



## Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc for the Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement

### The Examining Authority's first written questions Issued on 13 October 2023

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) first written questions (ExQ1).

Responses are due by Deadline 3 in the Examination Timetable, which is **Tuesday 31 October 2023 at 11.59pm**.

The list of questions is set out in a topic-based framework, which is generally based on the ExA's Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex C to the ExA's Rule 6 letter of 7 August 2023. The framework of issues set out there has been developed in accordance with matters that have arisen from representations. The answers provided will contribute to the ExA's examination and assessment of the application against relevant policy.

Column 1 of the table provides a unique reference number for each question. This starts with a topic code, then a '1' (for ExQ1), followed by a section number (for that topic), and finally an individual question number. When answering a question, or in any future representations, please ensure that you quote this unique reference number.

Column 2 indicates the party (or parties) that the question is directed to. The ExA requests all named parties to answer all questions directed to them, providing either a clear and suitably substantive response, or reasons why the question cannot be answered or is not relevant to them. This does not preclude an answer being provided by any other party, if that party believes they have additional information on that specific topic or point that would be useful to the Examination.

If you are answering a limited number of questions, responses in a letter format are appropriate. If you are answering several or many questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on that set out below. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available from the Planning Inspectorate. Please email your request to the case team at [bramfordtotwinstead@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:bramfordtotwinstead@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'Editable ExQ1 Table' in the subject line of your email.

The Examination Timetable makes provision for the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is required, the further questions will be referred to as ExQ2.



## Frequently used abbreviations

<b>AONB</b>	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>NPPF</b>	National Planning Policy Framework
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>CC</b>	County Council	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>CEMP</b>	Construction Environmental Management Plan	<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008
<b>CoCP</b>	Code of Construction Practice	<b>PC</b>	Parish Council
<b>CTMP</b>	Construction Traffic Management Plan	<b>REAC</b>	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments
<b>DC</b>	District Council	<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft DCO	<b>SI</b>	Statutory Instrument
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>SoR</b>	Statement of Reasons
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SSSI</b>	Site of Special Scientific Interest
<b>HDD</b>	Horizontal directional drilling	<b>TP</b>	Temporary Possession
<b>LEMP</b>	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan		

## The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (e.g., '[APP-010]') are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library will be updated as the Examination progresses. Please include the Examination Library unique reference when referring to any document in your reply.

## Contents

<b>0. Miscellaneous and general .....</b>	<b>5</b>
General and cross-topic.....	5
Legislation and policy .....	5
The Proposed Development .....	7
Alternatives.....	8
The Funding Statement .....	8
Socio-economics and other community matters: general .....	9
Socio-economics and other community matters: farming .....	10
Socio-economics and other community matters: tourism and local recreational users.....	11
Socio-economics and other community matters: employment.....	11
Socio-economics and other community matters: businesses .....	11
Socio-economics and other community matters: local residents and community .....	12
<b>1. Air quality and emissions.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2. Approach to the EIA and the ES, including cumulative effects .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3. Biodiversity, ecology and nature conservation, including HRA matters .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and other land or rights considerations .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5. Construction matters.....</b>	<b>23</b>
General construction matters.....	23
CoCP and control documents.....	26
<b>6. Draft Development Consent Order .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>7. Good design .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>8. Historic environment .....</b>	<b>43</b>

<b>9. Landscape and views, including trees and hedgerows</b> .....	<b>47</b>
AONB .....	47
Visual assessment.....	48
General LVIA matters .....	51
Hedgerows and trees.....	53
<b>10. Land use and soil</b> .....	<b>54</b>
Agriculture and other land use .....	54
Soils, geology and ground conditions .....	56
<b>11. Noise and vibration</b> .....	<b>57</b>
<b>12. The water environment</b> .....	<b>59</b>
Flood Risk Assessment .....	59
Surface water management.....	61
Management measures .....	61
Temporary bridges and culverts .....	64
Water resources .....	65
<b>13. Traffic and transport</b> .....	<b>65</b>
Transport assessment .....	65
Construction traffic and construction route strategy .....	67
Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders .....	69
Temporary and permanent measures to access the works .....	70
Public rights of way.....	71
Navigation.....	72

Reference	Question to:	Question
<b>0. Miscellaneous and general</b>		
General and cross-topic		
MG1.0.1	The Applicant	<p>There does not appear to be a separate application document dealing with the other consents and licences that would be required alongside any DCO for the Proposed Development. Is the list set out in section 2.5 of the Planning Statement definitive and up to date?</p> <p>The ExA notes that it is common practice for NSIP Applicants to provide a comprehensive, stand-alone guide, which has the advantage that it is simple to update during the Examination. Is the Applicant willing to do this?</p>
MG1.0.2	The Applicant	<p>If there was to be a dispute with the post-construction site condition survey and the landowner refused handover, how would the matter be resolved? How is handover secured in the dDCO? (Refer to paragraph 15.2.1 of the CEMP [APP-177].)</p>
MG1.0.3	The Applicant	<p>The CEMP [APP-177] at paragraph 15.4.5 sets out the process for dealing with complaints, involving the community relations team, other members of the project team and the project construction team. Would you have a target timeframe to investigate a complaint made by public, to issue findings, and to undertake remedial actions? If so, what would it be? If not, why not?</p>
MG1.0.4	The Applicant	<p>Following discussions at OFH1, you submitted the document, Extant Grid Supply Point Substation Consents [REP1-037] into Examination at Deadline 1. Its Appendix E, the Decision Notice, refers to approved plans. For completeness, can these be submitted into the Examination?</p> <p>If the grid supply point substation was to be constructed in accordance with the original and subsequently amended planning consent and approved drawings, would it affect the outcome and conclusions of the ES submitted with the DCO application?</p>
MG1.0.5	East of England Ambulance Services Trust	<p>At pages 135 and 136 of its Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] the Applicant responds to various points that you made in your RR [RR-030] about the need for a legal agreement. Have its comments addressed your concerns? If not, can you explain why not?</p>
MG1.0.6	Essex Police	<p>At page 137 of its Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] the Applicant responds to various points that you made in your RR [RR-033] about the potential for the Proposed Development to impact on services that you provide. Have these comments addressed your concerns? If not, can you explain why not?</p>
Legislation and policy		
MG1.0.7	Local planning authorities	<p>The Planning Statement [APP-160] refers, for example in the Executive Summary, to the draft replacement NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-5 that were the subject of consultation in 2021. Having noted what the Applicant said on the matter in its cover letter [APP-001] should its Planning Statement be updated to reflect the versions issued for consultation in March 2023, given that the application was made after this?</p>

Reference	Question to:	Question
MG1.0.8	The Applicant Local planning authorities	In the Applicant's cover letter [APP-001], reference is made to the Government document <i>Powering Up Britain</i> , published by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, March 2023, explaining the reason for not referencing it. What weight should be given to this publication?
MG1.0.9	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Neither the Planning Statement [APP-060] nor Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-070] appear to refer to <i>A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment</i> published by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in 2018. The Suffolk councils cite this in their LIR [REP1-045]. What weight should the Applicant give to this publication?
MG1.0.10	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Neither the Planning Statement [APP-060] nor Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-070] appear to refer to <i>The UK's Industrial Strategy</i> , included in the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045], that gave rise to the associated <i>Build Back Better: our plan for growth</i> that was published by HM Treasury in March 2021. Should the Applicant take account of it?
MG1.0.11	The Applicant	Has account been taken of <i>Smart Grid Vision and Routemap</i> published by the Department of Energy and Climate Change and Ofgem in February 2014 that is cited in Together Against Sizewell C's RR [RR-049]? What weight should be given to this publication?
MG1.0.12	The Applicant Local planning authorities	The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] refers to the Government's <i>Community Benefits for Electricity Transmission Network Infrastructure</i> , published in March 2003. Should the Applicant take account of it?
MG1.0.13	The Applicant Local planning authorities	The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] refers to the National Planning Policy Framework, September 2023. Given that its publication superseded submission of this application, what weight should the Applicant attach to it?
MG1.0.14	Local planning authorities	Are the host local planning authorities content with the assessment and conclusions of the Applicant's analysis of the local planning policy context set out in Section 8 and Appendices D and E of the Planning Statement [APP-160] (noting it was written with a 'data-freeze date' of 31 January 2023), Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-070] and ES Appendix 2.2 [APP-089]?
MG1.0.15	Local planning authorities	Acknowledging the helpful local policy coverage set out in the LIRs [REP1-039] and [REP1-045], are the host local planning authorities content with the assessment and conclusions of the Applicant's analysis of committed developments overlapping with the proposed Order Limits for the Proposed Development, as set out in Appendix C of the Planning Statement [APP-160]?
MG1.0.16	The Applicant Mid Suffolk DC Babergh DC	Section 4.3.3 of the Planning Statement [APP-160] states that: ' <i>Section A (Bramford Substation) and Section B (Hintlesham) are addressed separately, despite these are combined into a single Section AB (Bramford/Hintlesham) elsewhere in the application (sic). This recognises that Section A (Bramford Substation) falls within Mid Suffolk District, whereas Section B (Hintlesham) falls within Mid-Suffolk District.</i> ' Does this need to be corrected in relation to Section B?

Reference	Question to:	Question
The Proposed Development		
MG1.0.17	The Applicant	Trenchless crossings are proposed at several locations and the assessments set out in the ES have assumed their use (e.g., ES Ch 4 paragraph 4.7.2 ff [APP-072]). How does the dDCO secure the use of trenchless installation at these locations?
MG1.0.18	The Applicant Natural England RSPB Local planning authorities	ES chapter 4 [APP-072] (paragraph 4.6.6) includes an illustration (4.2) that shows how trees would be cut back where the 400kV line passes through woodland. On either side of the 20m swathe there is a 12.5m band of 'graduated cutting back'. Is this appropriate? It could, for example, lead to tall tree stumps that look unnatural and may not regrow. Might coppicing and regrowth management be more appropriate to achieve a more natural and biodiverse woodland edge ecozone?
MG1.0.19	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.2.4 of ES Appendix 4.1, Good Design [APP-090], compares the use of T-pylons and lattice pylons generally, and for the purposes of the Proposed Development. It states that T-pylons require ' <i>permanent maintenance access to each pylon for maintenance activities, whereas steel lattice pylons can be climbed by linesmen to perform any necessary maintenance for the duration of the asset lifecycle of the lattice pylons.</i> ' Assuming both types require permanent maintenance access, what is the difference between the requirements for the two pylon types, and what is the particular relevance of any difference to this project?
MG1.0.20	The Applicant	The Proposed Development includes the removal of certain lengths of the existing 132kV line and its associated pylons, and 2km of the existing 400kV line to the south of Twinstead Tee. The ES includes this as a benefit of the Proposed Development. Where the line proposed for dismantling is not to be replaced by a new 400kV line (for example on Work Plan Sheet 21 [APP-010]), how is its removal secured by the draft DCO, and over what timescale?
MG1.0.21	The Applicant	The parameters and Limits of Deviation for the height of structures (Article 5 of the dDCO [APP-034]) are set against finished ground level. How is it possible to compare and assess these against existing ground level? (It is noted that the grid supply point substation elevations show AOD, but this is less obvious for other structures.)
MG1.0.22	The Applicant	With reference to ES Chapter 4 [APP-072] at paragraph 4.4.10, have all of the temporary access routes that would be removed been identified, and have the effects of each been considered in the relevant ES chapters?
MG1.0.23	The Applicant	For areas of new mitigation and enhancement planting, can you advise if future farm machinery movements were taken into consideration and if existing routes for farm machinery are to be preserved?
MG1.0.24	The Applicant	Stour Valley Underground [RR-045] raised concerns about the apparent disassociation of the grid supply point substation from the wider Bramford to Twinstead NSIP project. Can you address its concerns about the need for this element of the Proposed Development not only in association with the current application but also:

Reference	Question to:	Question
		<p>a) Against the background of issues raised about its potential cumulative impact in combination with other projects that may tie into the grid supply point substation including but not limited to the cited 'Butler's Wood Green Energy Centre' and 'the Great Grid Upgrade/Norwich to Tilbury'?</p> <p>b) About your perceived failure to '<i>accurately disclose the full need case and wider objectives of the GSP substation</i>'?</p>
<b>Alternatives</b>		
MG1.0.25	The Applicant	Compared to those set out in Table 9.3, PS1 Lifetime Cost of the Strategic Options Report, June 2001 [APP-162], what are the equivalent current lifetime costs of transmission losses and maintenance for the PS1a (HVDC solution) and PS1b (AC solution)?
MG1.0.26	The Applicant	Tables 10.1 to 10.4 of the Strategic Options Report, June 2001 [APP-162] give costs for different technologies for the Bramford to Twinstead Strategic Options P2a, b and c for the financial year 2011/12. What are the current equivalent costs?
MG1.0.27	The Applicant	In respect of Option PS1a: Sizewell to Bradwell (subsea), the second sentence of paragraph 9.12 of the Strategic Options Report, June 2011 [APP-162] identifies a technical risk to the option. Has the technology progressed in the intervening 12 years to the extent that this risk would not weigh against its deployment?
MG1.0.28	The Applicant	What would be the cost differential between the development as proposed and undergrounding the entirety of the proposed new line?
MG1.0.29	The Applicant	The contents page of the Route Corridor Study October 2009 [APP-163] refers to ' <i>NG's Schedule 9 Statement</i> ' but it is not appended to the document. Has this been submitted into the Examination?
MG1.0.30	The Applicant	Point 10 of paragraph 5.5 of the Route Corridor Study October 2009 [APP-163] refers to review of the Schedule 9 Statement annually. Has the latest version been submitted into the Examination?
MG1.0.31	The Applicant	The contents page of the Route Corridor Study 2009 [APP-163] refers to Figure 1 to Figure 19 inclusive; these have not been included. Was their omission intentional or will they be submitted into the Examination?
MG1.0.32	The Applicant	What weight can the Applicant reasonably attach to the Substation Siting Study (February 2013) [APP-165] when planning permission has been granted for the grid supply point substation and work has started on site?
MG1.0.33	John Duncan Irvine Bennett	Which wood are you referring to in your RR [RR-058]?
<b>The Funding Statement</b>		
MG1.0.34	The Applicant	You say in the Funding Statement [APP-037] that £128.3 million of funding has already been secured; does this leave a current shortfall of £370.7 million given the current capital cost of £499 million? If so, is this the amount that RIIO-T3 (Revenue = Incentives + Innovation + Output) is hoped to fund?



Reference	Question to:	Question
MG1.0.35	The Applicant	Your Funding Statement [APP-037] says that any costs incurred during the RIIO-T3 period (i.e., post April 2026) will be subject to the prevailing framework agreement at that time, which is expected to make provision for the project. Accordingly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a risk that Ofgem might set an allowance that is lower than the amount required?</li> <li>• If this happened, how would any funding shortfall be met?</li> </ul>
MG1.0.36	The Applicant	What do 'reactive compensation works' entail? (Funding Statement [APP-037], paragraph 2.3.1.)
MG1.0.37	The Applicant	Does the £112.7 million baseline funding allowance through RIIO-T2 [APP-037] provide for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The estimated £2.84 million required to enter into the agreements for the necessary land and rights before access and construction commences?</li> <li>• The estimated £26.2 million needed for necessary agreements for all land acquisition matters (including a 10% contingency)?</li> </ul> <p>If not, considering <i>Planning Act 2008: guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> (paragraph 18), what evidence do you have to show that adequate funding is likely to be made available to enable the CA within the statutory period following any DCO being made?</p>
MG1.0.38	The Applicant	Can you explain how the biodiversity net gain is intended to be funded as this is not clear from the Funding Statement [APP-037]. How does this reconcile with your statement at paragraph 4.2.23 of Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-072] which says that: ' <i>the enhancements may be delivered through different funding streams....so that a clear distinction is drawn between necessary mitigation required to offset likely significant effects</i> '?
MG1.0.39	The Applicant	Can you advise if the change in Bank of England base rate of interest has altered the £499 million project cost? (The Funding Statement [APP-037] refers.)
MG1.0.40	The Applicant	Can you advise if the dDCO restricts or prevents other developments and whether there is an allowance for potential loss of development in the project cost?
MG1.0.41	The Applicant	Prior to pre-commencement, would a guarantee or security be in place to safeguard potential liability to compensation payable under the DCO?
MG1.0.42	The Applicant	What impact would compound interest per annum (until end of construction period) have on the cost of the project?
Socio-economics and other community matters: general		
MG1.0.43	Local planning authorities	Do you consider that the methodology used in the analysis of socio-economic impacts in Section 3 of the Socio-Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066] is appropriate and that the analysis has been carried out correctly in the context of this methodology?

Reference	Question to:	Question
MG1.0.44	Local planning authorities	Do you agree with the conclusions drawn from the socio-economic analysis in the Socio-Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066]? Are there particular points at issue?
Socio-economics and other community matters: farming		
MG1.0.45	The Applicant	Can you explain the process that you would use to microsite new pylons to ensure that impacts on arable practices are considered alongside construction related issues?
MG1.0.46	The Applicant	Could farming operations continue safely in the area whilst operations to dismantle pylons are underway? Has this been included in the assessment?
MG1.0.47	The Applicant	Can you describe the range of actions that would be taken to identify, maintain, repair or replace field drainage?
MG1.0.48	The Applicant	How has the ES considered the potential effects of haul roads on Rural Payments Agency (RPA), Basic Payment Scheme (BPS), Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI), and Farming Investment Fund (FIF) on landowners and tenants?
MG1.0.49	The Applicant	What degree of access would be afforded to farmers and landowners in order to maintain access to their land over the proposed temporary haul roads? Would access over existing access tracks to be used as haul roads during the construction phase of the proposed development also be concurrently available for the use of farmers and landowners? What measures would be implemented in relation to temporary accesses and haul routes to minimise impacts on the efficient and effective operation of the remaining agricultural land?
MG1.0.50	The Applicant	Would the height of the overhead conductors provide for unfettered use by modern farm machinery, maintaining the separations specified by the Health and Safety Executive to ensure safe working below and in the vicinity of overhead conductors?
MG1.0.51	The Applicant	Given the proposed Limits of Deviation, could the positioning of new pylons relative to field boundaries constrain the use of wide spraying and cultivating machinery?
MG1.0.52	The Applicant	Once installed, can you confirm the implications for, and restrictions on farming practices along the proposed underground cable alignment?
MG1.0.53	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.3.16 of the Socio-Economic and Tourism Report [APP-066] states, ' <i>The vast majority of agricultural land would be reinstated following construction and existing agricultural operations would continue</i> '. Explain: (i) the feasibility of commercial tree planting within the Order Limits (refer [RR-090]); (ii) the timescale for farmland affected by construction activity to return, post-construction, to its pre-construction agricultural output (refer [RR-002], RR-026] and RR-066)).

Reference	Question to:	Question
MG1.0.54	Local planning authorities	Do you consider that impacts on agriculture businesses have been properly considered and assessed?
Socio-economics and other community matters: tourism and local recreational users		
MG1.0.55	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.3.8 of the Socio-Economics and Tourism report [APP-066] states, ' <i>The good practice measures within the CoCP (application document 7.5.1) would reduce the effects experienced by visitors, by only closing accesses for short periods while construction activities occur and providing signed diversions for any temporary diversions required (TT03 in the CoCP), and therefore it is considered unlikely that there would be significant effects on these visitor attractions.</i> ' Would all routes subject to temporary closure in the Dedham Vale AONB and the Stour Valley with public access (walkers, cyclists and horse riders) be diverted?
MG1.0.56	Local planning authorities	Paragraph 5.2.7 (Effects During Construction) of the Socio-Economics and Tourism report [APP-066] states, ' <i>With these [good practice] measures in place, it is unlikely that the project would result in significant effects on the tourism economy during construction</i> '. Do you consider that the impacts on tourism been properly assessed, particularly with regard to Dedham Vale and the Stour Valley, footpaths, cycleways, bridleways, and other leisure areas? Do you consider that the proposed good practice and mitigation measures would address the potential impacts? If not, what additional measures do you consider are required?
Socio-economics and other community matters: employment		
MG1.0.57	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.3.22 of the Socio-Economics and Tourism report [APP-066] states, ' <i>However, from experience of other National Grid projects, it is likely that a minimum of 10% of the workforce would be sourced from the local labour market, including apprentices, security workers and delivery drivers.</i> ' (ES Chapter 4 [APP-072], paragraph 4.4.55 also refers.) What arrangements would be put in place to ensure that you source a minimum of 10% of the workforce from the local labour market? How is this secured in the dDCO?
MG1.0.58	The Applicant	Will you engage with Essex and Suffolk County Councils ([RR-004] and [RR-006]) to address what could amount to a skills shortage with the other projects, to secure benefits for and investment in local businesses, the supply chain and employment networks?
Socio-economics and other community matters: businesses		
MG1.0.59	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.3.14 of the Socio-Economics and Tourism report [APP-066] states, ' <i>National Grid has been working with local landowners and businesses that lie within the Order Limits to seek to reduce impacts on their operations.</i> ' Has the applicant been in contact with those business operations referred to in RRs [RR-133] and [RR-040]? If so, what is the outcome?

Reference	Question to:	Question
MG1.0.60	Local planning authorities	Do you consider that the impact of the Proposed Development on businesses has been properly considered and assessed, particularly in relation to the potential for disruption caused by the construction and dismantling process?
<b>Socio-economics and other community matters: local residents and community</b>		
MG1.0.61	The Applicant	For the construction works, can you explain: (i) The engagement techniques that would be used to facilitate active community liaison with members of the community (including residents) and local businesses (including landowners and tenants), including unscheduled activities that overrun beyond approved core working hours? (ii) Which aspects of the works would be communicated to members of the community and local businesses? (iii) How you would achieve accessibility for all members of the community and local businesses affected by the works? (iv) The resourcing and governance of good practice measure GG25 to ensure suitable and sufficient reduction of disturbance to residents?
MG1.0.62	Local highway authorities	Could you provide accurate, up-to-date and publicly accessible information on your websites relating to any walking, cycling and horse rider diversion routes that were agreed to facilitate the Proposed Development?
<b>1. Air quality and emissions</b>		
AQ1.1.1	The Applicant	ES Appendix 4.1, Good Design, states that National Grid would undertake emissions monitoring and implement control measures that are compliant with the F-gas Regulation or its successors until the point that Sulphur Hexafluoride (SF <sub>6</sub> ) can be phased out of use on the project. Is it the Applicant's intention to follow the requirement in the consultation draft of NPS EN-5 to produce and submit to the ExA a plan for the monitoring and control of fugitive SF <sub>6</sub> emissions consistent with the Fluorinated Gas Regulation and its successors, noting that the 2023 draft does not include reference to the ExA directly? Can you also advise how monitoring and control is secured through the draft DCO?
AQ1.1.2	The Applicant	Draft NPS EN-5 refers to providing evidence as to why SF <sub>6</sub> -free alternative are technically infeasible or require bespoke components that are grossly disproportionate in terms of cost. Can an estimate of the cost differential between the SF <sub>6</sub> -reliant asset and the appropriate SF <sub>6</sub> -free alternative be provided? Will the Applicant be providing the evidence referred to above for the two emerging technologies [fluorinated compound in combination with natural origin gases (CO <sub>2</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> , O <sub>2</sub> ); and synthetic air] for SF <sub>6</sub> -free switchgear into the Examination?
AQ1.1.3	The Applicant	Are you able to give a progress update on the research and development of alternative circuit breakers of SF <sub>6</sub> for the grid supply point substation and Bramford substation? Paragraph 4.9.4 in ES Chapter 4 Project Description [APP-072,]
AQ1.1.4	The Applicant	Why are other greenhouse gases (other than carbon dioxide and sulphur hexafluoride) not relevant to the Proposed Development? (Paragraph 2.1.2 in ES Appendix 4.3, Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP-092].)

Reference	Question to:	Question
AQ1.1.5	The Applicant	Has the estimated 111,484 tCO <sub>2</sub> e arising as a result of the Proposed Development been independently verified by a recognised and qualified party? If not, please outline your quality assurance checks to validate the figure. (Paragraph 3.1.1 in ES Appendix 4.3, Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP-092].)
AQ1.1.6	The Applicant	Is the Applicant able and willing to provide a summary breakdown of the carbon emission data related to the estimated 84,050 tCO <sub>2</sub> e for capital (construction) referred to in paragraph 3.1.1 of ES Appendix 4.3, Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP-092]?
AQ1.1.7	The Applicant	Is the Applicant able to identify any measures to be taken to reduce the estimated capital (construction) carbon dioxide equivalent and explain how these measures are secured in the dDCO?
AQ1.1.8	The Applicant	How would the estimated operational transmission loss of 26,133 tCO <sub>2</sub> e be monitored and controlled? (Paragraph 3.1.1 in ES Appendix 4.3 Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP-092].)
AQ1.1.9	The Applicant	How would the estimated operational transmission loss of 1,301 tCO <sub>2</sub> e (for sulphur hexafluoride) referred to in Paragraph 3.1.1 of ES Appendix 4.3, Greenhouse Gas Assessment [APP-092], be monitored and controlled?
AQ1.1.10	The Applicant	Do you intend to summarise your approach to carbon emissions effects against any local target set by Essex County Council and Sussex County Council? If not, why not?
AQ1.1.11	The Applicant	Is the alignment of the haul routes as shown on ES Figure 4.1 [PDA-002] considered to be worst case for the air quality assessment?
AQ1.1.12	The Applicant	Section 3.3, Mitigation, in ES Appendix 13.1, Dust Risk Assessment [APP-135], refers to site-specific mitigation. Can you summarise your proposed monitoring and response to dust incidents.
AQ1.1.13	The Applicant	Please signpost and summarise the dust assessment undertaken for fruit growing, crops, and properties, and the measures envisaged for dust control and dust monitoring.
AQ1.1.14	The Applicant	What is your response to the suggestion in the Howards' Relevant Representation [RR-090] that development impacts would make land unusable for their fruit growing business.
AQ1.1.15	The Applicant	Has any air quality information sourced from third parties been validated with on-site background air quality measurements?
AQ1.1.16	The Applicant	Receptors sensitive to potential dust impacts during earthworks and construction were identified from a desktop study using AddressBase Plus data (Ordnance Survey, 2022), as noted in paragraph 13.5.4 of ES Chapter 13, Air Quality [APP-081]. How would new or updated information in AddressBase Plus data (or information by third parties) be considered and what effects could this have on the ES and its conclusion?

Reference	Question to:	Question
AQ1.1.17	The Applicant	ES Chapter 13, Air Quality [APP-081], refers to <i>Construction Dust Guidance</i> (IAQM, 2016). Would the use of the latest IAQM Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction (Version 2.1, August 2023) affect the conclusions in the ES?
AQ1.1.18	The Applicant	The Transport Assessment [APP-061] anticipates that there would be no construction traffic through the AQMA in Sudbury based on the construction routes shown on ES Figures Part 8, 12.1: Traffic and Transport Study Area [APP-153]. How could you lawfully prohibit routing of construction traffic along public highways that run through the Sudbury Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?
AQ1.1.19	The Applicant	Should The Environmental Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023 be included in ES Appendix 2.1, Legislation Policy and Guidance [APP-088], and how would they affect the ES and its conclusion?
AQ1.1.20	The Applicant	Should the Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 be included in ES Appendix 2.1, Legislation Policy and Guidance [APP-088], and how would it affect the ES and its conclusion?
AQ1.1.21	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain whether it proposes to secure any of the carbon reduction measures outlined in Section 3.2 of ES Appendix 4.3 [APP-092] through the dDCO [APP-034] and, if so, how this would be achieved. If not, what are the reasons?
<b>2. Approach to the EIA and the ES, including cumulative effects</b>		
EA1.2.1	The Applicant	Noting the definitions of 'environmental information' and 'environmental statement' in the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended), why do you believe it is better to submit the documents listed at paragraph 5.7.2 of Chapter 5 of the ES [APP-073] outside the ES rather than as part of it? Are you content that the ES is compliant with Regulation 14 of these Regulations and relevant case law around the ES containing the information that is reasonably required to assess the effects of the project and noting that the ES must constitute a ' <i>single and accessible compilation of the relevant environmental information and the summary in non-technical language</i> '?
EA1.2.2	The Applicant	The ES is defined in the dDCO [APP-034] as, ' <i>Environmental Statement means the environmental statement (Documents 6.1 to 6.4 (inclusive)) together with any supplemental or additional environmental information certified under article 57 (certification of documents), and any environmental statement submitted for the purposes of complying with and/or discharging the Requirements.</i> ' The ExA wishes it to be clear what constitutes the ES at the close of Examination for the purposes of the relevant provisions in the dDCO. Can the Applicant provide a schedule setting out the documents that form part of the ES, including the revision number of any updated chapters, appendices or figures, and the name of any supplemental or additional information submitted during Examination? Can a final version of this schedule be submitted at Deadline 10?
EA1.2.3	The Applicant	Chapter 5 of the ES, EIA Approach and Method [APP-073] (paragraph 5.4.2), notes that the assessment was based on a 'reasonable worst case'. How is 'reasonable' defined, and how does this approach ensure that the implementation of the Proposed Development could not give rise to environmental effects that are worse than those predicted?

Reference	Question to:	Question
EA1.2.4	The Applicant	ES Chapter 4 [APP-072] (paragraphs 4.7.22 ff) assumes that HDD would be used, ' <i>particularly the geology and noise chapters</i> '. It also notes that, ' <i>There are different methods that could be used to construct the trenchless crossings. Each method would have a different construction footprint and potentially different environmental effects.</i> ' Is HDD the worst case for all possible impacts at all possible receptors, and, if so, where is this evidenced? If not, where are the worst-case impacts assessed?
EA1.2.5	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Section 4.10 of ES Chapter 4, the Project Description, [APP-072] assumes that the decommissioning impacts would be no worse than those assessed for construction. Is this a reasonable assumption in relation to all receptors for all topics, such as biodiversity and noise and vibration, bearing in mind the nature and amount of infrastructure to be broken up and removed? Would the following addition to Requirement 12 of the dDCO be beneficial? <i>'The written scheme of decommissioning must include sufficient information to demonstrate the validity of the assumption made in the original Environmental Statement for the Proposed Development that decommissioning impacts would be no worse than those concluded for construction or provide new assessments for any types of impact for which this is not demonstrated.'</i>
EA1.2.6	The Applicant	Paragraphs 5.4.18 ff of the ES [APP-073] describe how significance has been applied to each predicted impact and includes a matrix that was used in this process (Illustration 5.1). It recognises that the EIA Regulations 2017 do not define what constitutes a significant effect but suggests that these are, ' <i>typically taken to be a moderate or greater adverse or beneficial significance</i> '. Is this approach based on any policy or professional guidance, noting that it is discouraged in the IEMA publication, ' <i>The State of EIA Practice in the UK</i> ', 2011? Paragraph 5.4.21 states that, ' <i>consideration has been given to how those significant effects could be avoided, reduced or offset</i> '. Does this mean that impacts of 'minor' significance (in matrix terms) have not been considered for mitigation? If so, does this address the intention of EIA to, ' <i>reduce residual effects, where practicable, to a non-significant level</i> ' (paragraph 5.1.1), given that impacts of minor significance might reasonably be considered inherently significant?
EA1.2.7	The Applicant	Can you explain the steps that you would take to keep information about other developments that are relevant to the cumulative effects assessment (ES Chapter 15 [APP-083]) under review, including how any changes would be addressed and reported to the Examination?
EA1.2.8	Local planning authorities	Do the local planning authorities agree with the list of plans and projects included in the cumulative effects assessment (ES Chapter 15 [APP-083])?
EA1.2.9	The Applicant	Anglian Water [RR-022] provided comments about potential cumulative effects with its proposed 69km strategic pipeline project between Bury St Edmunds and Colchester, which you had identified in your list of potentially cumulative projects in ES Appendix 15.3 [APP-142]. ES Appendix 15.5 [APP-144] concludes that there would be no likely significant effects. However, Anglian Water notes that the construction programme for its project has changed from that used in your ES. Can you explain any implications of this for the cumulative assessment in ES Chapter 15 [APP-083]?

Reference	Question to:	Question
<b>3. Biodiversity, ecology and nature conservation, including HRA matters</b>		
EC1.3.1	The Applicant Natural England	The Applicant's comments on RRs [REP1-025] do not seem specifically to address the suggestion from Natural England [RR-042] that the potential impacts on the Hintlesham Woods SSSI interest features 'lowland mixed deciduous woodland' and 'breeding bird assemblages - mixed: scrub and woodland' require further assessment, and that consideration of mitigation or compensation is required. Can you indicate your current position on these matters.
EC1.3.2	The Applicant	Nick Miller [RR-103] raises concerns relating to biodiversity and refers to impacts on designated and non-designated sites of wildlife value. Can you respond to the specific suggestion that your assessment fails to pay adequate regard to the Alphamstone Meadows Local Wildlife Site and important adjacent scarce habitats, which he believes to be scarce in eastern England and to probably meet the NPPF glossary definition of 'Irreplaceable Habitat'?
EC1.3.3	The Applicant	Natural England has requested [RR-042] a summary table of the total area of all Habitats of Principal Importance that would be lost, permanently and temporarily, alongside the total area of proposed mitigation for each. Your response to RRs [REP1-025] seems to indicate that you do not intend to provide this. Please explain why.
EC1.3.4	The Applicant	Woodland creation is proposed to mitigate the loss and degradation of lowland mixed deciduous woodland (a habitat of principal importance). This is captured as EIA_B01 in the REAC [APP-179] and the location of the planting is shown on LEMP Appendix B [APP-184], as secured through Requirement 4(2) of the dDCO. However, the LEMP [APP-182] does not appear to provide information about the timing of planting or the approach to aftercare. (Section 9 sets out general principles but these relate to reinstatement rather than habitat creation.) Can you describe the approach to this woodland habitat creation in more detail and how the commitments are secured in the dDCO [APP-034], including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• when the planting would be undertaken;</li> <li>• whether this would be prior to habitat loss and, if not, why not;</li> <li>• the proposals for aftercare, including the time period proposed and why this is considered appropriate; and,</li> <li>• the mechanism for remedial action, if required.</li> </ul>
EC1.3.5	The Applicant Natural England Local planning authorities	The LEMP [APP-182] includes proposals for woodland establishment through natural regeneration, using the local seed bank already present. Does the LEMP include sufficient information on which to base the establishment and management of the larger areas that extend some distance from existing woodland on arable soils? Would soil fertility need to be reduced and is further detail needed on control of weeds? Is further detail required on the measures that would be taken if the establishment of naturally regenerated woodland is not occurring satisfactorily? Is the proposed monitoring and aftercare period sufficient?



Reference	Question to:	Question
EC1.3.6	The Applicant Natural England Local planning authorities	Section 9 of the LEMP [APP-182] appears to suggest that most areas of habitat (trees, woodlands, hedges, grasslands) created for mitigation, restoration, compensation and biodiversity net gain revert to the landowner after five years. Is this a correct understanding and do you believe that this is sufficient guarantee that the created habitat would provide its mitigation or compensation function in the longer term?
EC1.3.7	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	The Suffolk councils' position in their LIR [REP1-045] in relation to biodiversity impacts (at paragraphs 7.30 and 7.36) is unclear. While the Applicant's ES [APP-075] concluded that there are no likely significant residual effects in relation to biodiversity receptors during construction or operation, the LIR appears to conclude that there would be significant impacts during construction and decommissioning, ' <i>There would be material impacts upon ecological features (designated sites, protected and Priority species and habitats).</i> ' Can the position be clarified with specific instances and supporting evidence.
EC1.3.8	Nick Miller	You have raised concerns on matters relating to biodiversity [RR-103], referring to your ' <i>own surveys, and... important information from local residents Nigel Morgan, John Dumont and John McGlashan, as well as Nightingale survey information from Martin Peers, and Dormouse survey information from Suffolk Wildlife Trust (on behalf of Essex Wildlife Trust).</i> ' Do you intend to submit the survey information into Examination (noting that badger data would need to be on a confidential basis, and that the information should be evidenced and include the qualifications and experience of the surveyors)?
EC1.3.9	Nick Miller	Can you clarify if your representation [RR-103] questions the Applicant's baseline information and mapping in relation to the Alphamstone Meadows Local Wildlife Site and important adjacent scarce habitats (i.e., do you believe any are missed out of the ES)?
EC1.3.10	The Applicant	As a result of the preparatory management works that would be necessary in Hintlesham Woods SSSI, including coppicing and felling along the existing line corridor, did your assessment consider potential windthrow impacts on the woodland, and, if so, what would be the impacts on the woodland habitats and the SSSI? If not, why not?
EC1.3.11	The Applicant Natural England	The HRA Report [REP1-007] sets out how mitigation measures have been dealt with at the screening stage. Is there sufficient clarity in relation to the proposed trenchless crossings of the Rivers Box and Stour (paragraph 2.4.1, etc) to demonstrate that the approach accords with the People Over Wind and Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta judgement?
EC1.3.12	The Applicant Natural England Local planning authorities	The list of plans and projects where in-combination effects could occur was fixed on the 31 January 2023 to allow the HRA to be finalised for submission [APP-057]. Have any further relevant plans or projects come forward or become known since then that might affect the in-combination assessment?

Reference	Question to:	Question
EC1.3.13	The Applicant	Can you signpost where you have dealt with Natural England's concerns [RR-042] in relation to a possible bentonite breakout and the implications for habitats downstream, including the European sites.
<b>4. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and other land or rights considerations</b>		
CA1.4.1	Any Affected Person	The Applicant explains in its SoR [APP-38] that voluntary rights in land for underground cables and overhead lines, including pylons, would be sought by way of an option for easement under the terms of a Deed of Grant, rather than via wayleaves (paragraphs 6.1.5 to 6.1.7). a) Do you agree with the Applicant's approach? b) If not, explain why not with reasons. c) If not, and this affects land that you have an interest in, set out detailed reasons in relation to your specific rights.
CA1.4.2	Any Affected Person	Are you aware of any inaccuracies in the BoR [REP1-005], SoR and Appendices [APP-038] to [APP-041], Land Plans [REP1-004] or Special Category Land Plans [APP-009]? If so, set out what these are and provide the correct details.
CA1.4.3	Land Partners LLP on behalf of Robert Shelley	The Schedule of Changes to the BoR [REP1-027], (pages 2, 5 and 6), shows that interests have been added in your favour. With these amendments, are you content that the updated BoR [REP1-005] correctly records your interests?
CA1.4.4	Foot Anstey LLP on behalf of Pivoted Power LLP	The Schedule of Changes to the BoR [REP1-027], (pages 3, 5 and 6), shows that interests have been added in your favour. With these amendments, are you content that the updated BoR [REP1-005] correctly records your interests?
CA1.4.5	Any Affected Person	Do you have any concerns that you have not yet raised about the legitimacy, proportionality or necessity of the CA or TP powers sought by the Applicant that would affect land that you own or have an interest in?
CA1.4.6	The Applicant	In relation to your duties under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, have any Affected Persons been identified as having protected characteristics? (Any individual's specific details should not be included in your response.)
CA1.4.7	The Applicant	Can you confirm that the BoR [REP1-005] complies with the advice contained in the <i>Planning Act 2008 Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i> , September 2013, Department for Communities and Local Government, Annex D, paragraph 8? For example, are all those identified in BoR Part 3 also recorded in Part 1?
CA1.4.8	The Applicant	Can you confirm that all persons having an interest in land, including any rights over unregistered land, have been identified? Where this has not been possible can you:

Reference	Question to:	Question
		<p>a) Provide a summary of where it has not yet been able to identify any persons having an interest in land, including any rights over unregistered land.</p> <p>b) Advise as to what further steps you will be taking to identify unknown rights during the Examination.</p>
CA1.4.9	The Applicant	<p>The methodology for identifying Category 3 persons, as defined by Section 44 of the PA2008, are set out in Section 6.7 of the SoR [APP-038]. The ExA notes at page 3 of Appendix J of the Consultation Report [APP-053] the Applicant's statement that, '<i>the exclusion of parties from the Book of Reference or consultation does not preclude them from being able to make a relevant claim</i>'. Nevertheless, having considered Interested Parties' and Affected Persons' submissions on the impact that the Proposed Development would have on their interests, does the Applicant consider that are there any other persons who might be entitled to make a relevant claim if the dDCO were to be made and fully implemented and should therefore be added as Category 3 parties to the BoR [REP1-005]?</p> <p>This could include, but might not be limited to, those that have provided representations on, or have interests in the effect of construction or operation of the proposed development in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• human and animal health and wellbeing;</li> <li>• property values or prejudice to property sales;</li> <li>• access to their property;</li> <li>• potential subsidence;</li> <li>• dust;</li> <li>• impacts on a business;</li> <li>• claims that there are viable alternatives; or</li> <li>• blight.</li> </ul>
CA1.4.10	The Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 27 and 28 of <i>Planning Act 2008 Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land</i>, September 2013, Department for Communities and Local Government, state that applicants are urged to consider offering full access to alternative dispute resolution (ADR) techniques for those with concerns about CA of their land. Have you offered full access to ADR techniques for those with concerns about the CA of their land or considered other means of involving those affected? If so, give details.</p>
CA1.4.11	Local planning authorities Local highway authorities	<p>Are any of the Councils in their roles as the local planning authority and the highway authority aware of:</p> <p>a) Any reasonable alternatives to the CA or the TP which is sought by the Applicant?</p> <p>b) Any areas of land or rights that the Applicant is seeking the powers to acquire that you consider would not be needed?</p>
CA1.4.12	The Applicant	<p>Can you confirm the factors that you considered in weighing public benefit against private loss and how that exercise was undertaken. In doing so, you are asked to bring together the cross-referencing between the SoR [APP-049], the Planning Statement [APP-060] and the Need Case [APP-061].</p>

Reference	Question to:	Question
CA1.4.13	The Applicant	What degree of importance did you attribute to the existing uses of the land proposed to be acquired in assessing whether any interference would be justified, and why?
CA1.4.14	The Applicant	The SoR [APP-049] notes that, in pursuing the dDCO, the Applicant has weighed the potential infringement of the European Convention on Human Rights consequent on the inclusion of compulsory powers within the dDCO and concluded that the significant public benefits outweigh the effects of the dDCO on persons who own property in the Order Limits such that there would not be a disproportionate interference with Article 8 and Article 1 First Protocol rights ([APP-038], paragraphs 9.1.5 to 9.1.19). Can you explain more fully the factors that you considered in the balance (including references to any paragraphs of the relevant NPSs and Government guidance), the weight attributed to those factors and how this exercise was undertaken?
CA1.4.15	The Applicant	Paragraphs 2.4.4 and 2.4.5 of the SoR [APP-038] say that not all the land shown within the Order Limits on the Land Plans [REP1-004] as being subject to permanent acquisition or acquisition of rights would be required during the construction phase. In that context, can you explain how the extent of rights sought in land is consistent with the test at s122(3) of PA2008?
CA1.4.16	The Applicant	Paragraph 6.1.5 of the SoR [APP-038] describes a sequential approach to acquiring the rights in land necessary to construct the Proposed Development. What provisions of the dDCO is this approach founded on?
CA1.4.17	The Applicant	At paragraph 6.7.3 of the SoR [APP-038], you say that an assessment was carried out to identify properties outside the 500m buffer with a potential claim and, at paragraph 6.7.6, refer to Appendix J of the Consultation Report [APP-053]. However, as that does not appear to address the matter, what qualifying criteria were applied to the assessment?
CA1.4.18	The Applicant	Can you explain how your approach to biodiversity net gain is consistent with the statement at paragraph 4.2.23 of ES Chapter 4 where you say that, <i>'in the interests of clarity, the enhancements are not addressed as part of the ES, as the enhancements may be delivered through different funding streams and over a different timetable and so that a clear distinction is drawn between necessary mitigation required to offset likely significant effects'</i> ?
CA1.4.19	The Applicant	Can you explain why, save for the bell-mouths at the junction with public roads, the Order Limits for the proposed haul road between the A131 and Stour Valley west cable sealing end compound vary considerably in width? Is the extent of proposed acquisition of rights in this respect consistent with s122 of PA2008?
CA1.4.20	The Applicant	In the RR made on behalf of Peter Nott [RR-039], the point is made that definition of Class 4 – Compulsory Acquisition of Rights – Access is not appropriate to the requirements of the Proposed Development as it would affect his land and he asks whether an alternative Class should be defined? What is your response to this suggestion?
CA1.4.21	The Applicant	How do you justify the land take for the temporary construction compounds as described in Table 4.3 of the Project Description [APP-072]?

Reference	Question to:	Question
CA1.4.22	The Applicant	<p>Looking at the Land Plans [REP1-004], and with specific regard to each of the plots listed below, what would be the practical implications of CA or TP of those adjoining plots for access to and use of these Class 8 plots whilst construction is on-going? Further, should persons with rights in those plots be included within Category 3 as defined by s48 of PA2008?</p> <p>a) Sheet No. 02 - Rectangular plot of land bounded by the proposed overhead line to the north, plot 2-03 to the east and 2-04 to 2-06 inclusive to the south and west.</p> <p>b) Sheet No. 02 - Roughly square plot due north-west on the opposite side of the overhead line corridor.</p> <p>c) Sheet No. 02 - Triangular plot bounded by plots 2-32 and 2-33.</p> <p>d) Sheet No 03 - Rectangular strip of land bounded in the main by plots 2-53 and 2-52.</p> <p>e) Sheet No. 08 - Triangular piece of land (roughly in the middle of the sheet) bounded by, amongst others, plots 8-22, 8-25, 8-28 and 8-40.</p> <p>f) Sheet No. 09 - Land to the north of Plot 8-129 and bounded by Plot 8-131 on the other three sides.</p> <p>g) Sheet No. 09 – Triangular piece of land bounded to the west by Plot 8-131 and the overhead line corridor to the south and south-east.</p> <p>h) Sheet No. 28 - Triangle of land bounded by Plots 28-03 and 28-02, adjoining the proposed Stour Valley west cable sealing end compound.</p> <p>i) Sheet No. 28 - A strip of land to the west of Henny Back Road that plot 28-36 is contiguous with.</p>
CA1.4.23	The Applicant	<p>Can you explain the rationale for the inclusion in the Order Limits and proposed acquisition of rights over:</p> <p>a) Plots 9-11 and 9-14 (Sheet 09).</p> <p>b) 'Proposed power connection' that would lead north from the Stour Valley east cable sealing end, cross under the existing 132kV line, skirt Sawyer's Farm and terminate beside the curtilage of Little Hitches, Upper Road, Little Cornard (Sheet 19).</p> <p>c) Part of the curtilage of Little Hitches (Sheet 19).</p>
CA1.4.24	Mead Farms	Can you submit a plans or plans showing the plots of land that are the subject of your RR [RR-041] and with which you are concerned?
CA1.4.25	Malcolm Frost	Can you submit a map or plan showing the land that is the subject of the lease that you referred to in your RR [RR-079] and explain how the Proposed Development would affect your legal interest in that land?
CA1.4.26	Linda Keenan	Can you submit a map or plan showing your land referred to in your RR [RR-093]?
CA1.4.27	Land Partners LLP on behalf of Peter Nott	In your RR [RR-039] you refer to copies of drainage maps including highlighted areas that are of particular issue to you. Can you forward this evidence?

Reference	Question to:	Question
CA1.4.28	Foot Anstey LLP on behalf of Pivoted Power LLP	The Applicant responded to points raised in your RR [RR-035] at page 104 of its Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025]. Do you consider this a fair summary of your interaction with it to date?
CA1.4.29	Royal Mail	The Applicant addressed points raised in your RR [RR-023] at page 86 of its Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025]. Do you agree with its reasoning and conclusion? If not, can you explain why you disagree with its analysis of your concerns?
CA1.4.30	The Applicant	Table 3-1 of the Special Category Land Report [APP-041], Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought over Open Spaces, says in respect of Hintlesham Golf Course that CA Class 4 Compulsory Acquisition of rights of access are sought. However, when Sheet 02 of the Special Category Land Plan [APP-009] is cross-referenced with Sheet 03 of the Land Plans [APP-008], five of the plots identified as Open Space appear to be sought for Class 3 – Compulsory Acquisition of rights, underground cable. These are 3-13, 3-16, 3-18, 3-22 and 3-23. This appears to be consistent with what is said at paragraph 4.1.4 of the aforementioned Report [APP-041] and Table 8 of the SoR [APP-038]. Accordingly, does Table 3-1 of the Special Category Land Report [APP-041] need to be amended?
CA1.4.31	The Applicant	When Sheet 02 of the Special Category Land Plans [APP-009] is considered in the context of Sheet 03 of the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018], part of the Special Category Land at Hintlesham Golf Course is shown as 'Environmental area' ENV02. What would these proposed works involve? Would they be consistent with the excepting provision that the Applicant is relying on at s132 (3) of PA2008?
CA1.4.32	The Applicant	Table 3-1 of the Special Category Land Report [APP-041], Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought over Open Spaces, says in respect of Hintlesham Great Wood that CA Class 2 - Compulsory Acquisition of rights, overhead line is sought. However, when Sheet 03 of the Special Category Land Plans [APP-009] is cross-referenced with Sheet 06 of the Land Plans [APP-008], two of the plots identified as open space appear to be sought for Class 4 - Compulsory Acquisition of rights of access. These are 6-02 and 6-04. Table 8.1 of the SoR [APP-038] appears to be correct in saying that CA classes 2 and 4 are sought. On the foregoing basis, does row 2, column 5 of Table 3-1 of the Special Category Land Report [APP-041] need to be amended?
CA1.4.33	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 3.1.2 of the Special Category Land Report [APP-041] sets out the definition of 'open space' at Section 19 (4) of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. Whilst noting that the Applicant has taken a precautionary approach to include all land that could be considered to be open space, in light of the statutory definition of the term and its statement at paragraph 4.1.18 of the aforementioned Report that the land is not publicly accessible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why do you consider that each of the 3 plots at Assington Green (shown as 16-71, 16-75 and 16-79) on Sheet No 5 of the Special Category Land Plans [APP-009]) fit the legal definition of open space?</li> <li>• Does s131 of PA2008 apply to this aspect of the Proposed Development?</li> </ul>

Reference	Question to:	Question
CA1.4.34	Babergh DC	The Applicant sets out its case in the Special Category Land Report [APP-041] as to why it considers that the areas of open space shown on Special Category Land Plans [APP-009], over which CA of permanent rights in land are being sought, should be treated as an exception to the need for Special Parliamentary Procedure in accordance with s132 (3) of PA2008. Are you persuaded by its evidence? If not, please explain why not.
CA1.4.35	The Applicant Babergh DC Assington PC	Are the rights sought by the Applicant in respect of land at Assington Green, as shown on Special Category Land Plans [APP-009] at Sheet No. 05 and described in the Special Category Land Report [APP-041], consistent with Policy ASSN-10 Local Green Spaces of the Assington Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2036? Please give reasons for your answer and highlight any implications for the Examination.
<b>5. Construction matters</b>		
General construction matters		
CM1.5.1	The Applicant	Can you describe how the worst-case scenario for archaeological works has been assessed in the EIA and how it has been considered in ES Appendix 4.2, Construction Schedule [APP-091]?
CM1.5.2	The Applicant	Please provide a progress update on discussions for mains water and electricity supply to the main site compound at Leavenheath. Paragraph 4.4.58 in ES Chapter 4 Project Description [APP-072]
CM1.5.3	The Applicant	Table 4.5 in ES Chapter 4, Project Description [APP-072], indicates key waste anticipated on the project. Can you confirm the estimated quantity of shuttering, and also any hazardous waste anticipated (e.g., coal tar in tarmac)?
CM1.5.4	The Applicant	The draft Statement of Common Ground with TC East Anglia ONE OFTO Limited [REP1-030] notes that works associated with Proposed Development may affect East Anglia One landscaping mitigation measures. Please can you provide an annotated drawing showing the area and extent of these works?
CM1.5.5	The Applicant	Paragraph 3.2.4 in ES Appendix 13.1, Dust Risk Assessment [APP-135], refers to construction of temporary access routes and potentially dusty construction materials (e.g., concrete) and on-site concrete batching. Please signpost the relevant ES chapters where on-site concrete batching has been assessed, and - if applicable - identify the location(s) assumed.
CM1.5.6	The Applicant	The section shown on Design and Layout Plans Stour Valley east cable sealing end compound [APP-025] suggests that the proposed finished ground level would be level as it does not show a gradient or fall and would tie into existing levels near the perimeter security fence. At Issue Specific Hearing 1 the Applicant described the surrounding ground as undulating which would result in earthworks. Bearing in mind the preliminary design status for the Proposed Development can you confirm if earthworks would extend beyond the Order Limits?
CM1.5.7	The Applicant	Whilst recognising the temporary construction compound on ES Figure 4.1, sheet 20, [PDA-002] can you explain the much wider Order Limit at Bures Road, River Stour and the railway in comparison to the River Box crossing (sheet 14)?
CM1.5.8	The Applicant	Why there are two drill pits next to each other and adjacent to the railway on ES Figures, Figure 4.1, sheet 20 [PDA-002]?

Reference	Question to:	Question
CM1.5.9	The Applicant	Please confirm the span parameters of the temporary bridge over the River Stour and likely abutment location for the EIA worst case scenario and how it relates to the floodplain and limit of deviation (ES Figures, Figure 4.1, Sheet 20 [PDA-002] and Design and Layout Plans Temporary Bridge for Access [APP-031]).
CM1.5.10	East Anglia Three Limited c/o Scottish Power Renewables	Please advise if construction-related information for the EA3 Converter Station such as a programme of works and piling activities (referred in your RR [RR-029]) is available and will be submitted into the Examination.
CM1.5.11	The Applicant	The Applicant's follow-up notes to Issue Specific Hearing 1, at action point 6 [REP1-034], estimate an approximate volume of imported material of 277,800 tonnes. Construction activity plant and noise data [APP-136] indicate 9t dumpers (BS 5228-1 reference c4.4) for temporary access route and implies the number of dumpers (9t) bringing imported material to site to be in the region of 30,867(one way). How many heavy goods vehicles were considered in the transport assessment for import of material?
CM1.5.12	The Applicant Suffolk CC Essex CC	The Applicant's written summary of oral representations to Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-024] notes that the provisional programme has been prepared using 'standard industry working hours'. Can you provide any evidence to demonstrate that Sundays and bank holidays are or are not standard industry working hours?
CM1.5.13	The Applicant	What would be the implications for the Proposed Development if the core construction hours were modified to align with core construction hours suggested in the two local authority LIRs ([REP1-039], paragraph 17.4.6 and [REP1-045], paragraph 17.69).
CM1.5.14	The Applicant	Can you confirm any assumptions made in the ES about the expected frequency and duration of major works that may require the temporary access route off the A131 to be reinstated for use during operation, explain how the dDCO would control this, and indicate any other consents or procedures that would be necessary?
CM1.5.15	The Applicant	ES Chapter 4, Project Description [APP-072], notes that the proposed 12-hour construction day is likely to result in construction work taking place after nightfall during winter, for which task lighting may be required. The assessment assumed that activity would only take place at 'contained sites' (including ES Chapter 7, Biodiversity [APP-075]). Can you define contained sites and confirm how the dDCO [APP-034] restricts winter night-time working to these locations?
CM1.5.16	The Applicant	Please confirm if United Kingdom Power Networks (UKPN) worker numbers were included in the baseline and alternative scenario profiles in ES Chapter 4 Project Description [APP-072].
CM1.5.17	The Applicant	What is your response to the alternative route suggested by Little Maplestead PC in its Relevant Representation [RR-017] to use the Collins Road junction for traffic coming from the Halstead direction, to join the A131 at the Catley Cross junction for the return traffic?



Reference	Question to:	Question
CM1.5.18	The Applicant	What is your response to the suggestions in Alphamstone and Lamarsh PC's Relevant Representation [RR-008]: i) To join the proposed access road to the south of pylon PCB80 with the principal east-west access road along the 132kV corridor to ensure that no site traffic goes through Lamarsh Village? ii) To extend HDD drilling to the west and north near to pylon 4YLA003 to mitigate further the impact on Anells?
CM1.5.19	The Applicant	What is your response to Mrs Helen Neal's contention [RR-105] that Henny Road, Lamarsh, is narrow, has few passing places and is unsuitable for large vehicles?
CM1.5.20	The Applicant	Can you submit updated versions of the grid supply point substation layout [APP-019] and elevations [APP-020] showing the location, extent and height of the proposed mounds, with an indication of the slope angles. (See paragraph 4.9.37 of ES Chapter 4, Project Description [APP-072])?
CM1.5.21	The Applicant	In response to a comment from Suffolk County Council about Table 4.1 of the CTMP [APP-180] related to responsibility for compliance and enforcement of management plans, confirm that the applicant would retain overall responsibility for the works undertaken pursuant to the DCO?
CM1.5.22	The Applicant	For the good practice measures relating to the layout of construction sites GG11 and TT01 to TT03 (CEMP Appendix A, CoCP [APP-178]), can you confirm there is adequate space within the order limits to suitably and sufficiently: (i) segregate pedestrians and all works vehicles? (ii) protect all open edges of cable trenches to prevent falls from height?
CM1.5.23	The Applicant	How would you ensure that operatives who receive briefings had the required skills, knowledge, experience and training to make sure the control measures set out in the CEMP are carried out suitably and sufficiently? (Paragraph 15.1.2 of the CEMP [APP-177] refers.)
CM1.5.24	The Applicant	In relation to soil stripping (paragraph 11.3.19 of the CEMP [APP-177]), can you explain: (i) who would (a) agree the moisture content criteria and (b) measure the moisture content on site, and (ii) the weather-specific methods to be deployed prior to recommencing of soil stripping activities?
CM1.5.25	The Applicant	Would the relevant highway authorities and the Environment Agency be consulted about drainage works that could impact on highway drainage and watercourses? (Paragraphs 9.3.6 and 9.3.7 of the CEMP [APP-177] refer.)
CM1.5.26	The Applicant	Further to paragraph 9.3.9 of the CEMP [APP-177], what volume of water would be required to be (i) abstracted, and (ii) delivered by tanker for use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the construction of trenchless crossings;</li> <li>• in the site cabins;</li> <li>• for general cleaning; and,</li> <li>• for dust suppression?</li> </ul>

Reference	Question to:	Question
		Under what circumstances would abstraction of water be required for the construction of the trenchless crossings?
CM1.5.27	The Applicant	Can you confirm that the regime of monitoring and checking set out in Section 15 of the CEMP [APP-177] would include data collection, monitoring and reporting of the use of large vehicles complying with the most recent emission standards?
CM1.5.28	The Applicant	Further to Table 5.1 of the CEMP [APP-177], can you provide an estimate of the cost and construction time differences between open trench and trenchless methods for road crossings?
CM1.5.29	The Applicant	Can you confirm that the lifting operations described in paragraph 4.4.6 of the CEMP [APP-177] would be undertaken in compliance with the relevant lifting plan to ensure all anticipated heavy lifting operations are properly managed?
CM1.5.30	The Applicant	Would low-carbon concrete technology be used on the project? (Paragraph 4.5.4 of the CEMP [APP-17] refers.)
CM1.5.31	The Applicant	What demolition controls and practices would be used to ensure the dangers and risks of taking down all pylon structures would be as low a level as is reasonably practicable?
<b>CoCP and control documents</b>		
CM1.5.32	The Applicant	Would the Environmental Manager and Environmental Clerk of Works roles have a full-time presence on site during the pre-commencement and construction phase? Please explain how many such personnel there would be, and how these roles would fulfil their duties across the full working day, along a 29km distance, during seven-day working. (Refer to the CEMP [APP-177].)
CM1.5.33	The Applicant	Paragraph 15.3.1 (2.) of the CEMP [APP177] explains liaison procedures in the event of non-compliance with the Plan and refers to a 'Land Officer' who would be contacted if on private land. There appears to be no definition of this role or its responsibilities at Table 3.1 of the CEMP. Can you address this apparent omission?
CM1.5.34	The Applicant	Please confirm the minimum notice period that would be given to local residents to inform them about commencement and likely duration of the construction work. (Paragraph 3.4.2 in the CEMP [APP-177].)
CM1.5.35	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.2.5 in the CEMP [APP-177] notes that, where required, working areas would be appropriately fenced to reduce the risk of site staff from unintentionally exiting the site boundary (GG24). Please could you confirm your approach to the health and safety of the general public and how the Proposed Development would satisfy the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations, Regulation 18 (2) – fencing and signage of the perimeter of the construction site.
CM1.5.36	The Applicant	Further to paragraph 6.4.6 of the CEMP [APP-177], have temporary construction compounds where exceptional work and lighting is required been identified?
CM1.5.37	The Applicant	Please provide an illustrative plan and elevation with indicative dimension showing the cable sealing end compound covered with a weatherproof scaffold structure, as referred to in paragraph 4.6.11 of the CEMP [APP-177].
CM1.5.38	The Applicant	Can you give examples of additional pollution prevention measures that would be adopted if mobile plants were to be located within 15m of sensitive water features? (Paragraph 9.3.20 in the CEMP [APP-177] refers.)

Reference	Question to:	Question
CM1.5.39	The Applicant	Can a summary of the Proposed Development incident reporting procedure mentioned in paragraph 9.3.26 of the CEMP [APP-177] be provided?
CM1.5.40	The Applicant	Can you clarify if any of the main rivers are to be crossed by open cut method. (Refer to paragraph 9.3.29 of the CEMP [APP-177].)
CM1.5.41	The Applicant	What would be the future maintenance and monitoring responsibilities of any new or diverted permanent drainage, and how would such responsibilities be secured in any DCO? (Paragraph 9.3.35 of the CEMP [APP-177].)
CM1.5.42	The Applicant	Further to paragraph 10.3.5 of the CEMP [APP-177], can you outline your approach to discharge to ground if the ground was saturated during winter?
CM1.5.43	The Applicant	Can you confirm if archaeological strip, map and sample excavations would be backfilled, or would they remain open to facilitate the subsequent construction phase? Can you confirm what was assumed in the EIA? (Paragraph 11.3.18 of the CEMP [APP-177] refers.)
CM1.5.44	The Applicant	With reference to paragraph 14.3.7 of the CEMP [APP-177], can you provide examples of additional temporary noise mitigation measures (with evidence of consequent noise reduction levels) that would be put in place to reduce noise levels from construction plant and machinery, and their effectiveness for distinctive tonal sounds, and also for impulsive construction activities?
CM1.5.45	The Applicant	Paragraph 14.3.9 of the CEMP [APP-177] refers to mitigation of vibration effects. Please provide examples of additional temporary measures that would be put in place to reduce vibration levels from construction plant and machinery at pylon 4Y004A (with evidence of vibration reduction levels).
CM1.5.46	The Applicant	Please describe your engagement approach with affected residents, landowners and tenants for any unscheduled activities that would overrun beyond the approved core working hours. (Paragraph 14.4.11 of the CEMP [APP-177] refers).
CM1.5.47	The Applicant	Can you confirm the minimum road width required to enable one lane to remain open to traffic (with traffic management) and advise if roads not meeting this criterion have been identified in the ES? (See paragraphs 4.7.20 to 21 in ES Chapter 4, Project Description [APP-072].)
CM1.5.48	The Applicant	Following on from paragraph 5.5.4 of the CTMP [APP-180], can you describe the activities required to create an access point and how these would result in the closure of single carriageways for up to two weeks?
CM1.5.49	The Applicant	Further to paragraph 7.2.2 of the CTMP [APP-180], can you clarify if the mobile gangs being collected by the minibus or welfare van would report daily to the main site compound or go directly to their place of work on site?
CM1.5.50	The Applicant	Can you clarify the approach to reinstatement of land, noting that the CEMP [APP-177] at paragraph 4.7.1 refers to reinstatement of land to its 'pre-construction' condition whilst paragraph 11.3.35 refers to an 'appropriate' condition?

Reference	Question to:	Question
CM1.5.51	The Applicant	Table 2.1 of ES Appendix 14.1 the construction activity plant and noise data [APP-136], indicates plant required for construction activities. How would construction activity be monitored, and the type of construction plant controlled to ensure that the impacts assessed in the ES are not exceeded?
CM1.5.52	The Applicant	The Materials and Waste Management Plan [APP-181] notes that the Circular Economy Package Policy Statement (Defra, 2022) has been considered. Can you elaborate and summarise your approach to circular economy principles and how the Proposed Development would maximise opportunities to reuse material and minimise waste?
CM1.5.53	The Applicant	The Materials and Waste Management Plan [APP-181] identifies that environmental targets would be set for materials and waste, and that these would be monitored by the contractor when appointed. Can the Applicant explain how these environmental targets would be quantified and what is proposed in terms of identifying and implementing any remedial action if targets were to be exceeded?
CM1.5.54	The Applicant	Explain how you would determine whether a change to the CEMP [APP-177], CTMP [APP-180], MWMP [APP-181] or LEMP [APP-182] should be reported to the relevant planning authority and what mechanism would be in place to manage any dispute about a proposed change.
CM1.5.55	The Applicant	Paragraph 1.2.6 of the LEMP [APP-182] cites two appendices but elsewhere it refers to three. Three were submitted with the application [APP-182] to [APP-184] inclusive. Does paragraph 1.2.6 need to be amended accordingly?
CM1.5.56	The Applicant	The LEMP [APP-182] suggests that good practice measure GG07 (reinstatement of hedgerows, fences, walls, earthworks and boundary features) would only be implemented 'with landowner agreement' (paragraph 8.1.3). However, the REAC [APP-179] refers to implementation in consultation with the landowner. Can you clarify what is intended and the extent to which the ExA and SoS could rely on this measure being implemented to mitigate the relevant adverse impacts?
CM1.5.57	The Applicant	Paragraph 8.6.3 of the LEMP [APP-182] refers to natural regeneration of grassland as a restoration measure. Can the Applicant advise where this is intended as it is not evident in the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan set out in Appendix B of the LEMP [APP-184].
CM1.5.58	The Applicant	The first bullet point of paragraph 8.2.2 of the LEMP [APP-182] refers to planting in 'urban or park environments, where ornamental species may be more appropriate'. Can the Applicant clarify where this is intended as it is not evident in the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan set out in Appendix B of the LEMP [APP-184].
CM1.5.59	The Applicant	Paragraph 8.8.1 of the LEMP [APP-182] refers to an existing arable field margin (MM23) that would be retained and enhanced to compensate for arable field margin losses. Can you signpost where this feature is described and the proposals for mitigation and enhancement?
CM1.5.60	The Applicant	Could you confirm that you intend the submitted versions of the various management plans such as the LEMP to be considered as the final versions, rather than outline versions that would be detailed for agreement post-consent as part of

Reference	Question to:	Question
		the discharge of any DCO requirements? Can you respond to the Suffolk councils' submission in their LIR [REP1-045] (paragraphs 6.25 and 6.148) that this is concerning as the proposals are still at a preliminary stage.
CM1.5.61	The Applicant	Could the Applicant explain how it would determine whether a change to the CEMP [APP-177], CTMP [APP-180], MWMP [APP-181] or LEMP [APP-182] should be reported to the relevant planning authority and what mechanism would be in place to manage any dispute about a proposed change?
CM1.5.62	Braintree DC Mid-Suffolk DC Babergh DC Essex CC Suffolk CC Environment Agency Natural England	The CEMP [APP-177], CTMP [APP-180], MWMP [APP-181] and LEMP [APP-182] appear to be submitted as final documents, without a requirement to submit and approve detailed versions in the dDCO [APP-034]. Could you: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comment on the Applicant's proposed approach;</li> <li>identify any outstanding concerns with the content of the plans;</li> <li>describe the steps considered necessary to resolve outstanding concerns by close of Examination; and</li> <li>provide comments on the Applicant's proposed approach to managing future change of these management plans, i.e., that the Applicant would provide details of the change together with evidence of stakeholder engagement, and request that the relevant planning authority endeavours to respond to confirm its consent to the change or reasons for not accepting within 28 days?</li> </ul>
CM1.5.63	The Applicant	How do you respond to the Suffolk councils' suggestion in their LIR [REP1-045] (paragraph 6.18) that all prescriptions for implementation, establishment, and management of areas to be seeded, planted, or otherwise managed for landscape and ecology, should be brought together comprehensively in the LEMP?
CM1.5.64	The Applicant	The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] (paragraphs 6.114 to 6.117) raises questions and concerns in relation to your 'landscape softening' proposals. Why are these measures not considered to be mitigation that would be secured like other proposals? Why would they be they dealt with as voluntary measures that would not therefore be secure, to be agreed only with the landowner and tenant, but not with the relevant local planning authority (LEMP [APP-182], paragraph 8.2.6)?
<b>6. Draft Development Consent Order</b>		
DC1.6.1	The Applicant	Does the dDCO address the concerns expressed in the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] at paragraph 21.2.5 in respect of what constitutes the 'Environmental Statement'? If not, how can these be accommodated?
DC1.6.2	The Applicant	Your statement at page 69 of your Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] is noted but what are your perceived operational reasons for a statutory pre-commencement stage? How would it provide clarity and for whom?
DC1.6.3	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Paragraph 21 of PINS Advice Note 15: <i>Drafting Development Consent Orders</i> deals with the issue of defining 'commencement' - advance works and environmental protection and suggests they are generally unlikely to find favour with the SoS. The Applicant's associated submission is noted at paragraphs 3.6.14 and 3.6.15 of the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-035]. Nevertheless, can the range of potential 'pre-commencement operations' in Article 2 of the dDCO reasonably be described as either <i>de minimis</i> or having minimal potential for adverse impact?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.4	The Applicant	In arriving at the conclusion that the range of potential 'pre-commencement operations' in Article 2 are either <i>de minimis</i> or having minimal potential for adverse impact, where have you assessed the likely impact of each?
DC1.6.5	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Is the definition of 'pre-commencement operations' in Article 2 sufficiently clear and unambiguous? For example, 'demolition of existing buildings' could be read as meaning either the surveys required for the demolition of existing buildings or the actual demolition of existing buildings. Is amendment required in this or other respects?
DC1.6.6	The Applicant	How do you respond to each of the specific concerns articulated in paragraph 12.16 to 12.19 inclusive of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] in respect of pre-commencement operations?
DC1.6.7	The Applicant	What enforcement mechanism is available to local planning and highway authorities in respect of pre-commencement operations?
DC1.6.8	The Applicant	Does the definition of 'maintain' in Article 2 need to be amended in response to paragraph 21.2.6 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039]?
DC1.6.9	Braintree DC Essex CC	Looking at the final sentence of paragraph 21.2.7 of your LIR [REP1-039], how should the dDCO be amended to address your specific concern about 'trigger timings'.
DC1.6.10	The Applicant	The dDCO does not include any provisions relating to any ' <i>enactment applying to land within or adjacent to the Order Limits</i> ', providing that they have effect subject to the provisions of the DCO. The purpose of including such a provision, which has been commonly used in other DCOs, would be to avoid inconsistency with other relevant statutory provision that applies in the vicinity. Can you explain why this has not been included?
DC1.6.11	The Applicant	Articles 3 (2) (b) and 3 (3) (b) of the dDCO both contain the word 'may'. The expectation is that the apparatus would be removed as part of the Proposed Development. Should the wording be amended accordingly in the interests of precision?
DC1.6.12	The Applicant	Over and above the issue raised in the preceding question, can you respond to the concerns aired in paragraphs 21.3.1 and 21.3.2 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] in respect of Articles 3 and 4 of the dDCO?
DC1.6.13	The Applicant	In several places the dDCO [APP-034] seeks to incorporate flexibility by disapplying certain vertical Limits of Deviation (Article 5 (1) (b), (d) and (3) (b)), where it can be demonstrated that this would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those identified in the ES. Can the Applicant explain how these provisions would operate in practice, and how any amendments or addenda to the ES would be captured to provide certainty for the discharging authority?
DC1.6.14	The Applicant	Article 5 (1) (b) of the dDCO would allow pylons to deviate up to 4m above the heights shown on the Work Plans. In addition to the proposed new pylons, some of the Work Nos (Schedule 1) include modifications to the existing overhead transmission lines. Do the proposed Limits of Deviation apply to existing as well as proposed pylons? If so, has this been accounted for in the ES?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.15	The Applicant	It is not clear, either from the dDCO itself or the EM [APP-035] (section 3.9 onwards) as to what, if any, provision that Article 5 makes for 'Associated Development' as defined in Schedule 1 of the dDCO. Can you advise if such works and activities are provided for?
DC1.6.16	The Applicant Local planning authorities	In exercising rights conferred by Article 5, is it sufficiently clear on the face of the dDCO, without recourse to supporting documents, where construction activity should and should not take place, e.g., to avoid certain features or environmentally sensitive areas?
DC1.6.17	The Applicant	Is there merit in concerns expressed by the Essex councils about a ' <i>one size fits all approach</i> ' at paragraph 21.3.3 of their LIR [REP1-039]? If not, why not?
DC1.6.18	The Applicant	At paragraph 17.9 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] concerns are set out about the breadth of the Limits of Deviation in relation to pylons and overhead lines in sensitive locations. How do you respond to these?
DC1.6.19	The Applicant	Does the perceived need for Article 10 (2) of the dDCO extend beyond the grid supply point substation for which planning permission has already been granted under the Town and County Planning Act 1990 regime? If so, can you give examples of hypothetical situations that might arise whereby it perceives the inclusion of Articles 10 (2) and 10 (3) to be necessary? If no, could the drafting be limited to deal only with the GSP development subject of extant planning permission?
DC1.6.20	The Applicant	Are there any extant planning permissions or current applications for planning permission that the Applicant is aware of that it considers would warrant the retention of Article 10?
DC1.6.21	The Applicant	Given that the Applicant would have control over how the Proposed Development would be carried out within the scope of any forthcoming DCO and could presumably ensure that it would not conflict with planning permission it has secured or would apply for, can it provide fuller justification for Article 10 over and above what is set out in the EM [APP-035]?
DC1.6.22	The Applicant	In several of the dDCO's Articles (11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 47 and 53) provision is made for consent not being 'unreasonably withheld or delayed' together with the grant of the application default if the relevant authority does not determine it within the specified period. With inclusion of the quoted wording, what is the perceived need for the subsequent provision?
DC1.6.23	The Applicant	Does the Applicant agree with the suggestion that the words 'unreasonably withheld or delayed' are deleted from the Articles referred to in the previous question?
DC1.6.24	The Applicant	How does the Applicant respond to the concern that failure to make the revision referred to in the previous question could render the consenting authority open to criminal liability by virtue of Section 161 (1) (b) of PA2008; an excessive measure?
DC1.6.25	The Applicant	At paragraph 3.15.1 (c) of the EM [APP-035] reference is made to the provisions of Article 11 (2) of the Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014. It is noted that the phrase 'unreasonably withheld or delayed' is not

Reference	Question to:	Question
		included in that provision of the made Order. In that context, how is that facet relevant to this dDCO and why is it considered necessary and appropriate for the scheme applied for?
DC1.6.26	The Applicant	How does the Applicant respond to the suggestion that the 28-day time period in Articles 11 (3), 14 (5), 15 (9), 16 (2), 19 (9), 21 (8), 47 (8) and 48 (4) is increased to 56 days for the reasons set out in paragraphs 17.16 to 17.19 inclusive of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045]?
DC1.6.27	The Applicant	Is it reasonable that the period in the Articles specified in the preceding question should be paused if the relevant authority considers that additional information is reasonably required to determine the application?
DC1.6.28	The Applicant	At paragraph 3.16.7 of the EM [APP-035] reference is made to similar wording to the provisions of Article 12 of this dDCO being included in two other Orders, one of which is made. Paragraph 1.5 of PINS Advice Note 15: <i>Drafting Development Consent Orders</i> says that if a draft DCO includes wording derived from other made Orders, the EM should explain why that particular wording is relevant to the proposed draft DCO, for example detailing what is factually similar for both the relevant consented NSIP and the Proposed Development. It is not sufficient for an EM to simply state that a particular provision has found favour with the SoS previously; the ExA and SoS will need to understand why it is appropriate for the scheme applied for. Can the Applicant address this omission?  In doing so, the ExA notes that Article 9A (2) (a) of The Aquind Interconnector Order, at Appendix C of the ExA's Report, makes tailored provisions for specific local circumstances. On this basis, how are its provisions on all fours with the Article 12 of this dDCO?
DC1.6.29	The Applicant	At paragraph 3.17.5 of the EM [APP-035], reference is made to similar wording to the provisions of Article 13 of this dDCO being included in three made Orders. How is that wording is relevant to this dDCO and why is it considered necessary and appropriate for the scheme applied for?
DC1.6.30	The Applicant	How do you respond to paragraphs 12.21 to 12.22 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] in respect of disapplication provisions of Article 13 (3) of the dDCO?
DC1.6.31	Essex CC Suffolk CC	Save for the disapplication provisions subject of the previous question, are the highway authorities content with the disapplication of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 that is sought by Articles 13 (3) and 13 (4) in relation to works executed under Article 12? If not, please explain why not and advise how those provisions might be changed to address your concerns.
DC1.6.32	The Applicant	In paragraph 12.23 of their LIR [REP1-045], the Suffolk councils refer to perceived tension between Articles 14 (1) and Requirement 11 (1). Can you address this?
DC1.6.33	The Applicant	The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] (paragraphs 12.25 and 12.26) sets out concerns with Article 15. Can you address the points that are raised?



Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.34	The Applicant	Do Article 15 or Schedule 17 need to be amended considering comments in paragraph 21.3.7 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039]?
DC1.6.35	The Applicant	Should Articles 16 (1) (b) and (2) refer (solely) to the relevant highway authority?
DC1.6.36	The Applicant	How do you respond to the proposed amendments to Article 17 in: a) The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] at paragraphs 12.27 and 12.28; and b) the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] at paragraph 21.3.9?
DC1.6.37	The Applicant	At paragraph 3.21.1 of the EM [APP-035], reference is made to similar wording to the provisions of Article 17 of this dDCO being included in a made Order. Can the Applicant explain: why that particular wording is relevant to this dDCO; why it is considered necessary and appropriate for the scheme applied for; and give examples of where it might apply?
DC1.6.38	The Applicant	At paragraphs 3.22.1 and 3.22.2 of the EM [APP-035], reference is made to similar wording to the provisions of Article 18 (1) (a) and 18 (2) (c) of this dDCO being included in made Orders. Can the Applicant explain: why that wording is relevant to this dDCO; why it is considered necessary and appropriate for the scheme applied for: and give examples of where it might apply?
DC1.6.39	The Applicant	You explained in the ExM [APP-035], section 3.24, that Article 20 is more widely drawn than that included in other overhead line Orders: i) by extending the powers beyond a building and the land within its curtilage to 'any land, building, structure, apparatus or equipment'; and ii) by extending the powers beyond the Order Limits. Can you assist the ExA in providing fuller justification for the widening of the powers under this Article than currently set out in the EM [APP-035], namely helping to mitigate the risk of unforeseen circumstance prejudicing the delivery of this NSIP? a) What sort of unforeseen circumstances could arise (or have arisen on other built projects)? b) Could 'may be affected by the authorised development' (Article 20(1)) be more precisely defined? c) The EM states that exercising the power outside the Order Limits is caveated by 'where reasonably necessary'. The word 'reasonably' does not appear in Article 20(1). It refers to whether the undertaker considers it to be 'necessary or expedient'. Can you reconsider this wording in the interests of precision and clarity? d) Can you justify the length of the notice periods being not less than 14 days' notice to exercise the right and ten days' notice for a counter-notice (Articles 20 (5) and (6))? e) How is 'part' defined for the purposes of Article 20 (8) (b)? Does this mean that there would be partial completions relating to different timings for first bringing into operational use? f) What could, or would be most likely to, constitute 'any other works' (Article 20 (12) (a))? g) Can you explain how you would establish owners and occupiers of land outside the Order Limits. h) If not covered in SoCGs with Statutory Undertakers, how would you establish if they agree with the powers in this Article?

Reference	Question to:	Question
		i) Should the title of this Article be amended to properly reflect the powers sought within it that include land, structure, apparatus or equipment (Article 20 (12) (a))?
DC1.6.40	The Applicant	When exercising rights conferred by Article 20 in respect of any land, building, structure, apparatus or equipment lying outside the Order Limits, if those works constituted development for which planning permission is required in accordance with s55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, how would the dDCO interface with that legislation?
DC1.6.41	Statutory Undertakers	Are you content with the extent of the powers sought under Article 20? If not, set out your reasons and any suggested amendments to the wording of this Article.
DC1.6.42	Statutory Undertakers	Have you any objection to: a) The powers sought in connection with your land, building, structure, apparatus and equipment? b) The powers sought outside of the Order Limits? c) The notice periods (Article 20 (5) and (6))? d) The definition of 'protective works' (Article 20 (12))?
DC1.6.43	The Applicant	Article 21 (1) permits the undertaker to enter on any land ' <i>within the Order limits or which may be affected by the authorised development</i> ', which appears to be a wide power. Can the Applicant explain: a) Whether the scope of Article 21 (1) appropriate and proportionate in the context of the powers sought? b) Why it considers 14 days' notice (Article 21 (3)) appropriate and reasonable prior to entering land to undertake surveys and investigations.
DC1.6.44	Any Affected Person	Do you consider that 14 days' notice (Article 21 (3)) is an appropriate and reasonable amount of notice for the undertaker to give you prior to entering land to undertake surveys and investigations? If not, what notice period would you consider to be proportionate and reasonable?
DC1.6.45	The Applicant	To what extent have provisions in Article 24 been drafted in accordance with PINS Advice Note 15: <i>Drafting Development Consent Orders</i> , in particular, sections 23 (extinguishment of rights) and 24 (restrictive covenants)?
DC1.6.46	The Applicant	Given parliamentary approval of the TP regime under the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017, which was subject to consultation and debate before being enacted, should any provisions relating to notices or counter-notices in Article 26, 27 and 28 of the dDCO, which do not reflect the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 proposed regime (not yet in force,) be modified to reflect the incoming statutory regime more closely, where possible, as follows: a) The Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 provisions include the ability to serve a counter-notice objecting to the proposed TP so that the landowner would have the option to choose whether TP or permanent acquisition was desirable. Should these Articles make some such provision, whether or not in the form in the NPA 2017? b) Under the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017, the notice would also have to state the period for which the acquiring authority is to take possession. Should such a requirement be included in the aforementioned Articles?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.47	Any Affected Person	Do you agree with the notice periods set out in Articles 26 (2), 27 (2), 28 (3) and 28 (11)? If not, set out the reasons why you do not agree and suggest timescales that you consider to be appropriate, with reasoning.
DC1.6.48	The Applicant	In respect of Article 28 (11), the EM (APP-035) cites the River Humber Gas Pipeline Replacement Order 2016 as justification for the provision. However, the EM does not explain why that particular wording is relevant to the proposed dDCO, for example detailing what is factually similar for both the relevant consented NSIP and the Proposed Development. In that context, its relevance is unclear moreover as the ExA notes that it was not included in the Richborough Connection Project Order 2017. Why is it needed in this context?
DC1.6.49	The Applicant	Can you explain whether and how the controls on noise elsewhere in the dDCO are sufficient to justify the defence being provided by this Article 46 in respect of statutory nuisance claims?
DC1.6.50	The Applicant	Comments at paragraph 3.50.2 of the EM [APP-035] are noted in respect of Articles 46 (2) and (3). Nevertheless, are there any made DCOs for comparable projects where they have been included? Why are they considered necessary in this context and what are they perceived to add to the provisions of the Article when read in the round?
DC1.6.51	Local planning authorities	Are you satisfied that Articles 46 (2) and (3) provide a reasonable and proportionate defence to statutory nuisance. If not, why not?
DC1.6.52	The Applicant	Should Article 46 (3) refer to 'the local planning authority' rather than 'the local authority'?
DC1.6.53	The Applicant	Can the Applicant address the points at paragraph 21.3.11 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039]?
DC1.6.54	The Applicant	In Article 48 (8), is the reference intended to be to a tree identified in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) or to works to a tree identified in the LEMP?
DC1.6.55	The Applicant	'Near' is not defined in Article 2 of the dDCO. In that context, how is it to be interpreted in Article 48 (1)? In the interests of clarity, certainty and enforcement, does it need to be defined so that all parties know what rights it conveys?
DC1.6.56	Braintree DC Essex CC	At paragraph 21.3.13 of your LIR [REP1-039], you raised concerns about the implications for vessels moored upstream of proposed works on the River Stour. Do the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] on pages 81 and 102 as they relate to the works, allay your concerns about Article 50. If not, how should it be redrafted to address them?
DC1.6.57	Environment Agency	In your capacity as the navigation authority for the River Stour, has the Applicant addressed your concerns about Article 50 of the dDCO in Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] at pages 81 and 102?
DC1.6.58	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Whose would be responsible for registering Article 53's provisions as a local land charge, including any associated cost, as Article 53 (6) seeks?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.59	The Applicant Local planning authorities	A proposal's implications for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development would be capable of being a material consideration in determining any application for planning permission made wholly or partly within the Order Limits by virtue of Section 70 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990. In that context, is the Article 53 proposal to add to local planning authorities' administrative burden proportionate and necessary?
DC1.6.60	The Applicant Local planning authorities	The local planning authority is under a legal duty to determine applications for planning permission according to principles of administrative law. If this is not done, there is opportunity for challenge under existing legislation and public law principles. In relation to the proposed Article 53, do you consider the existing legal checks and balances to be insufficient to protect the Applicant's interests?
DC1.6.61	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Article 53 (5) of the dDCO would require that the matters raised in the undertaker's representations are 'addressed'. This contrasts with Section 70 (2) (c) of Town and County Planning Act 1990 that requires a local planning authority to 'have regard to' the listed considerations. Would this facet of the Article's wording arguably fetter a local planning authority's implementation of the provision of Town and County Planning Act 1990 by including the word 'addressed' as opposed to 'have regard to'?
DC1.6.62	The Applicant Local planning authorities	In relation to Article 53, the EM [APP-035] cites the Thames Tideway Tunnel Order as precedent but does not explain what it considers to be the factual similarities between the consented scheme and the Proposed Development? How are they considered to be comparable? Are the Thames Tideway Tunnel Order and the Proposed Development not distinguishable in terms of context with this being a predominantly rural area subject to comparatively less development pressure?
DC1.6.63	The Applicant	The Planning Statement [APP-160] at paragraph 1.1.6. lists ' <i>ancillary activities... required to facilitate construction and operation of the project...</i> ' Does this require amendment given that a number of the entries are not activities as such, and to be consistent with the draft DCO, which identifies them as Associated Development for which consent is sought?
DC1.6.64	Local planning authorities	Do you have any observations on the Applicant's response to Action Point 21 (AP21) arising from ISH1 that is set out on pages 14 and 15 of [REP1-034]?
DC1.6.65	The Applicant	In respect of 'Associated Development' as defined in Schedule 1 of the dDCO, how does the Applicant respond to the local planning authorities' concerns set out in paragraph 17.45 of the Sussex councils' LIR [REP1-045]?
DC1.6.66	The Applicant	Does sub-paragraph (r) under the Heading 'Associated Development' in Schedule 1 need to be amended to read, ' <i>...and which do not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the Environmental Statement</i> '? If you consider the amendment to be unnecessary, can you explain how sub-paragraph (r) relates to Article 2 (10)?
DC1.6.67	The Applicant	Can you address the concerns in respect of 'Associated Development' at paragraph 21.4.1 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039]?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.68	The Applicant	How do you respond to the concern about temporary site compounds at paragraph 21.4.2 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039]?
DC1.6.69	Local planning authorities	Does the Applicant's response to Action Point 22 (AP22) arising from ISH1 address local planning authorities' concerns that were raised in the preceding question? ([REP1-034], at page 15.)
DC1.6.70	The Applicant	It is noted that you propose to include the locations of the construction compounds within an updated version of the CEMP as a way of securing their locations and the works anticipated at each compound. Why is this approach favoured as opposed to their inclusion on the Work Plans and the accompanying Work Nos. at Schedule 1 of the dDCO?
DC1.6.71	Local planning authorities	Do you wish to respond to the Applicant's remarks about 'Associated Development' in its comments on RRs [REP1-025] at page 80?
DC1.6.72	The Applicant	Requirement 1 (1) defines the 'biodiversity metric' as Biodiversity Metric 3.1 as published by Natural England in April 2022. Your evidence on this point at page 111 of your Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] about the use of version 4.0 are noted. Nevertheless, should the dDCO refer to the most up-to-date version or any version that subsequently replaces it?
DC1.6.73	The Applicant	Should Requirement 1 (2) of the dDCO make provision for the relevant highway authority in addition to the relevant planning authority?
DC1.6.74	The Applicant	How do you respond to the points made in paragraph 17.56 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] in respect of Requirement 1 (4)?
DC1.6.75	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Article 2 of the dDCO includes a definition of 'commence' but neither it nor Requirement 1 define 'begin' for the purposes of Requirement 2 (1). For the sake of precision and enforceability, is such a definition required?
DC1.6.76	The Applicant	The issue of time limits has been addressed at paragraphs 4.37 and 4.38 of the EM [APP-035] but can the Applicant explain why: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• both Requirement 2 (1) and 2 (2) are considered necessary; and</li> <li>• the differences in the practical application of both in implementing the DCO?</li> </ul>
DC1.6.77	Local planning authorities	Is the distinction between the applicability of the time limits in Requirement 2 precise and enforceable? If not, how should it be changed?
DC1.6.78	Local planning authorities	Notwithstanding how 'stage' is defined in Requirement 1 of the dDCO, is it sufficiently clear to you what it means in the context of Requirement 3?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.79	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Should the written scheme referred to in Requirement 3 (1) be subject to approval by the relevant planning authority within a stated time period? If not, why not?
DC1.6.80	Local planning authorities	Should any amendments to the written scheme, referred to in Requirement 3 (2), be subject to approval by the relevant planning authority? If so, why?
DC1.6.81	The Applicant	By virtue of Requirement 4 (3), pre-commencement works must be carried out in accordance with the plans listed in sub-paragraph (2). However, the drainage and archaeological plans subject of Requirements 5 and 6 are not included – why is this?
DC1.6.82	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	Requirement 4 (3) refers to ' <i>other discharging authority as may be appropriate to the relevant plan concerned</i> '. Would this not address your concern that any departure from the CTMP should be agreed with the relevant highway authority?
DC1.6.83	The Applicant	Should Requirement 5 be amended to include consultation with the relevant planning authority in respect of the Drainage Management Plan?
DC1.6.84	The Applicant	Does Requirement 6 need to be amended in accordance with the comments of Suffolk CC Archaeological Service set out in paragraphs 8.49 to 8.52 inclusive of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045]?
DC1.6.85	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	Following on from your comment in paragraph 6.26 of your LIR [REP1-045], can you specify which Requirement(s) you consider need to be amended and suggest wording that would address your concerns?
DC1.6.86	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Should Requirement 8 refer to the baseline information and assessment set out in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-011]? If not, why not?
DC1.6.87	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Should the plan submitted under Requirement 8(1) also include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tree protection plans detailing temporary physical tree protection measures according to BS 5837:2012;</li> <li>• a schedule of any proposed tree and hedgerow management to facilitate retention;</li> <li>• specifications for temporary physical protection for retained and vulnerable trees; and</li> <li>• details of an auditable system of compliance with the approved protection measures?</li> </ul> If not, why not?
DC1.6.88	The Applicant	For the purposes of Requirement 9, can you clarify if 'reinstatement planting' is replacement planting for trees, shrubs and hedgerows lost to the Proposed Development?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.89	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Should Requirement 9 also refer to the need to include details of ground cultivation for planting, five-year maintenance proposals, and arrangements for the identification and replacement of any failures? The Applicant is referred to the Yorkshire Green dDCO as an example.
DC1.6.90	The Applicant	Requirement 10 - the title is ambiguous; the word 'maintenance' refers to the planting not the plan. Can the applicant address this imprecision?
DC1.6.91	The Applicant Local planning authorities	In the interests of clarity, do you agree that the maintenance arrangements in Requirement 10 (3) would be better part of the reinstatement planting plan to be agreed by the relevant planning authority and thus should be included in that plan and referred to in Requirement 9? If not, please explain why not.
DC1.6.92	The Applicant	Can you explain why a five-year aftercare period for mitigation planting has been proposed, as described in the LEMP [APP-182] and secured through Requirement 10 (3) of the dDCO [APP-034], given that the mitigation and residual effect conclusions in ES Chapter 6 [APP-074] rely on replacement planting maturing at Year 15 of operation. Please comment on the potential for a longer aftercare period and provide evidence for your position.  The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] (paragraphs 6.29 to 6.31) notes that they consider the proposals for aftercare presented in the LEMP to be insufficient. For trees, the councils advocate a minimum of 10 years aftercare, and for woodland planting a minimum of 15 years: even longer time scales may be required for natural woodland regeneration. They also suggest that the proposals for management and aftercare of natural woodland regeneration are not covered by any requirements in the draft DCO and advocate a requirement for dynamic aftercare. They believe that the proposals should allow for the costs of annual inspections by and reports to the local planning authorities for the duration of the aftercare period. You are also referred to Paragraph 21.5.7 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] in this respect. Can you respond to each of these comments?
DC1.6.93	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	What wording would you suggest in place of Requirement 11 as drafted?
DC1.6.94	The Applicant	Can you explain how the description of decommissioning presented in Requirement 12 of the dDCO differs from the activities defined in accordance with 'maintain' presented in Article 2 (1) thereof?
DC1.6.95	The Applicant	Whilst biodiversity net gain is not yet required by law, you ask the ExA and SoS to take its benefits into account. Requirement 13 simply commits you to submitting written evidence to the relevant planning authority in advance of the Proposed Development's operational use: there is no requirement for implementation, management, maintenance and retention of the proposed biodiversity net gain. In this context: a) What is the purpose of Requirement 13; and b) What weight can the ExA and SoS give to it in the overall balancing exercise?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.96	The Applicant	Without prejudice to the ExA's position on the incorporation of biodiversity net gain, has sufficient land been included within the Order Limits to accommodate this aspect of the Proposed Development in full? Paragraph 7.4.11 of the SoR [APP-038] suggests that is not the case. If not, how can the ExA be satisfied that additional land would be secured for that purpose and appropriate provisions put in place for its implementation, maintenance and retention, moreover, as you said that you did not envisage the need for Section 106 Agreements (refer to the Planning Statement [APP-160], paragraph 4.19)?
DC1.6.97	Essex CC Braintree DC	In paragraphs 21.5.10 and 23.3.2 of your LIR you refer to additional Requirements that you say should be considered. Can you provide draft wording of the additional Requirements that you consider need to be included in the DCO to deliver the project?
DC1.6.98	The Applicant	How do you respond to the Suffolk councils' contention at paragraphs 17.70 to 17.83 inclusive of their LIR [REP1-045] that the 28-day decision-making period in paragraph 1 (1) of Schedule 4, compared to the 42-day period in paragraph 1 (2) of Appendix 1 of PINS Advice Note 15: <i>Drafting Development Consent Orders</i> is unlikely to affect 'the immediate and pressing national need which the project is intended to address' as you say at paragraph 4.4.2 of your EM [APP-035]?
DC1.6.99	The Applicant	Paragraph 1 (2) of Schedule 4 of the dDCO provides for consent being acquired by default if the relevant authority does not determine an application for discharge of Requirements within 28 days. In this context and taking account of councils' submissions about resource implications for dealing with applications within the 28-day period specified in paragraph 1 (1) of Schedule 4 of the dDCO, is it fair, reasonable and proportionate? You are, for example, referred to paragraph 21.6.1 and 21.6.2 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-39] where precedent for a 56-day period for discharge is provided.
DC1.6.100	The Applicant	How do you respond to local planning authorities' contention that the timescale at Paragraph 2 (3) of Schedule 4 is insufficient? You are, for example, referred to Paragraphs 21.6.4 and 21.6.5 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-39] in this respect.
DC1.6.101	The Applicant	What is your response to submissions made by the local planning authorities that the fee at Paragraph 3 (1) (b) of Schedule 4 is insufficient? You are, for example, referred to Paragraph 21.6.3 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-39] in this respect.
DC1.6.102	Local planning authorities	Can you respond to the Applicant's submission on 'Timeframes for Determining Applications and Fees' in its comments on RRs [REP1-025] at page 82?
DC1.6.103	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	Why do you consider paragraph 3 (2) of Schedule 4 to be unreasonable? How does it need to be amended to address your concerns?



Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.104	Local planning authorities	What fee should be levied by paragraph 3 (1) (b) of Schedule 4 of the dDCO?
DC1.6.105	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	Can you provide suggested wording of the amendments to Articles, Requirements and Paragraph 1 of Schedule 4 that you refer to in paragraph 17.87 (a to j inclusive) of your joint LIR [REP1-045]?
DC1.6.106	The Applicant	Burstall PC [RR-013] seeks community involvement in the discharge of Requirements: what is your response?
DC1.6.107	The Applicant	Who would be the arbiter in deciding whether a right exercised by virtue of the DCO would give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the ES in the context of: Article 2 (1) definition of 'maintain'; Article 2 (10); Article 5 (4); Schedule 1 definition of 'Associated Development' sub-paragraph (r); Schedule 3 - Requirement 1 (4); and Schedule 4 – paragraph 1 (3) (c)? Would that decision be made after consultation with other parties and, if so, what provision is made for that in the dDCO?
DC1.6.108	The Applicant	Can you advise if the streets and public rights of way referred to in Schedules 7, 8 and 12 have been described in accordance with the street gazetteer and definitive map?
DC1.6.109	The Applicant	Do you need to amend any of the Schedules cited in the previous question considering paragraph 12.31 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] where they have identified errors when checking the location of accesses and their description against the street gazetteer thereby potentially invalidating speed limits, parking restrictions and road closures?
DC1.6.110	The Applicant	In respect of Schedule 12, Part 1, how do you respond to paragraph 12.35 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] where they question the need for proposed parking restrictions and, if they are to be retained, seek clarity on their scope?
DC1.6.111	The Applicant	In respect of Schedule 12, Part 3, at paragraph 12.36 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] they say that one-way movements on specified roads would be unacceptable to the local highway authority unless implemented overnight with an acceptable diversion; how do you respond?
DC1.6.112	The Applicant	Where a representation is made by a Statutory Undertaker under s127 of PA2008 and it has not been withdrawn by the close of the Examination, the SoS would be unable to authorise powers relating to the Statutory Undertaker's land unless satisfied of specified matters set out in s127. If the representation is not withdrawn by the end of the Examination, confirmation would be needed that the 'expedience' test is met.  The SoS would also be unable to authorise removal or repositioning of apparatus unless satisfied that the extinguishment or removal would be necessary for the purposes of carrying out the Proposed Development to which the Order would relate in accordance with s138 of PA2008. Justification would be needed to show that extinguishment or removal would be necessary.  Can you indicate when, if the objections from Statutory Undertakers are not withdrawn, this information would be submitted to the Examination?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.113	The Applicant	In respect of the public general legislation specified in Schedule 15, can you provide a table setting out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• why the specified provisions are being disapplied;</li> <li>• how the equivalent protections are provided for in the dDCO. If they are not provided for, provide justification of the approach; and</li> <li>• relevant provisions of the dDCO.</li> </ul>
DC1.6.114	The Applicant	In respect of Schedule 16, can the Applicant provide: <p>a) Copies of the local legislation;</p> <p>b) A table specifying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the provisions of both chapters;</li> <li>• why each is being disapplied;</li> <li>• how the equivalent protections are provided for in the dDCO;</li> <li>• if they are not provided for, provide justification of the approach; and</li> <li>• relevant provisions of the dDCO.</li> </ul>
DC1.6.115	The Applicant	Can you address the concerns raised in respect of Article 57 and Schedule 17 at paragraph 21.3.14 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039]?
DC1.6.116	The Applicant	In respect of Schedule 17, can you advise if there is a need to include the appendices to the principal (listed) plan documents they are an annex to if they have their own document numbers? For example, the LEMP is document 7.8 and is listed as such in Schedule 17. It has three Appendices, each of which is critical to achieving the mitigation assumed in the ES, but these are separately numbered as documents 7.8.1, 7.8.2 and 7.8.3. As such, it could be argued that they are currently not included in Schedule 17 and are therefore not secured. (Alternatively, it may be possible to achieve this through an amendment to the definition of the LEMP in Article 2 by adding the three appendices and their document numbers.)
DC1.6.117	Natural England	At pages 122 to 125 inclusive of its Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025], the Applicant responds to various points that you made in your RR [RR-042] about the scope of the dDCO's provisions. Have its comments addressed your concerns? If not, can you explain why not?
DC1.6.118	The Applicant	At paragraph 12.15 of their LIR [REP1-045] the Suffolk councils seek either the inclusion of Protective Provisions in the DCO or separate side agreement to provide sufficient protection for their role as highway authority. How do you respond both to this suggestion and also to their reference to an exemplar highway agreement?
DC1.6.119	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	At paragraph 12.11 of your LIR [REP1-45] you refer to the need for a Requirement to address decommissioning and removal route; can you suggest the wording that you would like to see included within the DCO?

Reference	Question to:	Question
DC1.6.120	The Applicant Environment Agency	Are negotiations continuing between the Applicant and the Environment Agency about potential further Requirements in the dDCO in relation to navigation of the River Stour and temporary in-river and cross-river construction structures and permanent cross-river structures? Will the outcome be reported in the Statement of Common Ground between the parties, and, if so, when is this expected? If there is no agreement on these matters as yet, can the Environment Agency suggest the wording that you would like to see included within the DCO?
<b>7. Good design</b>		
GD1.7.1	The Applicant Essex CC Braintree DC	Does the design of the proposed mitigation mounds and planting at the proposed new grid supply point substation comply with Horlock Guideline 9 and the good design tests in NPS EN-1 in terms of existing landscape character and landform?
GD1.7.2	The Applicant	Paragraphs 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 of ES Appendix 4.1 Good Design [APP-090] describe the relationship between the Limits of Deviation for permanent infrastructure and evolving good design, and the approach that the Applicant intends to take to this. Why have the same good design principles not been applied to temporary works such as access routes and construction compounds?
GD1.7.3	The Applicant	Appendix 1 of the LIR from Essex County Council and Braintree District Council [REP1-039] supports the preliminary design principles for the Proposed Development offered by Suffolk County Council in Annex C to its LIR [REP1-044]. Explain if and how these principles were considered and how they influenced the design of the Proposed Development. If they were not, explain why not.
GD1.7.4	The Applicant	Paragraph 7.2.1 in ES Appendix 4.1, Good Design [APP-090] notes that further work would be undertaken during detailed design to identify good design principles. Can you outline your design review process, and whether a design review panel and design champion (with relevant experience and qualifications) would be engaged?
<b>8. Historic environment</b>		
HE1.8.1	Historic England Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC Suffolk CC	Are you content with the study areas used for the historic environment baseline studies (paragraph 8.4.5 <i>ff</i> , ES Chapter 8 [APP-076])?

Reference	Question to:	Question
HE1.8.2	Historic England Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC Suffolk CC	The assessment of effects on settings in ES Chapter 8 [APP-076] (paragraphs 8.1.6, 8.4.11, 8.4.17, 8.4.22, etc) seems to rely on intervisibility between the Proposed Development and potential historic environment receptors. Do you understand that to be the case, and, if so, are you content with the approach?
HE1.8.3	Historic England	If not covered in your Written Representation, can you elaborate on your specific concerns in relation to the cable sealing end compound close to the Polstead Conservation Area [RR-036].
HE1.8.4	The Applicant	Chapter 8 of the ES, Historic Environment [APP-076], recognises that Dedham Vale and the Stour Valley have important historical cultural associations with famous artists. The LVIA methodology (Table 2.2 of ES Appendix 6.1 [APP-097]) also recognises the importance of such associations. Where can the assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development on the relevant historical cultural receptors be found?  The passing references in paragraphs 8.3.6 and 8.5.30 of the ES are noted, but they do not appear to identify any specific locations or views that were represented by the artists, nor do they provide any substantiation of the conclusion reached that, <i>'the project would not result in any change that would affect the artistic representations more than they have already been changed by the existing transport and overhead energy infrastructure.'</i> Could elaboration of the assessment and conclusions be provided.  Also comment on the suggestion in the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] (paragraph 6.130) that the Brett Valley shares similar characteristics and that the ES neither recognises the cultural significance of this landscape nor addresses the residual adverse impacts on its cultural associations with artists and writers, some of whom are listed in their Annex A, Assessment of Effects in the Brett Valley [REP1-044].
HE1.8.5	Braintree DC Essex CC	In your LIR [REP1-039], you say that <i>'further work will need to be done to understand the full impact of the proposals once the route has been finalised, and limits of deviation agreed'</i> (paragraph 11.4.1). Explain this comment in the context that the draft DCO sets the proposed Limits of Deviation for the route and that the Applicant says that the assessment has been carried out on the worst-case effect for each receptor. What further information and assessment would be required?  Similarly, paragraph 11.6.2 suggests that, <i>'as this application progresses, further detail must be given regarding the heritage assets which have been identified as affected by the proposals...'</i> , and goes on to suggest that this must inform the mitigation measures. Please explain what further information and assessment is considered to be required.
HE1.8.6	The Applicant	Comment on the five suggestions in section 11.9 of the LIR from the Essex councils [REP1-039] to amend the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-187], and the suggested amendments set out in the Suffolk councils' LIR at paragraphs 8.48 to 8.52, providing reasoning for your response in each case.

Reference	Question to:	Question
HE1.8.7	The Applicant	Requirement 6 of the dDCO [APP-034] requires the Proposed Development to be undertaken in accordance with the Archaeological Framework Strategy [APP-186] and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [AS-001], with a requirement for submission and approval of a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation prior to commencement of each stage. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation sets out the proposed approach to further archaeological investigation. The proposed location for each technique is shown on Figure 1 of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation, with areas in Sections D, G and H annotated as 'Archaeological mitigation to be confirmed'. Section 2 of the Archaeological Framework Strategy states that a targeted phase of archaeological trial trenching surveys has been completed but that this would be an ongoing process, which may not be available to inform the ES. The initial phase of archaeological trial trenching has focused on areas where there is potential for more complex remains, the results being presented in ES Appendix 8.1 [APP-125]. Can you confirm at what stage the archaeological mitigation required in Sections D, G and H (Figure 1 of Outline Written Scheme of Investigation) would be confirmed and whether this is likely to comprise one of the mitigation types already identified in the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation?
HE1.8.8	The Applicant	Can you comment on the suggestion in the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] (paragraphs 6.136 to 6.138) that some assets have not been properly explored and assessed, including Benton End House (a Grade II* Listed Building) and Overbury Hall (a Grade II Listed Building)? It is suggested that both assets, and their wider landscape setting in the Brett Valley, are particularly sensitive due to their associations with artists.
HE1.8.9	Historic England Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC Suffolk CC The Suffolk Preservation Society	<p>A number of parties have raised issues in relation to effects on the Grade I listed Hintlesham Hall and the associated listed buildings. The Applicant's proposals here are said to be based on the micrositing of towers agreed with Historic England prior to the project being put on hold in 2013, but the proposed Limits of Deviation proposed would allow pylons to vary from the indicative agreed positions.</p> <p>Do you consider this approach acceptable in the area within the setting of Hintlesham Hall?</p> <p>Are there any implications in relation to avoidable harm to Hintlesham Hall?</p> <p>Can you confirm if there is a specific area, component or extent of the proposed Limits of Deviation that is of concern, and any harm you consider could arise.</p> <p>Should any changes or deviation be restricted to those agreed by the relevant local planning authority and Historic England?</p> <p>Paragraph 8.11.6 of the ES [APP-076] addresses the sensitivity testing that was carried out in relation to pylon locations and alignment and concludes that, '<i>the pylons could be located anywhere within the parameters of the LoD (including the vertical LoD) without resulting in significant effects to heritage assets.</i>' Do you agree with this conclusion?</p> <p>Is the sensitivity testing and conclusion further described in the Applicant's Hintlesham Hall Assessment [APP-128] sufficiently evidenced, and do you agree with the conclusion?</p>

Reference	Question to:	Question
HE1.8.10	The Applicant Historic England Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC Suffolk CC The Suffolk Preservation Society	Noting that nearby locations and slightly different angles of view might introduce one or more of the proposed new pylons into the visualisation in addition to the new overhead lines, is the location of viewpoint HV01 [APP-063] reasonably representative of the full range of potential impacts on the listed buildings at the Hintlesham Hall estate, including their setting? On this basis, is the assessment set out in the Hintlesham Hall Assessment [APP-128] a reasonable worst case?
HE1.8.11	The Applicant	Paragraph 8.11.6 of the ES [APP-076] and the Hintlesham Hall Assessment [APP-128] address the sensitivity testing that was carried out in relation to pylon locations and alignment. What would be the worst-case scenario for the proposed 400kV line and pylons in relation to the impacts on Hintlesham Hall and Park? Provide a full assessment with visualisations of this scenario to compare with the assessment provided, which was based on the indicative proposed alignment.
HE1.8.12	The Applicant	Can you explain the options available to you to reduce the vertical and horizontal Limits of Deviation in the vicinity of Hintlesham Hall and its setting. If you consider there to be none, provide evidence of the constraints to support this position.
HE1.8.13	The Applicant	Sheet 3 of the Land Plans [APP-008] seems to indicate that you are seeking Compulsory Acquisition rights for biodiversity net gain at two points in the former continuation of the avenue from the front of Hintlesham Hall (parcels 3-09, 3-04 and 3-10). What assumptions were made in terms of the historic environment assessment in relation to these proposals? What is the nature of the biodiversity net gain proposed here and what implications might there be for the assessment of impacts on Hintlesham Hall and its setting? Explain what control there would be through the dDCO to ensure that any effect was not adverse in historic environment terms.
HE1.8.14	The Applicant	In your response to Relevant Representations [REP1-025], can you confirm an omission of 'no' in table 3.13, top of page 106 (i.e., should it read, 'As <i>no significant effect</i> ...')?
HE1.8.15	The Applicant Historic England	The ExA notes that the Applicant and Historic England are in ongoing discussions about mitigation for adverse effects on heritage assets, including the potential for landscape restoration of the historic park at Hintlesham Hall [RR-036]. Can the Applicant and Historic England provide an update on discussions and comment on how the Limits of Deviation proposed in this location might affect any proposals to restore parts of the historic park.

Reference	Question to:	Question
<b>9. Landscape and views, including trees and hedgerows</b>		
AONB		
LV1.9.1	Natural England Local planning authorities Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Partnership The PCs of Assington, Bures St Mary, Leavenheath, Little Cornard, Polstead and Stoke by Nayland	Having seen the information from the Applicant in ES Appendix 6.2 Annex A, Dedham Vale AONB Approach and Identification of Setting Study [APP-099], and its comments on RRs (e.g., section 2.12, section 2.13, page 64, section 3.9, page 113) [REP1-025], explain any outstanding concerns that you may have in relation to the Applicant's definition of, and assessment of impacts on the setting of the Dedham Vale AONB.
LV1.9.2	The PCs of Assington, Bures St Mary, Leavenheath, Little Cornard, Polstead and Stoke by Nayland	In your submission at OFH2 and your follow up note [REP1-070], you indicate that the six PCs intend to seek expert landscape advice in relation to the Applicant's approach to assessing effects on the setting of the AONB, with the intention of submitting this at Deadline 9. This would be very late in the Examination, so can this be submitted as a part of your Written Representation or as soon as possible after this?
LV1.9.3	Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Partnership	Your RR [RR-028] raised the matter of how the Proposed Development would impact on the ability to deliver the AONB's statutory purpose, without further detail. Having seen the Applicant's comments on your RR [REP1-025], can you elaborate on any outstanding concerns in relation to this?
LV1.9.4	Natural England	Having seen the Applicant's comments on RRs [REP1-025] (e.g., page 113 <i>ff</i> ) and its document, The Dedham Vale AONB Special Qualities and Statutory Purpose [REP1-032], do you believe that any further information is required to assess the

Reference	Question to:	Question
	Local planning authorities Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Partnership	Proposed Development's effects on the special qualities of the AONB? Do you agree with the Applicant's conclusions in this regard, and, if not, why not?
LV1.9.5	The Applicant Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Partnership	A number of AONB policy and management documents have been mentioned in submissions into the Examination, including: 'the AONB Management Plan' and six position statements on key issues affecting the AONB (including the 'Dedham Vale AONB Position Statement: Development in the Setting of the Dedham Vale AONB') (ES Appendix 6.2 Annex A, Dedham Vale AONB Approach and Identification of Setting Study [APP-099]); the 'Dedham Vale AONB and SVPA Management Plan (2016-2021)'; the 'Dedham Vale AONB and SVPA Management Plan (2021-2026)'; and the 'Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: Natural Beauty and Special Qualities document' [RR-028]. Which of these do you believe to be important and relevant to the considerations of the ExA and SoS, and do any of them need to be submitted into the Examination as a consequence?
LV1.9.6	Natural England Local planning authorities Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Partnership	Do you consider that the information submitted by the Applicant in its comments on RRs [REP1-025] (e.g., page 92 and page 113 ff) is sufficient to conclude that the Applicant properly addressed its duty of regard to the purpose of the AONB as described in section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000)? If not, why not?
Visual assessment		
LV1.9.7	The Applicant	Why are the visualisations for Viewpoint D04 in winter and summer taken from a different location or orientation [APP-064]? A worst case appears to be illustrated in the winter view, with the proposed pylon to the right of centre sitting between the mature trees, whilst in summer the same proposed pylon is partially obscured by one of those mature trees.
LV1.9.8	The Applicant	What was the rationale for the selection of the location and angle of view for viewpoint F2.14 (bearing to centre of panoramic: 170°) ([APP-064] and [APP-105])? Would the impact of the difference in prominence between the line and pylons to be removed and the proposed new ones have been more effectively illustrated had the location been moved to a nearby location on the footpath where there was a clear view over the hedgerow at normal pedestrian eye level, and the bearing rotated to approximately 240°, from where a user of the public footpath would be viewing the lines rising with the topography to a hilltop beside the Stour valley, and from where the influence of the man-made water tower might be considered less?



Reference	Question to:	Question
LV1.9.9	The Applicant	Why does visualisation G01 not illustrate the full height of the proposed pylon and line, when there appears to be ample superfluous foreground to allow the angle of the photograph to be altered to show the full height ([APP-106] and [APP-065]). Does this under-represent the magnitude and significance of the visual impact from this viewpoint?
LV1.9.10	The Applicant	What is the rationale for your description of effects at viewpoint AB2.13 - a reduction of pylons and a small beneficial change - in the context of what appears to be illustrated as an increase in pylons in the wirelines [APP-101]?
LV1.9.11	The Applicant	What is the rationale for the description of effects at viewpoint AB01 (a medium beneficial change), given that the 132kV pylons to be removed are barely discernible in the baseline photography, whilst there is a much more noticeable increase in density and numbers of the more prominent 400kV pylons in the right third of the view [APP-101]?
LV1.9.12	The Applicant	A 'small' magnitude of visual change is predicted in the ES for viewpoint D02, but the existing 132kV line pylons seem barely perceptible on the baseline photograph or wireline, whereas the future wireline suggests that the proposed 400kV line pylons would be almost as prominent as the existing 400kV line pylons, adding perhaps five prominent pylons to the four already in the centre and right of the baseline view [APP-103]. What was your rationale for this conclusion?
LV1.9.13	The Applicant	Your analysis of the predicted change at viewpoint D06 for operational year 1 states that the, ' <i>removal of the existing 132kV overhead line in association with the underground cables would remove the 400kV pylons from the foreground, resulting in a beneficial effect on the view...</i> ' [APP-103]. What is meant by the 400kV pylons in the foreground, and how did this lead to a predicted beneficial outcome in relation to the baseline situation?
LV1.9.14	The Applicant	Your analysis of the predicted change at viewpoint D07 for operational year 1 states that the, ' <i>removal of the existing 132kV overhead line and presence of underground cables would remove the 400kV pylon behind the conifers...</i> ' [APP-103]. What does this mean, and was it considered to contribute beneficially to the overall assessment of visual change at the viewpoint?
LV1.9.15	The Applicant	The predicted wireline for viewpoint F01 uses a different graphical representation for the existing pylon than that used on the baseline wireline [APP-105]. Confirm this represents an existing 400kV line pylon, and why there is a difference?
LV1.9.16	Suffolk CC	Your suggested locations for site inspections [PDA-007] includes VP AB2.19 (location 2). Is this an incorrect reference as it could not be located in the application documentation?
LV1.9.17	The Applicant Suffolk CC	Suffolk CC [PDA-007] believes there is an omission on Photomontages 34A and 34B [APP-065] (which display VP G07 in year 1 and year 15), in that no mitigation planting is shown in year 15 whereas ES Appendix 6.4, Viewpoint Assessment Section G Part 6 [APP-106], notes that year 15 would include mitigation. What is the situation with this?
LV1.9.18	The Applicant	Can you explain why VP H07 from Rectory Lane on the edge of Wickham St Paul [APP-107] was chosen as representative of impacts on users of public rights of way in this area rather than a view from a public rights of way closer to the Proposed Development (such as Bridleway 14 Bulmer, Footpath 16 Bulmer, Footpath 18 Bulmer, footpath 13 Wickham St Pauls or the nearby single-track lane)? (Section 7.4 of the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] refers.)

Reference	Question to:	Question
LV1.9.19	Braintree DC Essex CC	At paragraph 7.4.3 of your LIR [REP1-039], you suggest that there should be additional representative viewpoints and a visual assessment from public rights of way east of the A131 ('Twinstead 23, Twinstead 1 and Great Henry 18'). Can you specify the locations that you consider to be required, and what additional information this would add to the assessment?
LV1.9.20	The Applicant	Clarify the nature, extent and anticipated effectiveness of your proposed mitigation for the visual impacts highlighted for the view from Rectory Lane on the edge of Wickham St Paul (VP H07) during construction and at years 1 and 15. Explain how the mitigation planting that was assumed in the assessment is secured and monitored. (The Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] refers to this at paragraph 7.4.4.)
LV1.9.21	The Applicant	Can you address the request in the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] at paragraph 7.5.5 to clarify the nature, extent and anticipated effectiveness of proposed mitigation for the visual impacts highlighted for the Stour Valley west cable sealing end compound, including those from VP G07 (the public right of way near Mabb's Corner) during construction and at years 1 and 15? Explain how the mitigation planting that was assumed in the assessment is secured and monitored.
LV1.9.22	Braintree DC Essex CC	At paragraph 7.5.8 of your LIR [REP1-039], you suggest that an additional, closer viewpoint is required to assess the impacts of the proposed grid supply point substation and sealing end compound at Waldegrave Wood. You consider VP H07 (from Rectory Lane on the edge of Wickham St Paul) to be too far away to assess year 15 impacts. Can you confirm that the receptor of concern is users of the public rights of way network, explain why you do not believe that VPs H08 and H09 serve this function, and suggest a precise location where you consider the additional VP should be located?
LV1.9.23	The Applicant	The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] at paragraph 6.110 contends that the accumulation of long-term, minor, adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity experienced by communities along the route should be considered to be significant. What is your response to this? Has the cumulation of sequential effects been ignored or underestimated in your assessment? If not, please signpost where the sequential assessment can be read.
LV1.9.24	The Applicant	The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] at paragraph 6.108 suggests that the visual impact on recreational receptors using the public right of way represented from VP AB21 should be considered significant. What is your response to this?
LV1.9.25	The Applicant	What is your response to the uncertainty identified in the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] (paragraphs 6.144 to 6.145) about the nature of the landscape planting mitigation proposals for the Stour Valley west cable sealing end compound?
LV1.9.26	The Applicant	The Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] at paragraphs 6.161 to 6.164 raises concerns about your reliance on natural regeneration to achieve visual mitigation from some of the larger areas, both in terms of establishment and aftercare. Can you provide additional information and comfort that this would be effective in visual terms?
LV1.9.27	The Applicant	Can you signpost any landscape and visual assessment undertaken for the temporary bridges that are proposed to cross the River Stour, River Brett and River Box, as referred to in various documents such as the CEMP [APP-177] at paragraph 9.3.28? Clarify the dimensions of each of the proposed river bridges and the likely construction materials, explain how long each would be in place, and provide a landscape and visual assessment for each, if one is not already available, taking into account the sensitivity and susceptibility of the landscape and views in each case.

Reference	Question to:	Question
General LVIA matters		
LV1.9.28	Natural England	Your RR [RR-042] requests clarification in relation to the LVIA methodology and in particular how sensitivity was assigned to the Dedham Vale AONB in ES Chapter 6 [APP-074]. Has the explanation in the Applicant's comments on RRs [REP1-025] provided the explanation that you required, or do you have any outstanding concerns in this respect?
LV1.9.29	The Applicant Natural England Local planning authorities	The assessment is said to be based on GLVIA3 (ES Chapter 6 paragraph 6.4.11 [APP-074].) The Landscape Institute produced a consultation version of Draft Technical Guidance Note 05/23, <i>Notes and Clarifications on aspects of the 3rd Edition Guidelines on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3)</i> , in July 2023. Noting this remains as a draft, do any of the contents have any relevance to, or change the outcome of the LVIA set out in the ES?
LV1.9.30	The Applicant	Could you check consistency between the 'value', 'susceptibility' and 'sensitivity' ratings in ES Appendix 6.5 [APP-108], Assessment of Visual Effects on Communities, and ES Appendix 6.4 [APP-101] to [APP-107], the Viewpoint Assessments, and clarify the situation as necessary for all visual receptors.  (Apparent inconsistencies in the assessments include ( <i>inter alia</i> ): viewpoint D-04 (Shelley), (high susceptibility, high value, high sensitivity -v- high susceptibility, medium value, sensitivity not stated); viewpoint F-20 (Boxford), (high susceptibility, high value, high sensitivity -v- medium susceptibility, medium value, sensitivity not stated); viewpoint F-22 (Assington), (high susceptibility, high value, high sensitivity -v- medium susceptibility, medium value, sensitivity not stated); F-23 (Newton), (high susceptibility, high value, high sensitivity -v- medium susceptibility, medium value, sensitivity not stated). Are there any implications for the results and conclusions of the visual assessments as a consequence of that check?
LV1.9.31	The Applicant	Noting the statement in paragraph 6.4.26 of the ES [APP-074] that, ' <i>All assessment work has applied a precautionary principle, in that where limited information is available... a realistic worst-case scenario is assessed</i> ', can you provide clarification in relation to the comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility map in the ES figures ([APP-146], figure 6.7). Confirm that the ZTV for the new infrastructure, including all pylons, cable sealing ends and substation structures, is that shown in the pink and blue colours on the map. Explain the legend text that states, ' <i>AOD pylon height of 2.5 meters (sic) below top height of an indicative design. This provides an indication of places from which the very tops of the structures may theoretically be visible.</i> ' Firstly, does this mean that a height 2.5m lower than the indicative design has been used to generate the ZTV? Secondly, are the 4m Limits of Deviation sought in the draft DCO (Article 5(1)(b)(i)) taken into account? As such, is it the case that the ZTV may be based on a pylon height that is 6.5m shorter than that which could be built? Or on a pylon height that is 4m shorter than that which could be built?
LV1.9.32	The Applicant	How has the screening effect of vegetation has been taken into account in generating the ZTV? Can you clarify the apparent contradiction between the legend of figure 6.7 [APP-146] (' <i>woodland factored in</i> ') with paragraph 6.4.6 of the LVIA chapter [APP-074] (' <i>does not take into consideration screening effects of existing vegetation</i> ')?

Reference	Question to:	Question
LV1.9.33	The Applicant	Can clarification be provided in relation to the more detailed ZTV maps? In ES figures 6.8 to 6.13 inclusive [APP-147], what is the basis for determining the visibility of proposed pylons and other structures in relation to their height and the Limits of Deviation that the draft DCO seeks? Is the worst-case scenario used and shown? No ZTV is provided for pylon works in Project Section H. Is this because the works in this section are considered unlikely to lead to material changes in visibility?
LV1.9.34	The Applicant	The Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [APP-183] indicates trees and hedgerows to be retained, pruned, coppiced and removed. Does this categorisation assume that the proposed alignment is followed, and is it therefore just indicative? How is flexibility in the location of the Proposed Development within the Order Limits allowed for on the Plan and in the assessment?
LV1.9.35	The Applicant	Why is soil stripping considered essential at locations where temporary haul routes cross sensitive areas? For example, sheet 6 of the Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [APP-183] shows the removal of an area of potential ancient woodland along the footpath (PoAWS5) along a haul route under the indicative route of the new line. Sheet 9 shows a similar impact on EM-AB03 Valley Farm Meadows County Wildlife Site. Why is it necessary for these temporary works to include root removal rather than a temporary clearance by coppicing to ground level with root protection as part of a temporary trackway?
LV1.9.36	The Applicant	There appear to be a considerable number of instances where the Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [APP-183] and the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan [APP-184] do not correspond in relation to retained features. As just one example (on sheet 13 in both cases), a tree shown as lost (including roots) from H-E-04 on the removal plan re-appears as an existing feature on the reinstatement plan. Can each of the plan sheets be checked and an explanation provided, including any implications for the assessment?
LV1.9.37	The Applicant	The key for the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan [APP-184] includes a pink line for 'H1 hedgerow mix planting' and a green line for 'H1 hedgerow planting'. What is the difference, and how do these two categories relate to the H1 planting described in the Planting Schedule [APP-185]?
LV1.9.38	The Applicant	Can you clarify if the commitment to replace individual trees that are lost to the Proposed Development at a similar location or nearby is illustrated as 'T1 Individual Tree Planting' in the Planting Schedule [APP-185]? The Vegetation Reinstatement Plan [APP-184] includes this measure as a purple triangle on the key, but there are no immediately apparent uses of it on the plans themselves. Can this be explained?
LV1.9.39	The Applicant	Can you clarify how the final planting mix would be determined in each case of reinstatement, and how it would relate to those set out in the Planting Schedule [APP-185]?
LV1.9.40	The Applicant Local planning authorities	In the Planting Schedule [APP-185], do you consider the inclusion of <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (alder) in the H2 species-rich hedgerow mix with trees appropriate? Is alder die-back prevalent in the area, and - if so - should the planting of new alder trees be restricted?

Reference	Question to:	Question
Hedgerows and trees		
LV1.9.41	The Applicant	The impact assessment for hedgerows and trees (Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-067] paragraph 1.1.2 and section 2.3) is said to be based on the proposed alignment as set out on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018]. As such, it does not seem to have allowed for the different vegetation removal impacts that would arise where the Limits of Deviation were used. Can you explain how much reliance can be placed on the conclusions, and how this approach fulfils the requirements of the EIA Regulations in relation to impacts on trees and hedgerows?
LV1.9.42	The Applicant	At paragraph 2.3.2, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-067] assumes that, ' <i>trees on the periphery of the Order Limits would be retained and protected during construction.</i> ' Were the tree and hedgerow, landscape and visual assessments carried out on this basis? If so, how is this assurance that these peripheral trees would be retained and protected secured in the draft DCO?
LV1.9.43	The Applicant	The Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-011] is numbered as document 5.10 and does not form part of the submitted ES or the certified documents in Schedule 17 of the dDCO [APP-034]. Your comments on RRs [REP1-025] (page 129) notes that it includes information that would be relied on for construction planning and to design mitigation measures to reduce impacts on important receptors, for example root protection areas for veteran trees. Is this the only application document to identify the detailed baseline information that underlies the assessment and loss of important receptors such as veteran trees (e.g., T378) and associated design and mitigation measures? If not, please signpost where the same information can be found in the ES. Furthermore, Table 2.1 of the LEMP [APP-182], which lists the baseline surveys on which the LEMP is based, includes the Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-011]. Given all of the above, can you explain why it should not form part of the certified ES?
LV1.9.44	The Applicant	The Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed Plans [APP-017] use two shades of green to distinguish between those hedgerows considered to be 'important' and those considered to be 'not important' (in terms of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997). However, the impacts of the Proposed Development such as coppicing, pruning and complete removal are laid over this base using other colours. The ExA is having difficulty interpreting the underlying colour and therefore the value of the receptor. In addition, a red line is used to indicate removal of a hedgerow. This could cause confusion with the demarcation of the Order Limits. Can these plans be redrawn more clearly and resubmitted?
LV1.9.45	The Applicant	Paragraph 4.4.48 of Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-072] notes an intention to replant hedgerow gaps created during construction and that, ' <i>other areas would be replanted along with reinforcement planting along the surrounding hedgerow where appropriate.</i> ' Is this the reinforcement planting referred to in the LEMP [APP-182] at paragraph 8.5.1, 'reinforcement of hedgerow at MM06 and MM15'? If not, where is this reinforcement intended, and how is it secured?

Reference	Question to:	Question
LV1.9.46	The Applicant	The RR from Alan Hall [RR-033] suggests that the proposed entrance at an existing farm track adjacent to Rose Cottage in Burstall causes ' <i>needless... destruction of hedges and trees, including two very mature oak trees.</i> ' Can you signpost where this specific matter is considered in the ES and explain why you were unable to propose a less damaging option?
LV1.9.47	The Applicant	Can you explain the difference in hedgerow loss between paragraph 5.3.1 of the Environmental Net Gain Report [APP-176] (72m) and Table 7.9 of ES Chapter 7 Biodiversity [APP-075] (42m)?
LV1.9.48	The Applicant	In Table 7.7 of ES Chapter 7, Biodiversity [APP-075], can you further justify why Important Hedgerows have been given the same 'medium' value as other hedgerows (in terms of the Hedgerows Regulations).
LV1.9.49	The Applicant	Good practice measure GG07 in the CoCP [APP-178] refers to hedgerows being reinstated to a similar style and quality to those that were removed, in consultation with the landowner. Paragraph 3.2.6 of the Environmental Net Gain Report [APP-176] states that the objectives of new or restored habitats should always aim for a higher habitat distinctiveness or condition than those lost. Can you explain the reason for the two different condition restoration objectives for hedgerows?
<b>10. Land use and soil</b>		
Agriculture and other land use		
LU1.10.1	The Applicant	Have agricultural business activities currently operating beneath the 132kV overhead line to be removed been identified? (Paragraph 11.3.7 in the ES Chapter 11, Agriculture and Soils [APP-079].)
LU1.10.2	The Applicant	Please provide a table with the following data for each agricultural holding affected by the Proposed Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• holding name;</li> <li>• description of holding and land use;</li> <li>• land parcel/ plot;</li> <li>• Proposed Development infrastructure;</li> <li>• ALC grades in hectares (ha), Other (ha), Urban (ha);</li> <li>• total temporarily affected (ha);</li> <li>• total permanently affected (ha).</li> </ul>
LU1.10.3	The Applicant	NPS EN-1 (paragraph 5.1.080) states Applicants should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5). Please describe how it was possible to address this policy requirement when grade 3a and 3b land was grouped together for most of the Proposed Development.
LU1.10.4	The Applicant	Claims regarding compensation, including in relation to agri-environment and stewardship payments, would be addressed outside of the Examination process. Can you outline the claims process and confirm the data required to undertake the assessment? (Paragraph 11.6.13 in ES Chapter 11, Agriculture and Soils [APP-079] refers.)

Reference	Question to:	Question
LU1.10.5	The Applicant	How would link pillars and marker posts be positioned in a manner to limit the effect on land use and agriculture and how is this approach secured in the dDCO? (See ES Chapter 4, Project Description [APP-072].)
LU1.10.6	The Applicant	Further to paragraph 11.6.6 of ES Chapter 11, Agriculture and Soils [APP-079], would there be long term impact on soil volume or function associated with land removed from agricultural use at the cable sealing end compounds?
LU1.10.7	The Applicant	Referring to paragraph 11.3.5 of ES Chapter 11, Agriculture and Soils [APP-079], how were fragmentation and economic effects on farm holdings assessed?
LU1.10.8	The Applicant	Paragraph 11.4.2 in ES Chapter 11, Agriculture and Soils [APP-079] refers to key information gathered from discussions with landowners and land managers. Has or will this key information be submitted into the Examination?
LU1.10.9	The Applicant	Paragraph 10.11.18 of ES Chapter 10, Geology and Hydrogeology [APP-078] refers to land at Layham Quarry within and adjoining the Order Limits having been worked upon and that there would be no future work here. Can you signpost evidence of this?
LU1.10.10	The Applicant	<p>Please provide a table with the following information for mineral resource affected by the Proposed Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• description of mineral/ land use;</li> <li>• land parcel/ plot;</li> <li>• within Minerals Consultation Area/ Minerals Safeguarding Area;</li> <li>• Proposed Development infrastructure;</li> <li>• mineral extent (ha);</li> <li>• total temporarily affected (ha);</li> <li>• total permanently affected (ha).</li> </ul>
LU1.10.11	The Applicant	What would be the estimated economic value of the minerals sterilised by the Proposed Development?
LU1.10.12	The Applicant	<p>Please provide a table with the following information for agri-environmental schemes/ forestry schemes/ woodland grant schemes affected by the Proposed Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• description of land use;</li> <li>• land parcel/plot;</li> <li>• Proposed Development infrastructure;</li> <li>• agri-environmental scheme/forestry schemes/woodland grant schemes (ha);</li> <li>• total temporarily affected (ha);</li> <li>• total permanently affected (ha).</li> </ul>

Reference	Question to:	Question
LU1.10.13	The Applicant	<p>Can you clarify where and how you intend to carry out pre-construction soil surveys to establish baseline soil conditions (CEMP [APP-177] and CoCP [APP-178])?</p> <p>What are the proposed aftercare maintenance arrangements related to defined soil condition, soil nutrient levels and organic content?</p> <p>Notwithstanding the measures set out amongst others in the CEMP [APP-177] and the CoCP [APP-178], could such information be usefully collated into an outline Soil Management Plan, as suggested by Natural England [RR-042]?</p>
LU1.10.14	Local planning authorities Natural England	Should a Soil Management Plan or Outline Soil Management Plan be produced and secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO?
LU1.10.15	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	Paragraph 10.2 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] refers to temporary use of the Layham Quarry plant site as a construction laydown area. It is unclear if this reference is to an area proposed by the Applicant or to an alternative area proposed by the Councils. Please provide further information to identify this construction laydown area, including reference to documents in the Examination Library as necessary.
LU1.10.16	The Applicant	Paragraph 10.3 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] suggests that extraction (of minerals) within parts of the area occupied by the lattice towers, sealing end compounds and underground cables would not be possible. Please summarise your approach to restoring access to mineral resources following decommissioning and removal of development in the future.
LU1.10.17	Suffolk CC Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC	Paragraph 10.3 of the Suffolk councils' LIR [REP1-045] refers to extraction of minerals on site during the course of construction. At ISH1, the Applicant confirmed that any consent would not authorise this activity. Please clarify if you perceive the extraction of minerals on site during the course of construction forms part of the authorised development.
LU1.10.18	The Applicant	Please advise how an unknown infill site (Bte325), which is within the Order Limits, has been scoped out. (Refer to Table A.1 in ES Appendix 10.1, Geology Baseline and Preliminary Risk Assessment [APP-130].)
LU1.10.19	The Applicant	Please summarise your approach to address potential missing contaminated land areas between the data set contained in National Library of Scotland's (NLS) online resource and Google Earth imagery, as noted in in the Essex councils' LIR [REP1-039] at paragraph 13.5.1.
LU1.10.20	The Applicant	Please summarise the impact of the Proposed Development on security of food production in the UK.
<b>Soils, geology and ground conditions</b>		
LU1.10.21	The Applicant	How did your inability to survey and dig the soil pits along the full length of undergrounding section affect the EIA and its conclusions? (Paragraph 11.4.7 in the ES Chapter 11, Agriculture and Soils [APP-079] refers.)



Reference	Question to:	Question
LU1.10.22	The Applicant	Can you confirm, for the worst-case EIA scenario, the topsoil (ha): i) stripped; ii) re-used; iii) disposed of.
LU1.10.23	The Applicant	Can you confirm, for the worst-case EIA scenario, the subsoil quantities (m <sup>3</sup> ): i) excavated; ii) re-used; iii) disposed of.
LU1.10.24	The Applicant	For foundation excavation, can you clarify if the EIA assumed any pecking or drilling into rock?
LU1.10.25	The Applicant	Further to paragraph 4.7.27 of ES Chapter 4, Project Description [APP-072], can you clarify what is meant by wet arisings from trenchless methods and how it would be determined if it was waste or material?
LU1.10.26	The Applicant	How do you respond to Ian Rutledge's contention [RR-123] that there are difficult ground conditions for trenchless work in the valley and wooded area between Lightlands and Ansell's Farm and across Culverdown?
LU1.10.27	The Applicant	What is your response to Graham Baxter's RR [RR-057] regarding subsidence occurring as a result of plant and machinery?
LU1.10.28	The Applicant	What would be the effects on the soil structure when transporting, placing and moving cable drums? How would any damage be prevented?
LU1.10.29	The Applicant	How has the EIA considered unexploded ordnance?
LU1.10.30	The Applicant	Further to your comments on RRs [REP1-025], can you explain how you considered Mark Westwood's suggestion [RR-135] that the start of underground cabling at Polstead Heath should move less than a kilometre east to the old gravel pit, and confirm the reasons for your response.
LU1.10.31	The Applicant	Prior to and during construction, would there be a specific site role assigned to consult and engage with landowners and tenants?
<b>11. Noise and vibration</b>		
NV1.11.1	The Applicant	Is the alignment of the haul routes as shown on ES Figures [PDA-002, figure 4.1] considered to be worst case for the noise and vibration assessment? If not, how is this accounted for in the noise chapter of the ES?
NV1.11.2	The Applicant	Have on-site background noise measurements been undertaken at any of the noise sensitive receptors? If not, how was the baseline noise environment established and how reliable is this as a basis for the assessment?

Reference	Question to:	Question
NV1.11.3	The Applicant	Have any structural surveys been undertaken for existing buildings or other structures close to the Order Limits and would a vibration level of less than 12.5 mm/s peak particle velocity result in structural damage to sensitive buildings or structures? (Paragraph 14.4.31 in ES Chapter 14, Noise and Vibration [APP-082] refers.)
NV1.11.4	The Applicant	Further to the CEMP Appendix B, the REAC, EM-H01 [APP-179], please provide further details on the size and type of noise enclosure for the transformers at the grid supply point substation and evidence to demonstrate its effectiveness in reducing noise levels.
NV1.11.5	The Applicant	Paragraph 14.1.3 in the ES Non Technical Summary [APP-068] notes that a triple araucaria conductor bundle on a lattice pylon is relatively quiet in comparison to other conductor bundles. Please signpost the evidence that demonstrates this.
NV1.11.6	The Applicant	Appendix B of the CEMP, the REAC, EIA_NV01 [APP-179] refers to additional temporary noise mitigation measures (site-specific, best practicable means) that would be put in place to reduce noise levels from construction plant and machinery at specific locations. Please provide an example of screening or enclosures including their effectiveness in reducing noise levels.
NV1.11.7	The Applicant	Appendix B of the CEMP, the REAC, EIA_NV02 [APP-179] refers to additional temporary measures that would be put in place to reduce vibration levels from construction plant and machinery at a specific pylon. Please provide an example including their effectiveness to reduce vibration levels from construction plant and machinery at this pylon location.
NV1.11.8	The Applicant Local planning authorities	Would a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NaVMP) be useful to bring together and secure all of the relevant controls and mitigation measures? If so, should it be secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO?
NV1.11.9	The Applicant	Should the impact of noise and vibration and the potential effects on horses and livestock housed or grazing close to the Proposed Development been assessed in the ES? If not, why not?
NV1.11.10	The Applicant	ES Chapter 14, Noise and Vibration [APP-082], refers at paragraph 14.6.5 to temporal significance of ten days in any 15 consecutive days, or 40 days in any consecutive six months, as a reasonable worst case. Can you confirm the duration (short/ temporal) for noise and vibration effects associated with new pylon works shown on pylon working areas [APP-029] including earthworks and piling? If these works have been assigned a short duration in the EIA, can you explain what measures would be put in place to ensure that the effects of a longer duration resulting in a temporal impact would not be greater than those predicted in the ES? Similarly, can you advise on the scenario consisting of pylon removal including earthworks and breaking up of concrete foundation?
NV1.11.11	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.11.4 of NPS EN-1 notes that, where noise impacts are likely to arise from the proposed development, the applicant should identify any distinctive tonal, impulsive or low frequency characteristics of the noise. How were these characteristics explored and assessed in the ES in relation to construction noise?

Reference	Question to:	Question
NV1.11.12	The Applicant	Can you signpost where the ES has considered the effect of noise and vibration on nearby environmental designated sites and permanently present or seasonal wildlife?
NV1.11.13	The Applicant	Whilst paragraph 4.9.29 of ES Chapter 4, Proposed Development [APP-072], refers to a noise enclosure around the transformers to reduce operational noise, paragraph 5.11.8 of NPS EN-1 also refers to containment of noise within buildings wherever possible. Please summarise if such transformers can be housed within buildings, whether this was considered, and the reason for the outcome.
NV1.11.14	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.11.1 of NPS EN-1 notes that excessive noise can have wide-ranging impacts on the use and enjoyment of quiet places and areas with high landscape quality. Table 6.1 of ES Chapter 6, Landscape and Visual [APP-074], summarises the likely significant effects during construction with mitigation for landscape receptors and community areas. Can you confirm if any noise and vibration mitigation measures related to such receptors were considered and are included in the Proposed Development? If not, explain why.
NV1.11.15	The Applicant	Please respond to Graham Baxter's RR [RR-057] that the impact of noise from the compound would result in a loss of use of his garden for three to five years.
<b>12. The water environment</b>		
Flood Risk Assessment		
WE1.12.1	The Environment Agency River Stour Trust Lead Local Flood Authorities	Can you briefly confirm your views on the applicant's approach and method in the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-059]? Do you consider the Flood Risk Assessment to comply with NPS EN-1, the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance? Does the Flood Risk Assessment represent an accurate assessment of the flood risks on site and is the assessment proportionate to the risk and appropriate to the scale and nature of the project?
WE1.12.2	The Environment Agency River Stour Trust Lead Local Flood Authorities	Are you content with the Applicant's approach to the operational phase risk assessment, as set out in paragraphs 4.3.13 and 4.3.14 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-059]?

Reference	Question to:	Question
WE1.12.3	Lead Local Flood Authority	Does the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-059] adequately and appropriately cover the specific issues of concern to the Lead Local Flood Authority?
WE1.12.4	The Environment Agency River Stour Trust Lead Local Flood Authorities	Can you briefly confirm your views on the sufficiency and application of the sequential and exception tests set out in the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-059]?
WE1.12.5	The Applicant	Paragraph 3.2.11 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-059] states that it is not necessary to apply the exception test to the Proposed Development. Can you explain how this is compliant with paragraph 5.7.11 of NPS EN-1, given the presence of some infrastructure within Flood Zone 3?
WE1.12.6	The Applicant	The Flood Risk Assessment [APP-059] does not differentiate between land in Flood Zone 3a and Flood Zone 3b. Can you clarify the assumptions made about the extent of these areas within the Order Limits and any implications for the flood risk assessment?
WE1.12.7	The Applicant	To what extent are the proposed (a) permanent development (structures, access tracks) and (b) construction activities (drive pits, soil storage and stockpiling, temporary haul roads, and so on) within flood zones 2 and 3? If there would be permanent development and construction activities in flood zones 2 and 3: (i) Confirm whether it is possible that any floodplain storage would be temporarily lost and water flows impeded during construction, based on assumptions made about extent of flood zone 3b, and (ii) Confirm that there would be no permanent infrastructure in flood zone 3b resulting in loss of floodplain storage/impeding water flows?
WE1.12.8	The Applicant	Can you confirm whether Flood Zone 3 has been treated as a functional flood plain (Zone 3b) for the purposes of designing permanent and temporary (construction stage) infrastructure, such as drive pits (River Box and River Stour), temporary haul routes and stockpiles? Can you clarify how this represents the worst case for the purposes of concluding minor adverse (not significant) effect on flood risk during construction?
WE1.12.9	The Applicant	Can you confirm the appropriate systems that would be put in place to include risk assessments, method statements (RAMS) and design drawings with permit applications (Paragraph 9.5 of the Environment Agency RR, [RR-031] refers)?

Reference	Question to:	Question
WE1.12.10	The Applicant	The Flood Risk Assessment [APP-059] notes that a sustainable drainage system would be used during construction to manage surface water flood risk and that this is committed through W11 in the CoCP [APP-178]. Does the commitment in W11 to a sustainable drainage system apply to both the construction and operation phases? If so, how is the commitment secured through the operational phase?
Surface water management		
WE1.12.11	The Applicant	Can you provide information and a plan to show your proposed surface water management proposals during construction and operation and provide an explanation of how these proposals would be secured in any DCO.
Management measures		
WE1.12.12	Environment Agency River Stour Trust Lead Local Flood Authorities	What are your views on the management measures set out in Section 9.2 (Management Measures) of the CEMP [APP-177] regarding: (i) site planning and preparation; (ii) surface water abstraction and discharges; (iii) pollution and erosion management measures; and (iv) reinstatement?
WE1.12.13	Environment Agency River Stour Trust Lead Local Flood Authorities	What are your views on the capacity of the control measures set out in CoCP [APP-178] and REAC [APP-179] to manage flood risk?
WE1.12.14	Environment Agency River Stour Trust Lead Local Flood Authorities	Would the dDCO [APP-034] and Section 9.2 (Management Measures) of the CEMP [APP-177] adequately secure all measures required to mitigate flood risk?

Reference	Question to:	Question
WE1.12.15	Environment Agency	Paragraph 4.4.63 of ES Chapter 4 [APP-072] addresses abstractions and de-watering. Are you satisfied with the approach to dewatering activities? Can you see any reason why the relevant environmental permits would not be issued for groundwater abstraction and discharge?
WE1.12.16	The Applicant	Can you confirm that ES Chapter 10 [APP-078] (paragraph 10.4.37, bullet point 3) and ES Appendix 10.2 [APP-131] (paragraph 3.4.13) will be amended to reflect the need to gain Environment Agency approval of hydrogeological risk assessments? Is negotiation about the timescale of any such approval ongoing, and will it be a matter set out in the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and the Environment Agency?
WE1.12.17	The Applicant	Can you explain the systems that would be put in place to use ensure that water is used efficiently so as to minimise or negate reliance on the abstraction of water (paragraph 15.0 of the Environment Agency RR [RR-031] refers)?
WE1.12.18	The Applicant	Can you confirm the appropriate systems that would be put in place to engage with licence holders of abstractions downstream of the watercourse crossings ([RR-031], paragraph 18)?
WE1.12.19	Environment Agency	Paragraph 3.1.2 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment Report [APP-057] explains the proximity of the Stour and Orwell Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar sites to the Order Limits, noting that the River Stour, the River Box, the River Brett and the Belstead Brook all enter the Stour and Orwell Estuaries, approximately 5.72km south-east of the Order Limits. Are you confident that sufficient controls can be put in place to ensure that the proposed activities in Flood Zone 3 (including horizontal directional drilling under the River Stour) would not adversely impact the European sites? How would these drilling activities be controlled by Environment Agency licensing?
WE1.12.20	The Applicant	Which of the proposed site compounds would be located in Flood Zone 2, 3a or 3b? Further to paragraph 9.3.2 of the CEMP [APP-177], what would be the criteria for deciding whether buffer zones at watercourses would have silt fencing to provide further protection from potential site runoff?
WE1.12.21	The Applicant	In paragraph 9.3.3 of the CEMP [APP-177], you state: <i>'Where applicable, compounds will be provided with good practice measures for water conservation for example the use of water-efficient taps within welfare, waterless toilet facilities, assessment of whether water can be reused, for example for dust suppression, and regular checks for water leaks.'</i> Under what circumstances would these good practice measures not be implemented?
WE1.12.22	The Applicant	What are the requirements for the installation of land drainage (see paragraph 9.3.6 of the CEMP, [APP-177])?
WE1.12.23	The Applicant	Further to paragraph 9.3.10 of the CEMP [APP-177], under what circumstances would surface water discharges be required?

Reference	Question to:	Question
WE1.12.24	The Applicant	<p>What is the degree of certainty that good practice measure W02 would capture runoff and pollutants to prevent their entry into the watercourse (paragraph 9.3.15 of the CEMP [APP-177] refers)?</p> <p>Would spill kits, booms and other containment devices (and the necessary supporting equipment to install these devices) be located at each river crossing site in anticipation of a spill event?</p> <p>Would those on site be competent and experienced in the safe installation and use of this spill containment equipment for main and non-main rivers?</p>
WE1.12.25	The Applicant	<p>Following on from paragraph 9.3.18 of the CEMP [APP-177], under what circumstances would a wheel cleaning system not be provided at all site compounds where vehicles exiting a works compound on to the highway could deposit dust or mud onto the public road surface?</p>
WE1.12.26	The Applicant	<p>In paragraph 9.3.19 of the CEMP [APP-177], you state: <i>'It is anticipated that the storage of flammable liquids will be within double-walled tanks or surrounded by a containment area of 110% capacity which will capture any spillage/leakage in the event of a breach of containment.'</i></p> <p>If the anticipated scenarios do not materialise what are the alternative methods for storing flammable liquids?</p>
WE1.12.27	The Applicant	<p>In paragraph 9.3.20 of the CEMP [APP-177] you state: <i>'where practicable, they [refuelling points] will be stored at least 15m from watercourses, ponds and groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems. Where it is not practicable to maintain a 15m distance, additional pollution prevention measures will be identified.'</i></p> <p>Would those additional pollution prevention measures that have been identified also be implemented, and would they be secured?</p>
WE1.12.28	The Applicant	<p>In the reference to an 'emergency' situation in the description of practice measure GG15 in the CoCP [APP-178], are you referring to a situation that is unexpected or dangerous?</p> <p>Can you set out the scenarios when the discharge of contaminated site runoff to ditches, watercourses, drains or sewers without the appropriate treatment and agreement of the appropriate authority would be necessary?</p>
WE1.12.29	The Applicant	<p>In paragraph 9.3.23 of the CEMP [APP-177], are you referring to positioning the washout systems and containers on the side of a public highway?</p>
WE1.12.30	The Applicant	<p>Would the extent of buffer zone, referred to in paragraph 9.3.30 of the CEMP [APP-177], be established by calculation or professional judgement?</p>
WE1.12.31	The Applicant	<p>In paragraph 9.3.34 of the CEMP [APP-177], you say: <i>'It is also anticipated to include replacing any channel substrate that was temporarily removed during the works.'</i></p>

Reference	Question to:	Question
		If the anticipated scenarios do not materialise what would be the alternative proposals for channel substrate temporarily removed during the works?
WE1.12.32	The Applicant	Can you provide your definition of wastewater in paragraph 9.3.5 of ES Chapter 9, Water Environment [APP-077]?
WE1.12.33	The Applicant	Can you confirm the appropriate systems that would be put in place to remove contaminated rainwater (GG14 in the CoCP [APP178])?
WE1.12.34	The Applicant	Can you confirm the appropriate systems they would be put in place to inform the Environment Agency as soon as possible of any discharge of contaminated water in an emergency (paragraph 7.2 of the Environment Agency's RR [RR-031] refers)?
WE1.12.35	The Applicant	What systems would be put in place to contain pollution events and how and when would these be agreed with the Environment Agency (paragraph 7.3 of the Environment Agency's RR [RR-031] refers)?
WE1.12.36	The Applicant	Can you describe the systems that would be put in place to prevent groundwater flow patterns being altered (see paragraph 8.2 of the Environment Agency's RR [RR-031])?
WE1.12.37	The Applicant	A detailed, operational phase Drainage Management Plan is proposed to be produced post-consent, to be secured by any Development Consent Order. When will a draft Drainage Management Plan be submitted?
WE1.12.38	The Applicant	The CoCP [APP-178] includes a commitment (W11) to applying the Environment Agency's peak rainfall climate change allowances from May 2022 to the drainage design. Would this be the central or upper end allowance?
WE1.12.39	The Applicant	Good practice measure W18 in the CoCP [APP-178] states that temporary access routes and underground cables would cross an existing flood defence on the River Stour. The CoCP commits to avoiding impacts on this defence, but it is stated that should potential impacts be identified during detailed design, then monitoring would take place as agreed through a future application to the Environment Agency for a Flood Risk Activity Permit. What are the additional flood risk implications? What remedial actions might be required if issues arose during monitoring?
<b>Temporary bridges and culverts</b>		
WE1.12.40	Environment Agency	Paragraph 4.4.40 of ES Chapter 4, the Project Description [APP-072] looks at bridge crossings. Are you satisfied with the proposals for temporary (4-year) bridges across the Rivers Brett, Box and Stour? Can you see any reason why the relevant Flood Risk Activity Permits would not be issued?
WE1.12.41	The Applicant Environment Agency	Paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 of the Environment Agency RR [RR-031] raise concerns about the possible need to remove part of the embankment to install a temporary bridge. The Applicant [REP1-025] is not expecting this to be necessary. This matter appears to be close to agreement, but will it be included in the Statement of Common Ground between the two parties?



Reference	Question to:	Question
WE1.12.42	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 1.3 of the Environment Agency RR [RR-031] comments on the design considerations for temporary bridges spanning watercourses. Can you confirm that temporary bridges would be designed so that: (i) from the top of the bank on each side of the river, there is a minimum of 3m width of natural land corridor between the bank top and the abutments of the bridge; and (ii) there is a minimum of 600mm clearance between the land surface at the bank top and the soffit of the bridge?</p> <p>Can you confirm the measures that would be put in place to prevent (i) soil or other materials on the bridge surface falling directly into the river causing pollution, or (ii) run-off from the bridge deck could find its way into the watercourse.</p>
WE1.12.43	The Applicant Environment Agency	<p>Paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 of the Environment Agency RR [RR-031] comment on the impacts of temporary culverts on habitats and the hydro-morphology of watercourses. The Applicant has responded in its comments on RRs [REP1-025]. Will this matter be included in the Statement of Common Ground between the two parties?</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm the extent of temporary culverting of watercourses that would be required during construction?</p>
WE1.12.44	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 11.1 of the Environment Agency RR [RR-031] states: <i>'11.1 The standard crossing design it does mention about navigation and the crossing over the Stour will have some effect on the navigation during construction/installation'.</i></p> <p>You have responded in your comments on RRs [REP1-025]. Will this matter be included in the Statement of Common Ground between the two parties?</p>
<b>Water resources</b>		
WE1.12.45	The Applicant	<p>Further to the reference in the CEMP [APP-177], where temporary works are anticipated to last for a period of fewer than 100 days but within 500m of an active private groundwater supply, what measures for supply would be put in place for landowners and tenants?</p>
WE1.12.46	The Applicant	<p>If there was to be a risk of pollution or spillage leading to contamination of groundwater and private water supply, would there be a target timeframe to complete an assessment and to provide an alternative water supply to the affected parties? (The CEMP [APP-177] refers.)</p>
<b>13. Traffic and transport</b>		
<b>Transport assessment</b>		
TT1.13.1	The Applicant	<p>Can you explain the assumptions and judgements used to define the geographic boundaries of the Transport Assessment [APP-061]? If the appointed contractor chose not to endorse the construction routes selected by the Applicant, what would be the implications for the validity of the traffic study?</p>
TT1.13.2	The Applicant	<p>Which traffic models were used to undertake the transport assessment [APP-061]?</p> <p>Have you consulted with National Highways and the local highways authorities on the assessment and mitigation?</p>

Reference	Question to:	Question
TT1.13.3	The Applicant	Have the relevant highway authorities and National Highways agreed to the baseline conditions, methodology, transport analysis set out in Transport Assessment [APP-061]? If not, what are the outstanding issues?
TT1.13.4	The Applicant	Has agreement been reached with the relevant highway authorities and National Highways on: (i) construction routes set out in Figure 1 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061]? (ii) traffic restrictions set out in paragraph 2.4.6 of the CTMP [APP-180]? (iii) the necessity or otherwise of time restrictions on construction traffic movements in peak hours and normal working hours? If not, what are the outstanding issues?
TT1.13.5	The Applicant	How are the volumes of construction traffic for the Proposed Development calculated (paragraph 6.2.10 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061] refers)?
TT1.13.6	The Applicant	What assumptions were made in the Transport Assessment ([APP-061], paragraph 6.2.8) about the sourcing of construction materials? What are the most likely sources of materials for access road construction? What impact would the choice of supply sources have on the delivery routes? How can the ExA be confident that the final sources of construction materials and use of associated routes would not lead to traffic and transport effects greater than or different from those assessed in the ES?
TT1.13.7	The Applicant	What assumptions were made in the Transport Assessment ([APP-061], paragraph 6.2.8) about the disposal of materials at the end of the construction and dismantling process, especially with regard to stone from access tracks and haul roads? How can the ExA be confident that the agreed disposal points and the use of associated construction routes would not lead to traffic and transport effects greater than those assessed in the ES?
TT1.13.8	The Applicant	Once a main contractor has been appointed, could efficiencies such as a reduction in overall construction programme result in concentration of construction traffic over a shorter period and consequently affect the ES worst-case scenario for traffic and transport?
TT1.13.9	The Applicant	In paragraph 5.1.1 of its draft Statement of Common Ground [APP-171], National Highways expects to see a risk assessment (GG104) of the impact of the construction traffic on the junctions where the construction traffic joins the strategic road network. How would you assess the risks associated with construction traffic joining the strategic road network?

Reference	Question to:	Question
TT1.13.10	The Applicant	National Highways has a major upgrade of the A11 between J19 and J25 scheduled for 2024 and 2027 (Table 4.1 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061] refers). Have you obtained detailed information on routing or locations of impacts associated with the proposed A11 Junctions 19 to 25 major upgrade works from National Highways? Have these planned improvements to the A11 been taken into account in the transport assessment?
TT1.13.11	The Applicant	Table 6.1 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061] assumes that 70% of the construction staff workforce would travel in minibuses (four per minibus). Has a modelling sensitivity exercise been undertaken to test deviations in the percentage use of staff minibuses?
TT1.13.12	The Applicant	The latest Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment guidance on the environmental assessment of traffic and movement published in July 2023 refers to the 'Safe System' approach as international best practice. Did you consider using the 'Safe System' approach to analyse personal injury and collision data? If not, why not?
TT1.13.13	The Applicant	In relation to existing traffic flows, can you confirm whether traffic speeds were recorded as part of the traffic count surveys (paragraphs 4.3.3 to 4.3.6 of the Traffic Assessment [APP-061])? If traffic speeds were recorded, can you confirm whether the 85 <sup>th</sup> ile speeds did or did not exceed the speed limit on those roads surveyed?
TT1.13.14	The Applicant	Paragraphs 4.3.7 to 4.3.9 of the Traffic Assessment [APP-061] address personal injury and collision data. Can you confirm whether speeding was or was not a factor in the analysis of personal injury and collision?
TT1.13.15	The Applicant National Highways Essex CC Suffolk CC	Does the Transport Assessment [APP-061] submitted with the application meet the criteria set out in NPS EN-1, Section 5.14 Traffic and Transport, in relation to the requirements of a Transport Assessment? If not, in what respects is it lacking?
TT1.13.16	The Applicant	Would there be heavy goods vehicles movements associated with the maintenance and replacement of structural elements of the Proposed Development during its operational lifetime? (Refer to the Traffic Assessment [APP-061], paragraph 1.3.3.)
TT1.13.17	The Applicant	Have vehicle movements and staff numbers associated with the works to be undertaken by UK Power Networks been factored into the assumptions set out in Appendix C of the Transport Assessment [APP-61]?
<b>Construction traffic and construction route strategy</b>		
TT1.13.18	The Applicant	Are there any publicly maintained roads with 'C' or 'U/C' classification included in Figure 1 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061] showing project construction routes?

Reference	Question to:	Question
TT1.13.19	The Applicant	Regarding the definition of LGV given in the CTMP [APP-180], can a distinction be drawn between vans and passenger car vehicles?
TT1.13.20	The Applicant	Will the list of enforcing authorities provided in point 4 of paragraph 15.3.1 of the CEMP [APP-177] be extended to include local highway authorities for construction traffic activities on the highway not complying with the Construction Environment Management Plan?
TT1.13.21	The Applicant National Highways Essex CC Suffolk CC	Has agreement been reached with the highway authorities on a monitoring and enforcement strategy for construction and related traffic [sections 8.2 and 8.3 of the CTMP [APP-180] refer)? If not, what are the outstanding issues?
TT1.13.22	The Applicant	Can you demonstrate how the proposed good practice measure GG17 in the CoCP [APP-178] is in full compliance with section 149 of the Highways Act?
TT1.13.23	The Applicant	Would suitable arrangements be put in place to monitor, report and enforce vehicle emission standards on the project?
TT1.13.24	The Applicant	How would remediation works be commissioned by the applicant post-construction to return roads, tracks and public rights of way to their pre-construction condition (see section 8.2 of the CTMP [APP-180])?
TT1.13.25	Essex CC Suffolk CC	How often would local authority highway inspectors carry out statutory inspections of the highway network affected by the project?
TT1.13.26	The Applicant	Has the proposed frequency for checks of temporary signage, vehicle condition, and use of agreed construction routes been subject to a risk assessment (Table 8.1 of the CTMP [APP-180] refers)? How would site checks be reported to interested stakeholders?
TT1.13.27	The Applicant	Following on from paragraph 5.4.16 of the CTMP [APP-180], how long would temporary diversion signs be in place? How frequently would the signs be checked for safety defects?
TT1.13.28	The Applicant	Paragraph 5.4.3 of the CTMP [APP-180] refers to a requirement for drivers of abnormal indivisible loads and heavy goods vehicles (be they the main contractors, a sub-contractor or a supplier) not to use satnav equipment. How would compliance be monitored and enforced?
TT1.13.29	The Applicant	Which organisation commissioned the pre-construction structural surveys on routes anticipated to be used by abnormal indivisible loads (Section 5.2 of the CTMP [APP-180])? Were the local highway authorities engaged in this structural survey exercise?

Reference	Question to:	Question
TT1.13.30	The Applicant	Can a draft plan be provided to indicate the locations of construction route signage beyond the Order Limits and explain how the signage would be secured in the dDCO?
TT1.13.31	The Applicant	Would heavy good vehicles associated with the Proposed Development travel past any schools or other particularly sensitive receptors? If so, which would be affected and how would these heavy goods vehicles near these areas be controlled? How would any measures be secured?
TT1.13.32	The Applicant	Further to section 8.4 of the CTMP [APP-180] and in relation to raising complaints, how would members of the public be able to identify whether a vehicle was associated with the construction of the project? Would each vehicle (be it the main contractors, a sub-contractor or a supplier) bear distinguishable logos or livery to indicate its connection with the project?
TT1.13.33	The Applicant	What are the 'good practice commitments' referred to in Table 8.1 of the CTMP (Site Check) [APP-180]?
TT1.13.34	The Applicant	Has agreement been reached with the relevant highway authorities on condition surveys of existing highway assets likely to be used during construction (sections 5.2 and 8.2 of the CTMP [APP-180])? If not, what are the outstanding issues?
TT1.13.35	The Applicant	How were potential off-site contractor and visitor parking impacts considered in the ES? (Paragraph 4.2.10 of the CEMP [APP-177] refers.)
TT1.13.36	Babergh DC Mid Suffolk DC Suffolk CC	Are you satisfied with the Applicant's response (page 66 of its Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025]) to point n) (Traffic and Transport) in your RRs ([RR-001] and [RR-006]) related to monitoring and enforcement of construction traffic?
<b>Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders</b>		
TT1.13.37	The Applicant Essex CC Suffolk CC	Has agreement been reached between the relevant highway authorities and the Applicant on the use of Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (Schedule 11 of the dDCO [APP-034] refers)? If not, what are the outstanding issues?
TT1.13.38	The Applicant Essex CC Suffolk CC	What length of road markings and how many associated signs would be required for compliance with the current Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions and to bring the proposed temporary waiting restrictions into lawful effect? (See Schedule 11 of the dDCO [APP-034].)
TT1.13.39	The Applicant	In relation to Schedule 11, Part 1, of the dDCO [APP-034], have Essex County Council and Suffolk County Council been consulted about the civil enforcement of the proposed no waiting restrictions?
TT1.13.40	The Applicant	The numbering convention used in Schedule 7 of the dDCO [APP-034] indicates that the start and end points of various streets are given the same number even though they are not the same points. Is this street numbering convention novel for DCOs?

Reference	Question to:	Question
		Would it be clearer if a more usual street numbering convention (as used, for example, in previous electricity transmission made Orders)?
TT1.13.41	The Applicant Essex CC Suffolk CC	In relation to the temporary stopping up of streets and the temporary restriction of vehicular movement dDCO [APP-034], Schedule 7, Parts 1 and 2, and Schedule 11, Part 3) can the Applicant explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. for how long is it intended each restriction should operate?</li> <li>ii. what is the minimum and maximum period of closure sought for each location identified?</li> <li>iii. when would they be implemented?</li> <li>iv. how has the likely disruption to users of these streets been assessed in the Environmental Statement?</li> <li>v. what are the lengths of the proposed diversionary routes?</li> <li>vi. what mitigation measures would be used and how would these be secured in any DCO?</li> </ul> Are the proposed periods of closure likely to be acceptable to the highway authorities?
TT1.13.42	The Applicant	Can you confirm that each of the emergency services covering the counties of Suffolk and Essex have been consulted about the impact of the proposed temporary traffic regulation orders in Schedule 11 of the dDCO [APP-034]?
TT1.13.43	The Applicant	Have Essex and Suffolk Police Roads Constabularies been consulted about the enforcement of the moving traffic restrictions in Schedule 11 of the dDCO [APP-34]?
<b>Temporary and permanent measures to access the works</b>		
TT1.13.44	The Applicant	Have you discussed compliance of your proposed bell mouth design (Design and Layout Plans Temporary Bellmouth for Access [APP-030]) with the relevant Councils' highways planning standards?
TT1.13.45	The Applicant	For each of the 116 locations where a temporary access point is proposed, explain the types of works vehicles that would access the works site at each access point (paragraph 2.2.4 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061])?
TT1.13.46	The Applicant	Does the arboricultural survey data in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-067] include vegetation that would be lost to achieve the required visibility sightlines at each of the 116 proposed temporary access points?
TT1.13.47	The Applicant	What steps have been taken to ensure that that the areas of land whose acquisition is sought for the construction of suitable and safe temporary highway access points are of the appropriate size?
TT1.13.48	Essex CC Suffolk CC	The Applicant proposes to gain authorisation to erect temporary signs on the highway using the permit scheme described in Section 2.4 of the CTMP [APP-180]. Would you be satisfied to authorise consent to erect temporary signage under a permit scheme?

Reference	Question to:	Question
TT1.13.49	Essex CC Suffolk CC	The Applicant proposes to gain authorisation to erect scaffolding over the highway using the permit scheme described in Section 2.4 of the CTMP [APP-180]. Would you be satisfied to issue a licence for scaffolding oversailing the public highway using a permit scheme?
TT1.13.50	The Applicant	How would speed limits of 10mph and 15mph on the non-public unsurfaced and surfaced temporary access routes be enforced to ensure compliance with speed limits? (Paragraph 5.6.2 of the CTMP [APP-180] refers.)
TT1.13.51	The Applicant	Can you confirm: (i) which organisation would be responsible for removing temporary accesses and working areas once the main works and testing were completed? (ii) whether there are reasons, other than testing, why temporary working accesses and working areas might remain in place after the main works had been completed?
TT1.13.52	The Applicant	Has agreement been reached with the local highway authorities on the road safety audit process to be followed for new and upgraded temporary access points and other new and upgraded highway improvements?
TT1.13.53	The Applicant	In your comments on RRs in relation to the various PCs ([REP1-025], page 131), and in relation to accesses south-east of Lamarsh Village Hall and Daws Hall, you state you will endeavour to reduce impacts during construction. Can you explain the measures by which construction traffic impacts would be reduced?
<b>Public rights of way</b>		
TT1.13.54	The Applicant Essex CC Suffolk CC	Would local authority Public Rights of Way Officers be involved in monitoring of: (i) temporary signage; (ii) the various forms of public rights of way closures; (iii) safety measures; (iv) condition surveys; and (v) the reinstatement and inspections of the public rights of way affected by the project?
TT1.13.55	The Applicant	Have the views of the Essex and Suffolk Local Access Forums and the British Horseriders Society been sought on the significance of effects for walkers, cyclists and horse riders outlined in ES Appendix 11.1, Traffic and Transport Significance of Effects Tables [APP-134]: Table 2.1 – Significance of Effect Tables for WCH – Journey Length? Table 3.1 – Significance of Effect Tables for WCH – Severance? Table 4.1 – Significance of Effect Tables for WCH – Pedestrian, Amenity, Fear and Intimidation?

Reference	Question to:	Question
TT1.13.56	The Applicant	The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges guidance, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 8 (Highways Agency, 1994) has been withdrawn but is referenced in paragraph 11.4.3 (Impact Magnitude) of ES Chapter 11, Traffic and Transport [APP-080]. Could a copy of the relevant parts be submitted into the Examination?
TT1.13.57	The Applicant	In paragraph 11.4.9 of ES Chapter 11, Traffic and Transport [APP-080], explain how the needs of mobility impaired persons were considered in the selection of survey sites on the public rights of way network?
TT1.13.58	The Applicant	Which, if any, national guidance document was the following threshold from Table 1.2 of ES Appendix 5.4, Assessment Criteria [APP-096] based: <i>'Where closure is less than four weeks impacts downgraded to medium.'</i> Is the threshold considerate of the public rights of way users who are mobility impaired?
TT1.13.59	The Applicant	Table 8.1 of the CTMP [APP-180], Anticipated Site Checks Relevant to the CTMP notes that the role of the Environmental Clerk of Works includes monitoring of vehicles and the road network and public rights of way routes. Can you confirm that the Environmental Clerk of Works would liaise with the relevant highway authorities and resolve issues and problems through liaison with relevant stakeholders, and how this would be ensured?
TT1.13.60	The Applicant	Further to Table 6.1 of the CTMP [APP-180], Types of Public Rights of Way Intervention, have the proposed control measures to safeguard users of the public rights of way been subject to a risk assessment?
TT1.13.61	The Applicant	What measures are proposed to ensure that proposed diversions for bridleways would be suitable for equestrian use? (Paragraph 4.5.6 of Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-061] refers.) How are these measures secured in the dDCO?
TT1.13.62	The Applicant Essex CC Suffolk CC	Has the scope of the survey work to would need to be carried out to ensure that final reinstatement would return public rights of way to their original condition on completion of the Proposed Development been agreed? (Section 4.7 of the CEMP [APP-177] and paragraph 6.2.3 of the CTMP [APP-180].)
Navigation		
TT1.13.63	The Applicant	Have you surveyed commercial and private use of the rivers that would be affected by the Proposed Development and established times of peak navigational usage? If not, why not?
TT1.13.64	The Applicant	Have you identified local user groups with which to work to mitigate the impact of closures of the navigation or impingements on the navigation envelope, including businesses catering for tourist use of the rivers? If not, why not?
TT1.13.65	The Applicant	Can you describe the site-specific measure and the construction methodologies that would be required to avoid or reduce effects on navigation (for powered and unpowered craft), assist with travel planning and maintain safety?



Reference	Question to:	Question
TT 1.13.66	The Applicant	If at any time the complete closure of the River Stour to the passage of boats was required, what systems would you put in place to notify the Environment Agency and users of such closures?