NORTH FALLS

Offshore Wind Farm

CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX F.61 PART 6

Document Reference: 4.1.3.6
Volume: 4
APFP Regulation: 5(2)(q)
Date: July 2024
Revision: 0

NorthFallsOffshore.com

sse Renewables | RWE

Project Reference: EN010119

Project	North Falls Offshore Wind Farm
Document Title	Consultation Report Appendix F.61 (Part 6)
Document Reference	4.1.3.6
APFP Regulation	5(2)(q)
Supplier	Camargue Group Limited
Supplier Document ID	CAMFPT60724

Revision	Date	Status/Reason for Issue	Originator	Checked	Approved
0	July 2024	Submission	Camargue	NFOW	NFOW

F Appendices (continued)

F.61 Stage 3 (statutory) and stage 4 (targeted) consultation feedback and Applicant's regard (section 42(1)(d)) 1095

NORTH FALLS

Offshore Wind Farm

APPENDIX F

F.61

Stage 3 (statutory) and stage 4 (targeted) consultation feedback and Applicant's regard (section 42(1)(d))

Section 44 feedback analysis and Applicant's response for stage 3 (statutory) and stage 4 (targeted) consultations

Feedback	Times raised in feedback	Applicant's response	**Project change following this stage of consultation (Y / N)**
Respondents questioned the Project's onshore cable easement width, the number of cable circuits required and whether reducing the number of cable circuits would reduce the Project's generating capacity. Respondents also raised concerns regarding the extent of land sterilisation caused by the onshore cable easement width.	29	Each cable circuit will consist of three onshore electricity cables as well as up to three fibre optic cables and one earth cable. The Project had considered up to four circuits as, depending on the electrical configuration, this number may have been necessary to carry the full power from the wind farm. The exact number of circuits depends on the export voltage adopted and the final capacity of the wind farm. The amount of power that can be carried by a single cable is limited due to thermal effects, meaning it is not possible just to increase the size of a single cable to carry all the power. Export cable technology is rapidly evolving and to allow for potential technologies the Project had allowed for between one and four cables. Following feedback received by a number of landowners, both at the consultation events and via the Project's land agent, Dalcour Maclaren, the Project challenged its engineering team to review and optimise the Project's electrical transmission infrastructure, and specifically to discount solutions that required the Project to have four circuits. The Project has since collaboratively reviewed the electrical options and design with Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm (Five Estuaries) and carried out further optimisation work. This activity has resulted in both projects no longer proceeding with the four-circuit option. Each project will now have a maximum of two circuits. This decision means that the onshore cable easement will be significantly reduced. By including a maximum of two circuits per project, the projects will reduce and minimise the impact on both landowners and the onshore environment. The onshore cable route has been reduced from up to 243m, as presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), to a typical working width of up to 72m in areas where open cut trenching is the proposed construction method, 90m where trenchless techniques are proposed and up to 130m in areas where the trenchless crossing is particularly complex.	Y

Respondents raised concerns regarding the possible impact of the Project on future development opportunities. Predominantly this related to non-residential developments, although two respondents raised concerns regarding the possible impact of the Project on residential development opportunities.	27	Through consultation with land interests the Applicant was made aware of future development ambitions. Where reasonably practicable, the Applicant has sought to mitigate impacts on such potential developments at the design stage of the onshore cable route. While it has not been possible to fully mitigate impacts on all known potential developments, the Applicant has demonstrated reasonable endeavours to do so.	N
Respondents urged the Project to collaborate with other projects in the region, including Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm (Five Estuaries) and National Grid Electricity Transmission's (NGET) Norwich to Tilbury. Respondents requested that the Project work with other projects in the region to reduce cumulative impacts as far as possible.	48	Following requests from stakeholders throughout the development of the Project and Five Estuaries, the potential for coordinated delivery of onshore infrastructure elements has developed. The Applicant has also engaged proactively with the Sea Link project, promoted by NGET and NGET's Norwich to Tilbury project, which includes its East Anglia Connection Node substation. The Project and Five Estuaries have both been allocated the same grid connection point by NGET (East Anglia Connection Node), and have coordinated extensively on their development proposals to include: • An aligned landfall location for the offshore export cables to come ashore; • A shared onshore cable corridor; and • An overlapping onshore substation zone for the co-location of the prospective substations. The Project and Five Estuaries have coordinated during the pre-application process and have undertaken joint working groups with relevant stakeholders on a number of technical matters. The Project has also engaged with NGET and coordinated on assessments and joint mitigation, including on topics such as noise, traffic and transport and landscape. The Applicant's Coordination Report (document reference 2.5) provides more detail.	N
Respondents criticised the level of engagement with the Project and some of the information provided by the Project.	21	The process of engaging with landowners is set out in Chapter 3 Ongoing Engagement of the Consultation Report (document reference 4.1). This has included communication to establish ownership and rights, periods of consultation, and a dedicated phone number and email address to contact the Project's land agent, Dalcour Maclaren.	N

		The Applicant also refers to the Statement of Reasons Appendix B (document reference 6.5) which sets out the negotiations undertaken to date towards acquiring the necessary land and rights voluntarily. The Applicant will continue to engage with landowners up to and including construction of the Project.	
Respondents raised concerns regarding the depth the Project's onshore cable would be buried to and requested that sufficient clearance be provided for land drainage, irrigation infrastructure, and for landowners to generally manage their land in the same manner as before construction.	31	The cables will generally be buried at a depth not shallower than 1.2 metres (m) below ground level depending on ground conditions. This is designed to take into consideration the requirements for drainage and deep ploughing. Where necessary, for example if there is rock, concrete or another obstacle close to the surface (such as existing services), the cables may need to be laid at a shallower depth. The Compensation Code exists to protect land interests who may incur a loss as a result of a shallower depth of the cables. Where there are issues with the ground conditions, the Applicant will still aim to bury the cable as deep as is reasonably practicable and ensure that no infrastructure is shallower than 0.9m, including marker tape.	Y
Respondents requested compensation for any time lost as a result of engaging with the Project.	9	Land interests who incur a proven loss as a result of the Project will be entitled to compensation under the Compensation Code. For the avoidance of doubt the Applicant has confirmed that the same compensation provisions apply under the Compensation Code where land and rights are acquired voluntarily.	N
Respondents questioned how the Project was going to offset its carbon emissions and increase biodiversity.	17	The Applicant will be pleased to discuss specific proposals for biodiversity net gain and / or carbon offsetting, for areas of land directly affected by the Project, as part of individual discussions with landowners. To date no substantive information has been provided on this theme.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding onshore cables causing radiation and electromagnetic fields (EMFs) that could have an adverse effect on people's health.	18	EMFs are produced both naturally and as a result of certain human activities. The Earth has a magnetic field produced by currents deep inside the core of the planet. The Earth is also subject to electric fields produced by electrical activity in the atmosphere, such as thunderstorms. In the United Kingdom (UK), the Earth's magnetic field is approximately 50 microteslas. EMFs are inevitable wherever electricity is produced, distributed, and used, including electrical substations, power lines, and from household electrical	N

		equipment. The level of the magnetic field produced by alternating current (AC) underground power cables is less than the Earth's magnetic field in the UK. Moreover, EMFs from the electricity grid are low frequency and non-ionising. This means they do not have enough energy to cause damage to human or animal cells in the same way ionising radiation does. The World Health Organization states there is no evidence to conclude that exposure to low-level EMFs is harmful to human health[1]. More detail on EMFs is provided in Chapter 28 Human Health of the Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference 3.1.30).	
Respondents stated a preference for the Project to connect to the national electricity distribution network offshore rather than onshore via NGET's East Anglia Connection Node.	35	The Applicant has cooperated with the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero to explore grid connection options, as part of the Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR). Additionally, the Applicant has applied to the Offshore Coordination Support Scheme (OCSS) in consortium with NGET and Five Estuaries for an offshore connection to Sea Link, a marine cable between Suffolk and Kent proposed by NGET as part of its Great Grid Upgrade. The Applicant continues to engage with government, Office of Gas and Electricity Markets (Ofgem) and other developers to explore the potential options. More information can be found in Chapter 5 Project Description of the ES (document reference 3.1.7).	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding whether the Project's construction would have a negative impact on their property's value.	8	The overall value of land and rights has been assessed as part of the Funding Statement (document reference 6.4) which sets out the costs of acquiring the same using compulsory acquisition powers. The Applicant is also seeking to voluntarily acquire the necessary land and rights to deliver the Project at an appropriate value. The Applicant has considered the impact of the Project on property outside the Order Land which is also included within the Funding Statement. Property value is not assessed as part of the EIA process, although the Applicant has, through assessments and mitigation proposals, sought to mitigate impacts on all receptors wherever possible. The majority of onshore impacts potentially created by the Project are linked to the construction phase, and the Applicant has committed to managing these impacts through the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13).	N

[1] World Health Organization: https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/radiation-electromagnetic-fields#:~:text=Based%20on%20a%20recent%20in,exist%20and%20need%20further%20research.

Respondents raised concerns about their mental wellbeing, and / or the mental wellbeing of their family, and cited an increase in stress and anxiety as a result of the Project's development.	25	The Applicant understands the Project's potential impacts and that the length of the development process can create uncertainty and stress. The Applicant takes its role as a responsible developer seriously, and concerns and feedback will be considered throughout Project's continued development. The Applicant is also always happy to answer enquiries from landowners and members of the public. The Applicant will ensure its construction practices respond to these concerns as much as practicable, and how the Applicant intends to do this is set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13).	N
One respondent expressed concern about road closures specifically in relation to the subsequent impact on bus routes, the route to local schools, and commuting to work.	1	Since stage 3 (statutory) consultation the Applicant increased the number of areas using trenchless techniques to reduce the need for temporary road closures and public rights of way diversions. The use of a haul road along the onshore cable route was also developed in response to concerns regarding construction traffic and impacts to the local road network. As set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 7.16), this will enable construction traffic to reach the onshore cable route without having to use smaller / lesser main roads.	Y
Respondents raised general concerns regarding impacts caused by the Project's construction, including possible adverse effects of noise, light, vibration, dust and dirt. Some feedback included suggestions for mitigating construction impacts, including acoustic panel fencing to reduce noise impact and for construction vehicles to have non-audible warnings.	21	The Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13) sets out the approach that will be taken by the Project to mitigate construction disturbance. This document includes detailed measures to manage construction noise and vibration, light emissions, and a Dust Management Plan.	N
Respondents raised concerns about possible landscape and visual impacts caused by the Project's construction and specifically cited the removal of trees, hedgerows, verges, and general impact on the area's rural heritage.	36	The Applicant would aim to mitigate disturbance to hedgerows by using gaps in vegetation where practicable. Wherever a hedgerow crossing is unavoidable, and a trenchless technique such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) is not possible, and the hedgerow requires removal, the working width will be narrowed to minimise the width of hedgerow removal required. All removed hedges will be replaced with locally appropriate species. Additionally, the Applicant plans to avoid burying cables close to major tree roots in order to maintain cable integrity, as well as seeking to avoid potential impacts on trees.	Y

		Detailed hedgerow survey has been undertaken, with further detail in the Applicant's Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan (document reference 5.12) and Chapter 23 Onshore Ecology (Volume 1) of the ES (document reference 3.1.25).	
Respondents requested to be consulted on the substance of the Project's Outline Code of Construction Practice and for it to be followed during pre-construction investigations and mitigation works.	26	The Applicant will always follow best practice when undertaking pre-construction works and will comply with the final Code of Construction Practice, which is a requirement of the Development Consent Order (DCO). Interested parties will be able to provide feedback on the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13) as part of the examination process.	N
Respondents raised concerns about soil and how the Project's construction may impact soil quality. Some feedback included requests for access to the Project's Soil Management Plan, for all soil analysis undertaken ahead of construction to be shared with landowners, and to be consulted on any pre-construction works scheduled to take place on their land to ensure impact is mitigated. Some respondents also raised concerns about how heat dissipated by underground cables and compaction through construction could impact soil quality, productivity and overall value.	47	Soil management is covered in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13), which confirms that a Soil Management Plan will be completed in advance of construction by a suitable and competent soil specialist. The soil specialist will also undertake a soil condition survey prior to construction which will address the issues raised in feedback.	Y
Respondents raised concerns regarding land drainage and the possible flood risk caused by the Project's construction. Some feedback mentioned irrigation systems and boreholes.	49	The Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13) sets out the approach that will be taken by the Applicant in respect of drainage. Pre and post construction drainage plans will be developed by a drainage specialist. The Applicant has already engaged with all landowners and requested copies of plans showing existing drainage and irrigation systems. Flood risk is assessed as part of Chapter 21 Water Resources and Flood Risk of the ES (document reference 3.1.23). The onshore substation site is within Flood Zone 1, meaning it's outside the tidal and fluvial floodplain. Additionally, appropriate surface water drainage would be implemented to mitigate potential flood risk. Surface water drainage measures would be implemented to ensure that runoff from the	Y

		site is managed and restricted to approved rates, thereby not increasing surface water flood risk. The Project's flood management plan in regard to its onshore substation has evolved through design development, for example attenuation ponds as embedded mitigation.	
Respondents raised concerns regarding their private water supply and the potential for their water supply to be contaminated. Some feedback requested confirmation that landowners will be able to safely store water on their property.	27	The Applicant is liaising directly with utility providers to ensure asset protection. For other water supplies, these are assessed within Chapter 21 Water Resources and Flood Risk (document reference 3.1.23) of the ES and Chapter 19 Ground Conditions and Contamination (document reference 3.1.21) of the ES. The Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13) sets out the approach that will be taken by the Applicant in respect of private water supplies, including undertaking a hydrogeological risk assessment with respect to any supplies potentially affected during the Project's construction works. The Applicant has already engaged with landowners to undertake surveys to determine the existing quality of private water supplies.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding the location of the Project's link boxes and joint bays. Some feedback included requests for joint bays to be buried at least 1.2m deep to allow for normal agricultural operations and sufficient drainage above, as well as requests for link boxes to be situated at the edge of fields.	29	The location of link boxes and associated joint bays is dictated by detailed design, which will seek to locate these as close to field boundaries and in accessible locations where possible. However, it may not be practicable to locate them in a location that is preferred by a landowner or occupier. The requirement for joint bays and associated link boxes is covered in sections 5.7.3.3.2-5.7.3.3.3 of Chapter 5 Project Description of the ES (document reference 3.1.7). Any proven losses arising out of the location of above ground apparatus can be claimed by a land interest under the Compensation Code.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding the Project's onshore substation, including the cumulative impact of North Falls, Five Estuaries and Norwich to Tilbury's respective substations, including visual and drainage, especially considering the flat nature of the land in the area. Some feedback included requests for the Project's onshore substation to be sufficiently screened from view.	26	Consultation feedback encouraged greater coordination with Five Estuaries and NGET's Norwich to Tilbury project regarding the location of each project's' onshore substation. This coordination has allowed us to: • Focus impacts in a single area when considering cumulative development; • Have a lower overall land take when compared to locating substations in different search areas; and	Y

		• Coordinate design, including the potential for shared temporary and permanent access roads, and landscape mitigation principles to support reducing impact on the surrounding area. Feedback on substation screening will be considered by the Applicant as the design is further developed. This issue is assessed in Chapter 30 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES (document reference 3.1.32) and visualisations including the effect of screening are included in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Figures (document reference 3.2.26). Design and mitigation related to screening of the onshore substation are included in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (document reference 7.14) and the Design Vision (document reference 2.3). Feedback on potential drainage issues caused by the building of the substation is considered in the Outline Operational Drainage Strategy (document reference 7.19). This document outlines details of site operational drainage, including what attenuation will be managed throughout on-site Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).	
Respondents raised concerns about possible impacts on cropping as a result of the Project's construction. Some feedback included requests that severed land remains in a cover crop following construction for up to a two-year period, and for compensation to be paid on any loss of crop yield.	21	Until final design and confirmation of the construction scenario, it is not possible to confirm potentially severed land. The Applicant will engage with land interests prior to commencement of works to confirm the area of land deemed to be severed or agree alternative access arrangements to it to ensure it can be continue to be farmed. Whilst a cover crop may be a suitable solution in some instances, it may not be appropriate for others which will be discussed on a case-by-case basis. Land interests will be entitled to claim proven crop losses under the Compensation Code, whether or not access has been taken under either voluntary agreements or compulsory acquisition for the Project's construction.	N
Respondents raised concerns about possible disruption to farm management practices as a result of the Project's construction.	22	Land interests will be entitled to claim proven losses under the Compensation Code, whether or not access has been taken under either voluntary agreements or compulsory acquisition for the Project's construction.	
Respondents raised concerns about possible impact to commercial shoots as a result of the Project's construction. They questioned whether	7	The Applicant will endeavour to mitigate the impact of construction works on commercial shoots. Where it is not possible to do so, land interests will be entitled to claim proven losses under the Compensation Code, whether	N

they would have right of access during construction to retrieve birds and some raised concerns about the impact of construction noise on the shoot. Some feedback included requests for construction to be scheduled to avoid shoot dates.		or not access has been taken under either voluntary agreements or compulsory acquisition for the Project's construction.	
Respondents raised concerns about the impact of the Project's construction on farm business and commercial matters, and some feedback included requests for loss of income compensation.	35	Land interests will be entitled to claim proven losses under the Compensation Code, whether or not access has been taken under either voluntary agreements or compulsory acquisition for the Project's construction.	N
Respondents raised concerns about the environmental impact of the Project's construction, including possible loss of habitat and general impact on wildlife, animal welfare and bees.	23	The assessment of wildlife impacts is detailed in Chapter 23 Onshore Ecology of the ES (document reference 3.1.25). This includes impacts on sensitive habitats and species and is based on an extensive suite of baseline surveys, which can be found in Appendices 23.1-23.9 (document reference 3.3.30-3.3.38).	N
Some respondents expressed a desire to see the Project deliver landowner and community benefits.	2	The Applicant has on previous schemes supported the communities in which it operates and has committed to work with communities to develop its approach to supporting the local area. At this stage, the details of any community benefit package associated with the Project have not been finalised. The Applicant will engage with local people and groups prior to construction commencing to help shape how the Project can best support the community. The Outline Skills and Employment Plan (document reference 7.18) sets out how the Applicant intends to maximise the benefits of the Project in relation to key skills and employment.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding access, including access to and from their own land and access to and from their land and the public highway. This included feedback relating to bridle paths, the transportation of potentially hazardous materials and the difficulty of access in some places due to inclement weather and adverse ground conditions. Some requested that	25	Access arrangements with individual landowners are being discussed on a site-specific basis as part of commercial negotiations. The Agricultural Liaison Officer, as set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13), will work with individual landowners to mitigate any impacts on access from construction activity.	N

operations and maintenance access be limited to no more than once a year and for access points to follow field boundaries as closely as possible.		The construction of the Project will interact with a number of walking, cycling and horse rider routes within the onshore cable route. The Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference 7.17) sets out the approach that will be taken to manage public access and should be read in conjunction with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13) and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 7.16), which sets out how walking, cycling and horse rider users of the public highway would be considered and the assessment of the Project's construction traffic. The Applicant plans to maintain access for landowners to their properties through diversions.	
Respondents raised concerns regarding possible impact to recreational and commercial equine activities during construction.	6	Land interests will be entitled to claim proven losses under the Compensation Code, whether or not access has been taken under either voluntary agreements or compulsory acquisition for the Project's construction.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding possible impact to livestock and grazing during the Project's construction.	2	Land interests will be entitled to claim proven losses under the Compensation Code, whether or not access has been taken under either voluntary agreements or compulsory acquisition for the Project's construction.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding the possible proximity of the onshore construction works to existing utilities. Respondents urged the Applicant to liaise with the necessary statutory undertakers.	1	Where the construction works will be in close proximity to existing utilities, or any works affecting existing drains, sewers or chamber works, works will be undertaken in a manner agreed with the statutory undertaker in accordance with the protective provisions provided in the draft DCO.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding the possible impact to leisure and recreation activities in the Project area during construction, including to walkers, cyclists and cycling clubs.	8	Since stage 3 (statutory) consultation the Applicant increased the number of areas using trenchless techniques to reduce the need for temporary road closures and public rights of way diversions. The use of a haul road along the onshore cable route was also developed in response to concerns regarding construction traffic and impacts to the local road network. The overall transport access strategy for the Project looks to maximise the use of the haul road and minimise the use of smaller / lesser roads, thereby mitigating impact on recreational activities.	Y

		The potential impact is assessed in Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport of the ES (document reference 3.1.29) and management of impacts from construction traffic is detailed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 7.16). The construction of the Project will interact with a number of walking, cycling and horse rider routes within the onshore cable corridor. The Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (document reference 7.17) sets out the approach that will be taken to manage public access and should be read in conjunction with the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13) and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 7.16), which sets out how walking, cycling and horse rider users of the public highway would be considered and the assessment of the Project's construction traffic. The Applicant plans to maintain access to public rights of way through diversions. Chapter 32 Tourism and Recreation of the ES also includes detailed assessment of the impact of the Project on recreational opportunities.	
Respondents raised concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land and its potential impact on national food production. Respondents stressed the importance of homegrown food and food security.	8	Chapter 22 Land Use and Agriculture of the ES (document reference 3.1.24) assesses the potential construction impacts on soil and land quality, and the loss of agricultural land due to the onshore cable route and onshore substation.	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding the Project's proposed haul road, namely the cumulative impact of North Falls, Five Estuaries and Norwich to Tilbury using the haul road to build their respective projects.	13	Detailed design of the haul road will be the responsibility of contactors, but landowners will be engaged in the process. The purpose of the haul road is to take traffic off the local road network and minimise as far as possible the impact to local communities and road users from construction traffic. Potential cumulative effects arising from use of the haul road by multiple projects (North Falls, Five Estuaries, Norwich to Tilbury) have been considered within relevant chapters of the ES, including Chapter 20 Onshore Air Quality (document reference 3.1.22), Chapter 26 Noise and Vibration (document reference 3.1.28), Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport (document reference 3.1.29), and Chapter 22 Land Use and Agriculture (document reference 3.1.24).	N
Respondents raised concerns regarding Temporary Construction Compounds (TCCs), including their proposed locations and the	6	The number and size of Temporary Construction Compounds (TCCs) required is covered in Chapter 5 Project Description of the ES (document reference 3.1.7). The locations of TCCs are provided in Figure 5.2 of this chapter. Depending on which build-out scenario transpires, the full extent of	N

potential disruption caused by the required temporary land take.		the footprints shown may not be needed for any or all TCCs. For example, should a joint build-out scenario with Five Estuaries transpire, the two projects may need the full extent of any number of the TCC locations. The Project's build-out scenarios are covered in Table 5.2 of Chapter 5 Project Description of the ES (document reference 3.1.7) and more information regarding how the Project is collaboration with Five Estuaries is included in the Coordination Report (document reference 2.5). Where land interests incur proven losses as a result of the Applicant's occupation of a TCC, they will be entitled to claim compensation under the Compensation Code, whether or not a TCC has been occupied under either voluntary agreements or compulsory acquisition.	
Respondents questioned the routeing of the onshore cable route. Some respondents requested that the onshore cable route be moved further from their property and that it be as closely aligned with field boundaries as possible.	14	The onshore cable route site selection process took into account an extensive range of technical, environmental, social, planning and community considerations to identify the DCO order limits. The final route was selected based on the route which minimised the route's environmental impact. At the Project's detailed design stage, there will be scope within the onshore cable route selected to micro-site around some obstacles. This will include aligning with field boundaries where it is practicable to do so. The onshore cable route has been reduced from up to 243m, as presented in the Applicant's PEIR, to a typical working width of up to 72m in areas where open cut trenching is the proposed construction method, 90m where trenchless techniques are proposed and up to 130m in areas where the trenchless crossing is particularly complex.	N
Respondents raised general concerns regarding public safety during construction of the Project caused by an increase in traffic and the possible transportation of potentially hazardous materials.	1	The Applicant's construction accesses and haul road crossings have been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. Where necessary, designs have been amended to ensure they are safe. Some temporary traffic management measures, including temporary speed limit reduction and temporary traffic control, have been identified at some of the construction accesses or haul road crossings. Further detail can be found in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 7.16). Further traffic management measures will be discussed and agreed with Essex County Council as part of the Project's detailed design stage (should the Applicant's DCO be approved) and set out in the Applicant's final Construction Traffic Management Plan, which will be prepared by the Applicant and approved by Essex County Council.	N

		The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out the measures and processes that would be implemented on construction access routes and haul road crossings to minimise disruption on the public highway and maintain safety for all users.	
Respondents raised concerns regarding the proposed widening and improvement of Bentley Road to facilitate the Project's construction, including increased traffic and subsequent increased risk to road users. Feedback was also received regarding the temporary footpath and cycleway proposed to run alongside Bentley Road.	14	Improvements to Bentley Road were introduced after stage 3 (statutory) consultation and consulted on during stage 4 (targeted) consultation. These improvements were introduced to help manage traffic impact between the A120 and the proposed haul road. The Applicant's construction accesses and haul road crossings, including the works along Bentley Road, have been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. Works relating to the A120 have also been discussed and agreed in principle with National Highways. Where necessary, designs have been amended to ensure they are safe. Some temporary traffic management measures, including temporary speed limit reduction and temporary traffic control, have been identified at some of the construction accesses or haul road crossings. Further detail can be found in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 7.16). Further traffic management measures will be discussed and agreed with Essex County Council as part of the detailed design stage (should the Applicant's DCO be approved) and set out in the Applicant's final Construction Traffic Management Plan, to be prepared and approved by Essex County Council. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out the measures and processes that would be implemented on construction access routes and haul road crossings to minimise disruption on the public highway and maintain safety for all users. Chapter 27 Traffic and Transport of the ES (document reference 3.1.29) sets out the potential impact on Bentley Road during construction.	N
Respondents raised general concerns regarding construction traffic, including the cumulative volume of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements (North Falls, Five Estuaries, Norwich to Tilbury) and the unsuitability of certain lesser roads to withstand construction traffic. Concerns were also raised about the possible burden of traffic on the A120 and	29	Prior to and following completion of each stage of onshore construction works, road condition surveys for minor roads will be undertaken and agreed with Essex County Council. These surveys will inform any works that may be required to rectify specific damage to the road network as a direct result of construction work. Since stage 3 (statutory) consultation, the need for highways and junction improvements at Bentley Road were identified. This was then consulted on as part of stage 4 (targeted) consultation. More detail on stage 4 (targeted)	N

feedback was provided relating to construction traffic visibility splays.		consultation can be found in Chapter 11 of the Consultation Report (document reference 4.1). More detail on Bentley Road improvement works can be found in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (document reference 7.16). A detailed traffic capacity assessment, including on the A120 has also been undertaken and can be found in Appendix 27.1 Transport Assessment (3.3.64).	
Respondents provided feedback relating to archaeology, including requests that all archaeological finds remain in the ownership of the landowner. Concerns were also raised regarding how soil would be managed and / or moved in the event of an archaeological dig and / or find.	11	Archaeological assessment is covered in Chapter 25 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the ES (document reference 3.1.27). An Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (document reference 7.12) has been submitted with the DCO application and details the procedures to be followed in the event of any archaeological finds. Conversations regarding archaeological finds will be had with individual landowners on a case-by-case basis as required.	N
Respondents reiterated that newly provided feedback did not supersede any previously submitted feedback.	13	Noted by the Applicant.	N
One respondent suggested that the Applicant's DCO application may be premature given NGET's Norwich to Tilbury DCO application is yet to be submitted.	1	It is not unusual for energy generation projects to progress the DCO application process in advance of consent for the transmission into the national electricity distribution network being granted. The Applicant has a grid connection agreement in place to connect into the proposed East Anglia Connection Node. The Applicant is also participating in the UK Government's offshore coordination scheme and as such has included an onshore and offshore connection option as part of its DCO application. These connection options are described in Chapter 5 Project Description of the ES (document reference 3.1.7). Ultimately, the Applicant is focused on its own programme and commitment to be operational by the end of the decade.	N
One respondent offered the use of their land for cable storage during construction	1	Noted by the Applicant.	N
Some respondents raised concerns about the construction programme and provided	3	The core working hours for the construction of the Project are set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (document reference 7.13).	N

suggestions for reducing construction impacts, including limiting construction working hours.			