methods and Crossing</b></p>		
Q1.24.3.1	Environment Agency Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Watercourse Crossings</b></p> <p>Comment on whether the proposed watercourse avoidance measures, as set out in the FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 158], provide sufficient security for those watercourses and the hydrological systems that feed into them.</p>
Q1.24.3.2	Environment Agency	<p><b>River Crossings and HDD</b></p> <p>The Applicant proposes to cross all major rivers using HDD, stating entry and exit pits will be at least 9m away from riverbanks and the cable depth will be 2m below the channel of each river.</p> <p>a) Are the dimensions from the Applicant sufficient to avoid direct impacts on the watercourses?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<p>b) Are the dimensions from the Applicant sufficient to avoid indirect impacts on the watercourses?</p> <p>c) Given the potential for water run-off and the spread of contaminants from a HDD works compound (75m x 75m), should a greater margin than 9m from a riverbank be sought?</p>
Q1.24.3.3	Applicant	<p><b>Soil Storage</b></p> <p>With reference to the ES [APP-104, Paragraph 140], would soil/ spoil storage also be a minimum of 10m back from any watercourse to avoid potential contamination or excess sediment discharge?</p>
Q1.24.3.4	Environment Agency Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Ordinary Watercourses</b></p> <p>With reference to the ES [APP-104, Paragraphs 104-106], given the extremes of climate that are being experienced, when would the temporary damming of watercourses be scheduled in the construction programme to have the least impact?</p>
<b>Q1.24.4 Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures</b>		
Q1.24.4.1	Applicant	<p><b>Watercourse Consents</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 69] sets out that all necessary applications for watercourse consents will be made to and agreed with the appropriate authority post-DCO consent. Where is this secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.24.4.2	Applicant	<p><b>Perched Groundwater Mitigation</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 173] sets out that the risk to the onshore export cables from perched groundwater, if encountered, would need to be mitigated by appropriate construction techniques and in accordance with an appropriate method statement to ensure Health and Safety and Environmental Permitting requirements are satisfied. Is this fully reflected in the OCoCP [APP-302]?</p>
Q1.24.4.3	Applicant	<p><b>Trenched Crossing Mitigation</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 194] notes that "<i>Where the onshore cable corridor crosses the Ordinary Watercourses, these will be crossed using trenched techniques in some instances. The risk to the onshore export cables will be mitigated by appropriate construction techniques and in accordance with an appropriate method statement to</i></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<i>ensure Health and Safety and Environmental Permitting requirements are satisfied". Is this fully reflected in the OCoCP [APP-302]?</i>
Q1.24.4.4	Applicant	<p><b>Ground Levels</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 210] sets out that <i>"The land will be reinstated, and existing ground levels will be maintained. Mitigation during construction is discussed in Section 18.2.8 in relation to both surface water and Ordinary Watercourses". Is this fully reflected in the OCoCP [APP-302]?</i></p>
Q1.24.4.5	Applicant	<p><b>Substation Site</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 328] recommends that any permanent or temporary access routes, welfare and ancillary infrastructure associated with the onshore substation should be located away from the area of increased surface water flood risk near the northern boundary of the site, where reasonably practical, or designed in such a way so as not to interfere with the area at increased flood risk, to ensure the risk of flooding is minimised and flow conveyance is not inhibited. Where are such measures secured in the dDCO?</p>
Q1.24.4.6	Applicant	<p><b>Substation Site and Overland Flow Pathway</b></p> <p>In relation to the Substation Site, the FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 329] states <i>"Alteration of ground levels within the overland flow pathway should be avoided, where possible. However, further information relating to ground levels will be obtained as part of more detailed site investigations, which will inform the development of appropriate mitigation measures. This will be secured within the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Document reference 9.17)". In addition, it is also stated at Paragraph 333 that: 'Further mitigation measures related to the access road will be required to ensure the development does not increase surface water runoff or exacerbate the flood risk associated with the overland flow pathway. This will be secured within the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Document reference 9.17) and Outline Operational Drainage Plan (Document reference 9.20)". Identify where in these documents such measures are secured.</i></p>
Q1.24.4.7	Applicant	<p><b>Landfall Compound</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 342] sets out that <i>"In the event of a tidal flood being forecast, mitigation measures will need to be put in place to ensure that materials remain confined to the compound and portable offices, welfare facilities and storage are secured, to prevent and minimise damages from flood waters. This will be secured within the</i></p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

		<i>Outline Code of Construction Practice (Document reference 9.17)”. Where are such measures secured in the OCoCP [APP-302]?</i>
Q1.24.4.8	Applicant Environment Agency Norfolk County Council	<p><b>Site-Specific Investigations at Crossings</b></p> <p>The FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 410] identifies that site-specific investigations will be carried out and crossing methodologies produced at detailed design stage to identify the local ground and groundwater conditions, enable a site-specific hydrogeological risk assessment to be undertaken and to understand the potential impact of any works on flows along the watercourse and flood risk in the local area. Is it appropriate to undertake these post-consent and where are these measures secured in the OCoCP [APP-302]?</p>
Q1.24.4.9	Applicant	<p><b>Methodology for Temporary Construction at Crossing Points</b></p> <p>It is set out in the FRA [AS-014, Paragraph 412] that <i>“The detailed methodology to be used for any temporary construction at crossing points over existing ditches and watercourses shall be agreed with the Environment Agency, Local Authority and / or Internal Drainage Board. To manage this ahead of the main works, the Principal Contractor will develop the construction drainage in consultation with the landowner and other statutory stakeholders”</i>. Where are such measures secured in the OCoCP [APP-302]?</p>
Q1.24.4.10	Applicant	<p><b>Operational Drainage Plan</b></p> <p>The Outline Operational Drainage Plan [APP-307] only deals with the onshore substation. Is there a need for such a plan for the cable corridor or landfall? If not, explain why.</p>
Q1.24.4.11	Applicant	<p><b>Structure Resilience</b></p> <p>In the summer heatwaves, hydrology was severely affected, and land heave/ fall occurred across the nation. How would the onshore substation be future proofed against such conditions when extreme heat arises?</p>

**Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023**

**ANNEX A: Schedule of all agreements, negotiations and objections to the grant of Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession powers for Application by Equinor New Energy Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Sheringham Shoal Offshore and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project**

Unique reference number and status key <sup>i</sup>	Name	EL reference numbers <sup>ii</sup>	Interest <sup>iii</sup>	Type of Rights relating to specified plot(s) <sup>iv</sup>		Update on agreement, negotiations and objection, including indicative timescales
				Plots	Type of rights	
					Permanent	
					Temporary	
					Temporary with permanent rights	
					Permanent	
					Temporary	
					Temporary with permanent rights	
					Permanent	
					Temporary	
					Temporary with permanent rights	

<sup>i</sup> Assign a unique number, in sequence, to all agreements, negotiations and objections listed in this table. Indicate the status using the Status Key. You may add more categories to the Status Key if more detailed information is available.

Status Key	
	Agreement signed
	All matters agreed, signing pending
	No objection, and negotiations ongoing
	No objection, negotiation not commenced

## Provisional deadline for responses is Deadline 1: Monday 20 February 2023

---

	Objection, but ongoing negotiation
	Objection, agreement unlikely before close of Examination
	No responses so far to correspondence from the Applicant

- ii List the Examination Library (EL) reference numbers for all representations made by the party to the Examination, including Relevant Representation, Written Representation, other written submissions, oral submissions at Hearings, and appearance at Accompanied Site Inspection(s).
- iii Identify the parts of the Book of Reference relating to the entry, and if the IP or AP is Category 1, 2, or 3.
- iv Indicates whether the Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land/rights, or temporary possession with permanent rights. The Applicant may edit these categories, if required.