



Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects

The Applicant's Comments on Christopher Bond's Deadline 7 Submission

Revision A

Deadline 8

July 2023

Document Reference: 22.23

Title:	
Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects Examination submission The Applicant's Comments on Christopher Bond's Deadline 7 Submission	
PINS document no.: 22.23	
Document no.: C282-DM-Z-GA-00017	
Date:	Classification
July 2023	Final
Prepared by:	
Dalcour Maclaren	
Approved by:	Date:
Ebru Tatlidil Gee, Equinor	July 2023

Table of Contents

1 The Applicant's Comments on Christopher Bond's Deadline 7 Submission4

Table of Tables

Table 1 The Applicant's Comments on Christopher Bond's Deadline 7 Submission 5

1 The Applicant's Comments on Christopher Bond's Deadline 7 Submission

1. This document presents the Applicant's comments on Christopher Bond's Deadline 7 submission [Submission ID: 18353].

Table 1 The Applicant's Comments on Christopher Bond's Deadline 7 Submission

ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Response
1	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I Christopher Bond of Bidwells write as requested by the Inspector at the end of Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (session 2) on Thursday 22nd June 2023 to submit my closing statement/summary to include any outstanding concerns that have not been resolved.</p> <p>The points are as follows:-</p>	<p>No response required.</p>
2	<p>a) Survey Rights (all clients)</p> <p>The issue of the extent of the proposed survey areas/rights within the DCO application as provided for in Article 16 of the draft Development Consent Order and, specifically, how such survey areas could restrict my clients' activities on such designated land was raised at Issue Specific Hearing 2 on 20th January 2023 and followed up with a representation for Deadline 1 stating specifically the need for these areas to be restricted if/when the DCO is granted. At this point specific reference was made to my clients, John Barnard (identification number 20033228/Sheet 34 of 40 of the Land Plan " Onshore), Robert Barnard (identification number 20033231/Sheet 33 of 40 of the Land Plan " Onshore) and Peter Gowing & Partners (identification number 20033227/Sheet 34 of 40 of the Land Plan " Onshore), these being specific examples of Landowner concerns over the possible extent of the survey rights. Any restrictions on land use due to the survey rights in connection with the Windfarm Extension Projects will be of concern to all my clients and, I suggest, all landowners affected by the projects as it is impossible to predict when opportunities will arise for alternative uses of the land apart from agriculture which may not involve development in a traditional sense, specific examples are the construction of solar farms or battery storage.</p>	<p>In response to ID 2, 3 and 4, the Applicant refers to the response provided to Q2.11.3.3 in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-101].</p> <p>The Applicant also refers to item 16.ii of the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 [REP3-113] which summarises the Applicant's comments on this point at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that these responses address the points raised by the Respondent. For the avoidance of doubt, Article 16 does not place any restriction on land use as is suggested in item 2.</p>
3	<p>A further submission was made at Deadline 3 as a result of the Inspector's request that the applicants consider if a definition of "land adjacent to Order Limits' should be included in the draft DCO. Again, it was stated that it is of paramount importance that landowners know the extent of the survey rights being sought and possibly imposed by the projects as</p>	

ID	Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Response
	landowners would seek to minimise the extent of the survey areas/rights so that the future use of their land is not impacted and equally that the survey rights fall away if an alternative non-agricultural use of the land is planned.	
4	I do not believe that this issue has been satisfactorily addressed to date as there is still no definition of the extent of the survey rights that will be permitted under the DCO so they can be referenced to a plan.	
5	b) John Barnard (identification number 20033228) Representations have been submitted (latest at Deadline 3) concerning the access proposed by the Applicant to Mr Barnard's land from the B1172 Road.	The Applicant refers to The Applicant's Comments on Written Representations [REP 2-017] at 2.4 on this subject.
6	Mr Barnard has proposed an alternative access which it is believed is preferable to the Applicants and this needs further consideration by the Applicant. I have not reiterated the points previously made in this submission but would suggest, as previously, that a site meeting should be held between my client and the Applicant in an attempt to resolve this matter. To date, the Applicant has not agreed to such a meeting.	The Applicant refers to Access to Works Plan (Revision C) [document reference with regard to ACEW99 and ACC60. The Applicant also refers to the commitments set out in Requirement 15 and 17 of the draft DCO (Revision K) [document reference 3.1]. The Applicant welcomes the opportunity to have a meeting and site visit with Mr Barnard and Mr Bond to discuss these matters. However, the Applicant has not been approached or requested to attend a meeting to date. The Applicant will continue to engage with Mr Bond to agree a meeting date.
7	c) As a member of the Land Interest Group (LIG), I support all the points made in the joint submission by the National Farmers Union and LIG to Deadline 7 but have chosen not to repeat Can the above issues please be considered further by the Examination Panel.	The Applicant refers to the response provided at Deadline 8 being The Applicant's Comments on the National Farmers Union (NFU) and Land Interest Group's (LIG) Deadline 7 Submission [document reference 22.22].