

BT-NG-020621-545-0223

# Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement

## Volume 8: Examination Submissions

Document 8.5.3.1: Applicant's Comments on Suffolk County Council and Babergh Mid Suffolk District Council Local Impact Reports

Final Issue A  
October 2023

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020002

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 Regulation 8(1)(k)

nationalgrid



**Page intentionally blank**

# Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Document Purpose	1
1.2	Project Overview	1
1.3	Structure of the Report	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapters 1 to 5</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Introduction	3
2.2	Comments Table	3
<b>3.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 6 (Landscape)</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Introduction	5
3.2	Comments Table	5
<b>4.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 7 (Biodiversity)</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1	Introduction	34
4.2	Comments Table	34
<b>5.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 8 (Historic Environment)</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1	Introduction	38
5.2	Comments Table	38
<b>6.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 9 (Water Environment)</b>	<b>44</b>
6.1	Introduction	44

6.2	Comments Table	44
<b>7.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 10 (Geology and Hydrogeology)</b>	<b>46</b>
7.1	Introduction	46
7.2	Response Table	46
<b>8.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 11 (Agriculture and Soils)</b>	<b>49</b>
8.1	Introduction	49
8.2	Comments Table	49
<b>9.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 12 (Traffic and Transport including PRow)</b>	<b>51</b>
9.1	Introduction	51
9.2	Comments Table	51
<b>10.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 13 (Air Quality)</b>	<b>80</b>
10.1	Introduction	80
10.2	Comments Table	80
<b>11.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b>	<b>82</b>
11.1	Introduction	82
11.2	Comments Table	82
<b>12.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 15 (Economic Development, Skills and Tourism)</b>	<b>85</b>
12.1	Introduction	85
12.2	Comments Table	85
<b>13.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 16 (Public Health)</b>	<b>93</b>
13.1	Introduction	93

<b>14.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 17 (Draft DCO)</b>	<b>94</b>
14.1	Introduction	94
14.2	Comments Table	94
<b>15.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Annex A (Brett Valley)</b>	<b>114</b>
15.1	Introduction	114
15.2	Comments Table	114
<b>16.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Annex B (Hintlesham Hall)</b>	<b>116</b>
16.1	Introduction	116
16.2	Comments Table	116
<b>17.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Annex C (Design Principles)</b>	<b>118</b>
17.1	Introduction	118
17.2	Comments Table	118
<b>18.</b>	<b>Applicant’s Comments on Annexes D to F (Traffic and Transport)</b>	<b>121</b>
18.1	Introduction	121
18.2	Comments Table	121
	<b>Reference List</b>	<b>147</b>

---

Table 1.1 – Structure of the Applicant’s Comments on the Host Authority Local Impact Report	1
Table 2.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapters 1 to 5 of the Host Authorities LIR	3
Table 3.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 6 (Landscape) of the Host Authorities LIR	5
Table 4.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) of the Host Authorities LIR	34
Table 5.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 8 (Historic Environment) of the Host Authorities LIR	38
Table 6.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 9 (Water Environment) of the Host Authorities LIR	44
Table 7.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 10 (Geology and Hydrogeology) of the Host Authorities LIR	46
Table 8.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 11 (Agriculture and Soils) of the Host Authorities LIR	49

Table 9.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 12 (Traffic and Transport Including PRoW) of the Host Authorities LIR	51
Table 10.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 13 (Air Quality) of the Host Authorities LIR	80
Table 11.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the Host Authorities LIR	82
Table 12.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 15 (Economic Development, Skills and Tourism) of the Host Authorities LIR	85
Table 14.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 17 (Draft DCO) of the Host Authorities LIR	94
Table 15.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Annex A (Brett Valley) of the Host Authorities LIR	114
Table 16.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Annex B (Hintlesham Hall) of the Host Authorities LIR	116
Table 17.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Annex C (Design Principles) of the Host Authorities LIR	118
Table 18.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Annexes D to F (Traffic and Transport) of the Host Authorities LIR	121

---

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Document Purpose

1.1.1 This document provides National Grid Electricity Transmission plc's (the Applicant's) comments on the joint Local Impact Report (LIR) made by Suffolk County Council (SCC) and Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils (BMSDC) in response to an application for development consent for the Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement (the project). Collectively, SCC and BMSDC they are referred to as 'the Councils'.

## 1.2 Project Overview

1.2.1 An application for development consent was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on the 27 April 2023 to reinforce the transmission network between Bramford Substation in Suffolk, and Twinstead Tee in Essex. The project would be achieved by the construction and operation of a new electricity transmission line over a distance of approximately 29km comprising of overhead lines, underground cables and grid supply point (GSP) substation. It also includes the removal of 25km of the existing distribution network, 2km of the existing transmission network and various ancillary works.

1.2.2 The application for development consent was accepted for Examination on the 23 May 2023.

1.2.3 A full description of the project can be found in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072].

## 1.3 Structure of the Report

1.3.1 The SCC and BMSDC LIR [REP1-045] has been divided into 17 Chapters as detailed in Table 1.1. The Applicant has commented on each of the Chapters and Annexes in the LIR in Tables 2.1 – 18.1. The Applicant has commented on paragraph numbers found in the SCC and BMSDC LIR [REP1-045], grouping paragraphs where relevant.

Table 1.1 – Structure of the Applicant's Comments on the Host Authority Local Impact Report

LIR Chapter/Annex Number	Chapter/Annex Heading	Applicant's Comments
1	Introduction	N/A

<b>LIR Chapter/Annex Number</b>	<b>Chapter/Annex Heading</b>	<b>Applicant's Comments</b>
2	Terms of Reference	N/A
3	Description of the Area with reference to the Proposed development	Table 2.1
4	Policy Context	N/A
5	Other Relevant Local Policy	Table 2.1
6	Landscape and visual	Table 3.1
7	Biodiversity	Table 4.1
8	Historic Environment	Table 5.1
9	Water Environment	Table 6.1
10	Geology and Hydrogeology	Table 7.1
11	Agriculture and Soils	Table 8.1
12	Traffic and Transport (including Public Rights of Way)	Table 9.1
13	Air Quality	Table 10.1
14	Noise and Vibration	Table 11.1
15	Economic Development, Skills and Tourism	Table 12.1
16	Public Health	Table 13.1
17	Draft Development Consent Order	Table 14.1
Annex A	Assessment of Effects in the Brett Valley, 2013	Table 15.1
Annex B	Assessment of Effects in the Brett Valley (Addendum – Detailed Alignment Options, Hintlesham Hall, Hintlesham, Suffolk), 2013	Table 16.1
Annex C	Design Principles for the Bramford to Twinstead 400kV Project, 2023	Table 17.1
Annex D	Traffic and Transport (Chapter 12), Detailed Comments, 2023	Table 18.1
Annex E	Traffic and Transport (Chapter 12), Short Description of the Local Highway Network within the Study Area, 2023	Table 18.1
Annex F	Traffic and Transport (Chapter 12), Review of Site Accesses, 2023	Table 18.1



## 2. Applicant’s Comments on Chapters 1 to 5

### 2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 This section provides the Applicant’s comments on Chapters 1 to 5 of the LIR. Chapter 1 of the LIR provides an overview of the LIR. Chapter 2 of the LIR details the terms of reference used in the LIR, stating which guidance and legislation has been followed to author the LIR, the project description and purpose and structure of the LIR. The Applicant has no comments to make on the content in Chapters 1 or 2.
- 2.1.2 Chapter 3 of the LIR describes the location of the project for which no comments are made by the Applicant apart from paragraphs 3.1 and 3.7 which are included in Table 2.1. Chapter 4 of the LIR presents the policy context both nationally and locally summarising which policy documents are relevant to the project. The Applicant has one comment to make on Chapter 4 of the LIR which are included in Table 2.1. Chapter 5 of the LIR summarises SCC and BMSDC’s other local policy which has relevance to the project. Therefore, Table 2.1, sets out the Applicant’s comments on the relevant paragraphs within Chapter 3, Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 of the LIR.

### 2.2 Comments Table

Table 2.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapters 1 to 5 of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant’s Comments
<b>Chapter 3 Description of the Area with Reference to the Proposed Development</b>			
3.1/3.7	Stour Valley	Some of the affected parts of the Stour Valley are statutorily designated as the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	The Applicant disagrees with this description. The Stour Valley is not statutorily designated as part of the Dedham Vale AONB, nor is it a candidate AONB. The Stour Valley is covered by the same Management Plan as the AONB (Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley Partnership, 2021) but the Stour Valley is not a designated site. Natural England is also not currently considering it as a candidate AONB. Parts of the Stour Valley have been identified as within the setting of Dedham Vale AONB, as outlined in ES Appendix 6.2 Annex A: Dedham Vale AONB Approach and Identification of Setting Study [APP-099].
<b>Chapter 4 Policy Context</b>			
4.7	NPS EN-3	NPS EN-3 is the UK Governments’ strategy for renewable energy infrastructure.	The Applicant notes the Council’s reference to ‘NPS EN-3’, and that the footnote links to the March 2023 consultation draft. It is the Applicant’s case that NPS EN-3 is relevant insofar as it provides strong support for the delivery of renewable energy developments supported by the project. The Applicant further acknowledges that the March 2023 draft of

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>EN-3 gives express support for 'onshore and offshore network infrastructure and related network reinforcements' (paragraph 3.8.12), which are described in the context of the 'critical national priority' (CNP).</p> <p>However, as set out in the Planning Statement [<b>APP-160</b>] the assessment of the application for development consent should be made primarily against the extant (2011) National Policy Statements (NPS) (EN-1 and EN-5), albeit the Applicant acknowledges that the emerging 2023 drafts are likely to be important and relevant matters.</p>
<b>Chapter 5 Other Relevant Local Policy</b>			
5.1	Other relevant Local Policy	There are several additional documents produced and endorsed by the relevant authorities which represent local policy on specific topics which the Councils consider of relevance to the proposed developments.	Whilst the assessment of the application for development consent should be made against the extant NPS (EN-1 and EN-5), it is noted that other documents may be important and relevant. However the primary basis for determination pursuant to S.104 of the Planning Act 2008, will be the extant NPS.
5.3	Energy and Climate Adaptive Infrastructure Policy	SCC supports projects that are necessary to deliver Net-Zero Carbon for the UK. However, in order to be able to support a project, SCC expects that any impacts are appropriately dealt with.	The Applicant welcomes SCC support for the project's principle of development. In relation to matters raised about the impacts of the project, the Applicant can confirm that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken for the project and is presented in the ES [ <b>APP-068 - APP-085</b> ] in Volume 6 of the application for development consent. The EIA presented in the ES will help inform the decision-making process. The ES documents the likely significant effects that are anticipated as a result of constructing and operating the project. Where a significant effect has been identified, the ES presents the proposed mitigation that would be implemented, where appropriate to reduce the significance of the effect.

# 3. Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 6 (Landscape)

## 3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This section provides the Applicant’s comments on Chapter 6 (Landscape) of the LIR. Chapter 6 of the LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within this section of the LIR (paragraphs 6.1 to 6.31). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 6.32 to 6.74). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 6, with the exception of paragraphs relating to the Limits of Deviations (LoD) (paragraphs 6.9 to 6.11) and compensation (paragraphs 6.19 to 6.24). Therefore, Table 3.1 covers the Applicant’s comments on the LoD, Compensation, Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 6.9 to 6.11, 6.19 to 6.24 and 6.75 to 6.183 of the LIR.

## 3.2 Comments Table

Table 3.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 6 (Landscape) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant’s Comments
<b>Route alignment, Micro-siting and Limits of Deviation (LoD)</b>			
6.9	Route alignment, micro-siting and Limits of Deviation	The Councils have concerns about the proposed LoD. In particular, the lateral and longitudinal LoD for pylons and overhead lines could, in combination and on their own, significantly alter the resulting landscape and visual effects for the worse.	<p>The Applicant disagrees that changes to the alignment within the LoD would result in additional significant landscape and visual effects. The ES assesses the effects of the Proposed Alignment as shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018] and includes sensitivity testing for the flexibility provided within the LoD.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that, as set out at paragraph 3.9.6 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>), ‘when each of the limits of deviation for the overhead electric line works and the underground electric line works are viewed as a whole, the overall flexibility is more limited because the combination of these limits of deviation restricts each of the individual limits of deviation’.</p> <p>The ES presents the likely significant effects for each topic and where a significant effect has been identified, additional mitigation is proposed where appropriate. This is considered appropriate for managing the likely significant effects of the project.</p> <p>Flexibility within the LoD has been considered for landscape and visual effects in Section 6.11 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074] and this has confirmed that there would be no new or different likely</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			significant effects to those identified in the baseline scenario assessed (i.e. the Alignment as shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018]). This included consideration of the lateral and longitudinal movement of pylons as discussed in Table 6.6 of ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual [APP-078].
6.10 to 6.11	Micro-siting of pylons	<p>The Councils request that the final alignment, including the micro-siting of towers in sensitive key locations, is agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority or that the limits of deviation are reduced and/or more tightly controlled in these key locations.</p> <p>The Councils request that the pylon positions in key locations will be as shown on consented plans (and as previously agreed with Historic England), unless otherwise agreed with the relevant planning authority and Historic England.</p> <p>In particular, around Hintlesham Hall any changes and deviation should only be made in agreement with the relevant local planning authority and Historic England (for example, Viewpoints AB21 and HV01 [PDA-001] Appendix 2, Photomontage Viewpoint Plan, sheet 1 (for location) and [APP-063] Photomontages Appendix 3 Part 1, Photomontages 04 and 05).</p>	<p>The Applicant needs to maintain flexibility provided by the LoD to take into account unknown constraints that may arise during detailed design and construction. The Applicant carries the liability of the design and construction of the project, and therefore needs to own and take responsibility for the final positioning of project components within the LoD set out within the application for development consent.</p> <p>The ES assesses the effects of the Proposed Alignment as shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018] and includes sensitivity testing for the flexibility provided within the LoD. The ES presents the likely significant effects for each topic and where a significant effect has been identified, additional mitigation is proposed where appropriate. This is considered appropriate for managing the likely significant effects of the project.</p> <p>Given that changes to pylon locations would not result in new or different significant effects and the LoD have been assessed in the ES, it is not considered appropriate or necessary for the final locations to be agreed with the Councils. However, the Applicant recognises the concerns from the Councils and Historic England in relation to Hintlesham Hall and as a result has revised the commitment EM-AB01 wording to avoid positioning a pylon in the area most visible from the ancillary buildings (see the updated REAC submitted at Deadline 3 (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>)).</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it practicable to involve third parties in the detailed designs and micro-siting of pylons as this will be determined by many factors involving engineering and safety requirements, landowner requirements as well as environmental constraints.</p>
6.12 to 6.16	Mitigation and compensation	The definition and application of the mitigation hierarchy has not been agreed and will need to be discussed and agreed with the Applicant. The Councils consider it reasonable to use the emerging definition of the mitigation hierarchy, as included in the draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), which does include compensation as part of the process to	Paragraph 6.13 states that <i>“The Councils consider it reasonable to use the emerging definition of the Mitigation Hierarchy, as included in the draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), March 2023, (p.158), which does include compensation as part of the process to protect the environment and biodiversity.”</i> This definition merely states that ‘mitigation hierarchy’ is <i>“A term to incorporate the avoid, reduce, mitigate, compensate process that applicants need to go through to protect the environment and biodiversity.”</i> Whilst recognising that

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>protect the environment and biodiversity. On this basis, it is necessary to clearly define, which measures are for Biodiversity and Environmental Net Gain, which are measures are for mitigation and which for compensation, both required to make the project acceptable.</p>	<p>'compensation' is at the bottom of the mitigation hierarchy, it does not itself create any requirement to compensate for residual effects.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.8 of the draft NPS EN-1 (March 2023) states that <i>"Biodiversity net gain should be applied after compliance with the mitigation hierarchy and does not change or replace existing environmental obligations."</i> The Applicant agrees that it is important to differentiate between measures required to address significant adverse effects and measures to deliver biodiversity net gain. Indeed, there is a commitment in Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>In paragraph 6.15 of the LIR the Council then goes on to state that <i>"Where, even with additional mitigation, significant adverse effects remain, <u>compensation in form of landscape restoration and enhancement will be required</u> at a scale commensurate with the level of harm resulting from the construction of the surface infrastructure and of the cable route."</i> No justification is provided for the assertion that 'compensation' in the form of landscape restoration and enhancement is <i>"required"</i>; it is certainly not 'required' by draft NPS EN-1.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out its approach to landscape mitigation in ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [<b>APP-074</b>] and its landscape strategy is set out in the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>).</p> <p>Environmental effects have been avoided and reduced throughout development of the project by, amongst other things, following the Holford and Horlock Rules on good design for overhead lines, as encouraged by the designated and draft EN NPS-5.</p> <p>In the context of a major infrastructure project, the residual adverse effects are considered to be very limited and should be considered in the context of the significant benefits of the project. These benefits include contributing to energy security, supporting the transition to net zero and other significant beneficial effects, such as those achieved through the removal of the 132kV line, the removal of a section of 400kV line and undergrounding the proposed 400kV line.</p> <p>The ES identifies the additional mitigation that is included to reduce the likely significant effects in the assessment. The ES also acknowledges that there would be some residual significant adverse landscape and visual effects around Burstall and Hintlesham but that other areas, including Dedham Vale AONB and the Stour Valley will experience</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>significant beneficial effects. The ES identifies the likely residual significant effects after efforts have been made to avoid, reduce and, if possible, offset those effects. These residual effects can be considered as part of the planning balance. Compensation planting at other locations will not remove the likely significant adverse effects identified within the ES at Burstall and Hintlesham.</p> <p>The LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) contains all the planting required to make the project acceptable, including the embedded and best practice measures (including planting embedded into the design of the project and reinstatement planting) and additional mitigation as well as biodiversity compensation planting and landscape softening (EN-5). For clarity, the Applicant has separated biodiversity net gain into the separate Environmental Gain Report <b>[APP-176]</b> to clearly define what is additional to the requirements of the EIA process.</p> <p>The remaining residual effects are considered to be acceptable without further action on mitigation or compensation.</p>
6.17	Landscape and Environmental Masterplan or Strategy	It would be useful if the information and proposals provided with regard to Biodiversity Net Gain, Environmental Gain, vegetation reinstatement, additional screen planting, landscape character enhancements, etc., could be brought together in a Landscape and Environmental Masterplan or Strategy for the project area, that fully integrates the requirements for landscape and visual mitigation/compensation with those of Ecology, Recreation and Cultural Heritage.	<p>The LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) contains all the planting required to make the project acceptable, including the embedded and best practice measures (including planting embedded into the design of the project and reinstatement planting) and additional mitigation as well as biodiversity compensation planting and landscape softening (EN-5). This includes the planting required across all disciplines. No additional measures have been identified for recreation or cultural heritage (outside of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) <b>[AS-001]</b>, therefore the LEMP already performs the function of the Landscape and Environmental Masterplan or Strategy requested.</p> <p>For clarity, the Applicant has separated net gain into the separate Environmental Gain Report <b>[APP-176]</b> to clearly define what is an enhancement and therefore additional to the mitigation requirements of the EIA process.</p>
6.18	LEMP	The Councils consider 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.	<p>The Applicant considers that all implementation, establishment, and management of areas to be seeded, planted, or otherwise are already included within the LEMP.</p> <p>For clarity, the Applicant has separated biodiversity net gain into a separate Environmental Gain Report <b>[APP-176]</b> to clearly define what is an enhancement and therefore additional to the mitigation requirements of the EIA process.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Compensation</b>			
6.19 to 6.20	Compensation to allow for landscape restoration	<p>It is acknowledged that the project will result in impacts and landscape and visual effects that are not capable of mitigation.</p> <p>In accordance with the Mitigation Hierarchy (recognised in Regulation 14 (2)(d) and Schedule 4 (paragraph 7) of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017, and supported in draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), March 2023, p.158), compensation will be required in these circumstances, to allow for landscape restoration at a scale commensurate with the level of harm resulting from the construction of the surface infrastructure and of the cable route in order to protect the environment and biodiversity and to improve the quality of the landscape within the affected areas and to compensate for the residual the harm, that cannot be mitigated.</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.20 refers to and relies upon the 'mitigation hierarchy' "<i>recognised</i>" in Regulation 14 (2)(d) (sic) [NB this should be Reg.14(2)(c)] and Schedule 4 (paragraph 7) of the <u>Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017</u>.</p> <p>It is important to note that at the outset that these provisions require an Environmental Statement to include "<i>a description</i>" of any features of the proposed development, or measures envisaged in order to avoid, prevent or reduce and, if possible, offset likely significant adverse effects on the environment; they do not impose a 'requirement' on an applicant to actually avoid, prevent or reduce and, if possible, offset such effects.</p> <p>In the context of these provisions, the Councils' LIR then says (para 6.20) that "<i>compensation will be required in these circumstances, to allow for landscape restoration at a scale commensurate with the level of harm resulting from the construction of the surface infrastructure and of the cable route in order to protect the environment and biodiversity and to improve the quality of the landscape within the affected areas and to compensate for the residual the harm, that cannot be mitigated</i>". Compensation is, clearly, not "<i>required</i>" pursuant to any 'mitigation hierarchy' implicit in the above provisions.</p> <p>The Councils then say that "<i>the land within the red line boundary of the scheme as well as a sufficiently large area beyond the red line boundary should be included in a comprehensive and integrated programme of landscape enhancement and improvement</i>" (para 6.21) and that they would "<i>encourage a side agreement (such as a Section 106 agreement) between the Applicant and the relevant planning authorities, to fund landscape restoration projects in this area for a set period of time, including, but not limited to woodland and hedgerow planting, wetland and pond creation, connection of habitats, etc</i>" (para 6.21). The Applicant does not agree with the implication here, and elsewhere in the Councils' LIR, that its package of landscape mitigation is inadequate or inappropriate and nor does it agree that 'compensation' is required or appropriate in this case.</p> <p>As described in Section 4.17 of the Planning Statement [<b>APP-160</b>], the development of measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any significant adverse effects of a project is an intrinsic part of the EIA process. As described in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered [<b>APP-</b></p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p><b>071]</b> the Applicant has sought to take into account environmental constraints and to avoid them as far as possible. ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>] describes the design submitted within the application and describes the embedded measures included as part of this.</p> <p>The Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement is a well mitigated project in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the 29km of transmission line proposed, approximately 11km of the proposed alignment will be underground in the most highly valued landscapes.</li> <li>• In underground sections trenchless crossings will be used to protect the most sensitive ecological and landscape features.</li> <li>• 25km of the existing 132kV overhead line will be removed (where this coincides with the undergrounding there will be one less overhead line in the landscape).</li> <li>• 2km of existing 400kV overhead line will be removed in the Stour Valley.</li> <li>• Embedded mitigation planting will be implemented at the GSP and CSE compounds which will be maintained for the lifetime of the asset.</li> <li>• Reinstatement will take place in accordance with the LEMP.</li> <li>• Additional mitigation planting and landscape softening has been proposed (as shown in the LEMP).</li> <li>• Enhancement planting has been committed to in the form of biodiversity net gain.</li> </ul> <p>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [<b>APP-074</b>] presents the results of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. As stated in Table 6.5 and sections 2.8 and 2.16 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [<b>APP-074</b>], there would be long term significant adverse effects on the central part of Burstall community area and on the central and northern parts of Hintlesham community area due to the presence of the new 400kV overhead line north of Hintlesham Woods. The southern part of both Burstall and Hintlesham community areas would however benefit from removal of the existing 132kV overhead line.</p> <p>National Policy Statement EN-5 acknowledges that new overhead lines can give rise to adverse landscape and visual impacts (paragraph 2.8.2 in the designated NPS and 2.9.7 in the draft NPS (March 2023)) and the</p>



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>Applicant considers that these effects would not be mitigated through additional planting at these locations.</p> <p>For the sections of underground cables within the AONB and the Stour Valley, as with any large construction project there would be some significant adverse effects during construction and in Year 1 before the vegetation establishes. However, as stated in Table 6.5 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], during operation there will be significant landscape and visual benefits due to the removal of the existing 132kV overhead line and a section of existing 400kV overhead line (in the Stour Valley) in association with the underground cables.</p>
6.21 to 6.22	s106	<p>The Councils consider that the land within the Order Limits as well as a sufficiently large area beyond the red line boundary should be included in a comprehensive and integrated programme of landscape enhancement and improvement.</p> <p>The Councils would encourage a side agreement (such as a Section 106 agreement) between the Applicant and the relevant planning authorities, to fund landscape restoration projects in this area for a set period of time.</p>	<p>The project is well mitigated and includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of the 29km of transmission line proposed, approximately 11km of the proposed alignment will be underground in the most highly valued landscapes.</li> <li>• In underground sections trenchless crossings will be used to protect the most sensitive ecological and landscape features.</li> <li>• 25km of the existing 132kV overhead line will be removed (where this coincides with the undergrounding there will be one less overhead line in the landscape).</li> <li>• 2km of existing 400kV overhead line will be removed in the Stour Valley.</li> <li>• Embedded mitigation planting will be implemented at the GSP and CSE compounds which will be maintained for the lifetime of the asset.</li> <li>• Reinstatement will take place in accordance with the LEMP.</li> <li>• Additional mitigation planting and landscape softening has been proposed (as shown in the LEMP).</li> <li>• Enhancement planting has been committed to in the form of biodiversity net gain.</li> </ul> <p>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074] presents the results of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and identifies the significant effects and the mitigation proposed to reduce residual landscape and visual effects. As noted in Table 6.5 and sections 2.8 and 2.16 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], there would be long term significant adverse effects on the central part of Burstall community area and on the central and northern parts of Hintlesham community area due to the presence of the new 400kV overhead line north of Hintlesham Woods. The southern part of both Burstall and</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
6.23 to 6.24	Funding for dedicated officer	For the delivery of such projects, the agreement should provide funding for a	<p>Hintlesham community areas would however benefit from removal of the existing 132kV overhead line.</p> <p>As the adverse effects are from the introduction of the 400kV overhead line, these cannot all be mitigated through planting due to the size of the pylons. Areas of planting have been proposed in these community areas in the vicinity of residential properties to soften the effects of the overhead line, in line with NPS EN-5 (paragraph 2.8.11), but additional mitigation would not reduce the effects of the project to a non-significant level in these areas. The Applicant has also committed to delivering at least 10% biodiversity net gain on the project, which is secured through Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>). As stated in Table 6.5 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [<b>APP-074</b>], during operation there will be significant beneficial landscape and visual effects due to the removal of the existing 132kV overhead line and a section of existing 400kV overhead line (in the Stour Valley) in association with the underground cables. As concluded in Chapter 10 of the Planning Statement [<b>APP-160</b>] while significant adverse effects to landscape and visual receptors weighs negatively in the overall planning balance for the project, it is noted that paragraph 5.9.8 of EN1 indicates '<i>virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have effects on the landscape</i>'. The project has been designed carefully and, having regard to siting constraints, the potential harm to the landscape has been reduced through the provision of reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate. In addition, this harm is offset in the overall planning balance by the beneficial visual effects which are likely to occur where the existing overhead lines in the landscape are removed. Weight should be afforded to the likely beneficial visual effects, and where applicable the beneficial effects on the setting of heritage assets, where existing overhead lines are removed and not replaced with new overhead line. This occurs where the existing 132kV overhead line is removed and not replaced with a new 400kV line in Dedham Vale AONB, part of the Stour Valley, and the stretch of Section AB within which the routes of the proposed 400kV overline and the existing 132kV overhead line diverge.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Councils and the AONB Partnership on this topic. However, currently, the Applicant is not of the opinion that a s106 agreement on this basis would meet the relevant tests within Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) (CIL Regulations).</p>
			For the sections of underground cables within the AONB and the Stour Valley, as with any large construction project there would be some

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
	and holistic approach	dedicated Officer for the agreed period, as well as for enabling works such as relevant studies and community engagement. As the route of the scheme crosses the Dedham Vale AONB and adversely affects not only the AONB, but also its setting, and other sensitive landscapes, the Councils considers that a dedicated AONB Officer may be best placed for project conception, management, and delivery.	<p>significant adverse effects during construction and in Year 1 before the vegetation establishes. However, as stated in Table 6.5 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], during operation there will be significant landscape and visual benefits due to the removal of the 132kV overhead line (and a section of existing 400kV overhead line in the Stour Valley) in association with the underground cables. As such, the Applicant considers that the reinstatement and mitigation proposed is adequate to address the effects of the underground cable within the Dedham Vale AONB and the Stour Valley.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Councils and AONB Partnership on this topic. However, at present the assessments have not identified any need for a Section 106 Agreement and no suggestions have been put forward by the Councils that meet the relevant tests for planning obligations.</p>

### Local Impact Assessment

6.88 to 6.93	Construction phase impacts	<p>There would be material impacts upon the Dedham Vale AONB and other sensitive landscapes, such as the Box, Brett and Stour valleys. Within the Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley, this would include an 80m wide swathe that would be disturbed due to the construction of underground cable sections of the route. In other areas, surface infrastructure construction would represent an intrusive feature in the landscape during construction.</p> <p>The Councils request that the final alignment and positioning of towers is agreed with the relevant Local Planning Authority.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074] presents the results of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. As with any large construction project there would be some significant adverse effects during construction and in Year 1 before the vegetation establishes. However, as stated in Table 6.5 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], during operation there will be significant landscape and visual benefits due to the removal of the 132kV overhead line (and a section of existing 400kV overhead line in the Stour Valley) in association with the underground cables.</p> <p>The LIR notes that the direct impacts involve an 80m swathe during construction. This is correct in areas of cable using open cut methods. However, the Applicant notes that use of trenchless crossing techniques in four proposed locations including approximately 2.1km under the Stour and Box Valley would avoid and reduce vegetation removal and landscape and visual impacts.</p> <p>Section 3.4 and Table 6.5 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes [APP-098] conclude that, although the presence of the new 400kV overhead line when seen alongside the existing 400kV overhead line would slightly intensify the presence of high voltage electricity infrastructure in the Brett Valley, the resultant effects would not be significant. The new 400kV pylons would increase the proportion of available views occupied by high voltage electricity infrastructure within the SLA but would be in the context of the continuing presence of the existing 400kV overhead line which would moderate the overall effect.</p>
--------------	----------------------------	--	---

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>Furthermore, the Dedham Vale AONB Special Qualities and Statutory Purpose report submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-032] concludes that the project would not impact on the ability of the AONB to deliver its statutory purpose.</p> <p>The Applicant needs to maintain flexibility provided by the LoD to take into account unknown constraints that may arise during detailed design and construction. The ES assesses the effects of the Proposed Alignment as shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018] and includes sensitivity testing for the flexibility provided within the LoD. This sensitivity testing confirmed that there would be no significant new or different environmental effects as a result of pylons moving within the LoD. Given that changes to pylon locations would not result in new or different significant effects and the LoD have been assessed in the ES, it is not considered appropriate or necessary for the final locations to be agreed with the Councils.</p>
6.94 to 6.102	Operation phase impacts	Due to their size and industrial character, the pylons and overhead cabling would create residual significant adverse impacts over a wide area, and most of which cannot be mitigated with planting. A comprehensive mitigation plan should be provided that includes off-site mitigation, plus a fully funded compensation plan to offset the permanent adverse effects of the overhead sections.	<p>See comments in relation to paragraph 6.21 to 6.22 of the LIR above.</p> <p>No offsite planting is proposed and all proposed planting is within the Order Limits. Locations of proposed planting are shown at LEMP Appendix B Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) and planting schedules at LEMP Appendix C: Planting Schedules [APP-185].</p>
6.103 to 6.106	Decommissioning phase impacts	The Councils anticipate that there would be material impacts upon the Dedham Vale AONB and other landscape areas. This would include parts of the 80m wide swathe that would be disturbed due to the removal of underground cable sections of the route. Surface demolition would represent an intrusive feature in the landscape during decommissioning.	<p>As stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072], decommissioned underground cables could be left in the ground with any above ground structures such as link pillars removed. Cables could also be removed from the ducts using the jointing bays. These works are anticipated to be localised and short term in duration. Therefore, decommissioning of the underground cables is unlikely to require a further 80m swathe as required during construction.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Summary</b>			
6.107 to 6.108	Significant residual landscape and visual effects	<p>The summary section of ES Chapter 6 states 'No significant effects have been identified for key recreational receptors during operation', and that views are only transient glimpsed through vegetation even when in close proximity and therefore effects would not be significant.</p> <p>The Councils disagree with this statement, based on several viewpoint photographs taken from the PRow network demonstrate the opposite, e.g., VP AB21 [APP-063].</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that when a pylon is seen in close proximity it will be very visible and this is the case for Viewpoint AB21. However as advocated by GLVIA3, the level of effect also takes into consideration the duration of the view. In the case of recreational receptors using Public Rights of Way (PRow), the pylons will only affect the view transiently and for a short period. This moderates the overall effect.</p> <p>It should also be emphasised that in many situations the Project involves the replacement of existing 132kV pylons by taller 400kV not the introduction of a completely new overhead line. This reduces the magnitude of change when comparing the development of the project to the baseline scenario.</p>
6.109 to 6.110	Significant residual landscape and visual effects	<p>There are also localised significant residual visual effects within community areas close to the route and substations and CSE compounds, notably Burstall and Hintlesham. In this context, the Councils consider that the accumulation of long-term minor adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity experienced by communities along the route should also be considered to be significant.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074] presents the results of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>As stated in Table 6.5 and sections 2.8 and 2.16 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], there would be long term significant adverse effects on the central part of Burstall community area and on the central and northern parts of Hintlesham community area due to the presence of the new 400kV overhead line north of Hintlesham Woods. The southern part of both Burstall and Hintlesham community areas would however benefit from removal of the existing 132kV overhead line.</p> <p>The linear nature of this project means that several community areas would be affected albeit that most effects would not be significant. The purpose of the landscape and visual assessment is to assist the Secretary of State (SoS) in making a decision as to whether the combined effects of the project along the route are/are not acceptable in accordance with National Policy.</p>
6.111	Significant residual landscape and visual effects	<p>It is acknowledged in the ES Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that there are significant adverse visual effects from the proposed 400kV overhead line which cannot be mitigated due to the pylon heights. The remaining residual significant landscape and visual effects need to be compensated for in a strategic way.</p>	<p>See the Applicant's response to paragraphs 6.19 to 6.20 of the LIR above in response to this matter.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Required Mitigation</b>			
6.112 to 6.113		The Councils consider that secured options for further mitigative screen planting, including off-site, need to be achieved and should be fully explored by the Applicant, in particular in, but not limited to, areas, where residual adverse effects remain significant in the long-term, such as around Bramford substation, Hintlesham, Burstall and others (as listed above).	See the Applicant's response to paragraphs 6.19 to 6.20 of the LIR above in response to this matter.
6.114 to 6.117	Landscape softening	<p>The Councils seek clarification, why several of the proposed additional mitigation measures relate to the avoidance or reduction of significant effects for biodiversity, and why planting relevant for screening is categorised as landscape softening.</p> <p>The Councils consider that measures for biodiversity are not additional mitigation but are integral to the project, and measures to screen the development are part of landscape and visual mitigation, required to make the scheme acceptable, rather than voluntary landscape softening. It is currently unclear, where the proposed 'Landscape Softening' measures would sit on the Mitigation Hierarchy.</p> <p>There remain concerns with regards to the voluntary and therefore non-secure nature not only of landscape softening, but also of the proposed reinstatement planting, the final placement of which would be agreed with the landowner and tenant, but thus far not with the relevant local planning authority.</p>	<p>The additional mitigation for biodiversity is the mitigation that is required to offset a significant effect identified in ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [<b>APP-075</b>]. It is classed as 'additional' to differentiate it from the embedded and good practice measures as described in ES Chapter 5: EIA Approach and Methodology [<b>APP-073</b>]. The additional mitigation for biodiversity is secured through the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>).</p> <p>The landscape and visual assessment presented at ES Appendix 6.5: Assessment of Visual Effects on Communities [<b>APP-108</b>] does not rely on the 'landscape softening' measures shown on the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>).</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 8.4.9 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>), the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) which is secured through Requirement 9 (reinstatement planting plan) of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) identifies areas for potential 'landscape softening' which would provide screening from visual receptors. Although these softening areas are not required to offset a significant effect within the ES, the planting could soften the views of the project from specific properties identified in the community assessment. As noted in paragraph 2.8.11 of the designated NPS EN-5 and paragraph 2.10.6 of the Draft NPS (March 2023), the landscape softening would be discussed with the relevant landowners, who may choose to decline the landscape softening proposals.</p>
6.118 to 6.119	BNG and monitoring	The Councils acknowledge that the measures for Biodiversity and Environmental Net Gain have been covered separately in the Environmental Gain Report	As stated in paragraph 9.1.2 of the LEMP ( <b>document 7.8 (B)</b> ), where vegetation including woodland, hedgerows and trees have been planted as part of the reinstatement, these will have a five-year aftercare period in accordance with good practice measure LV03 in the CEMP Appendix

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>[APP-176] and understands that the identified Environmental Areas are where BNG will be achieved. This is reflected in section 7.3 Management and Monitoring, which allows a monitoring period of 30 years.</p> <p>The Councils consider that annual monitoring should be continued until at least the end of year five for some habitats such as grassland and hedgerows, provided these are establishing well, and longer for woodland establishment, in particular for natural woodland regeneration.</p>	<p>A: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (<b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b>) and Requirement 10(3) of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p> <p>National Grid will continue to maintain planting at the GSP substation and the CSE compounds for the life of the asset, in accordance with embedded measures EM-D01, EM-F01, EM-G03, EM-G06 and EM-H02 set out within the REAC (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>).</p> <p>National Grid will also maintain mitigation area MM09 to the north of Hintlesham Woods SSSI, for up to 30 years due the importance of this site in meeting an objective to improve habitat connectivity between Ramsey Wood and Wolves Wood.</p>
6.120 to 6.121	Hedgerows	<p>The ES provides an Important Hedgerow Assessment [APP-115], which lists the Important Hedgerows, and the Important Hedgerows are shown and referenced on the LEMP Appendix A – Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [APP-183]. The hedgerow losses are summarised in ES Chapter 7 – Biodiversity [APP-075], Table 7.9. There are useful quantifications within the Biodiversity chapter, but it is difficult to gauge how many trees and hedgerows and how much woodland will be lost in each section of the scheme, and to what extent they will be reinstated in each section.</p>	<p>Table 7.9 in ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [APP-075] provides a summary of permanent loss, temporary loss, coppiced and pruned hedgerow Habitat of Principal Importance (HPI). Table 7.10 provides a summary of permanent and temporary Non Woodland HPI Impacts. ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [APP-075] concludes that there are no significant effects in relation to other habitats, once habitats have been reinstated, as shown on Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plans [APP-184]. All habitats affected have been quantified as part of the Defra Metric 3.1 presented in the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176].</p> <p>LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [APP-183] shows all of the trees and hedgerows which would be affected by the works based on the Proposed Alignment shown on the General Arrangement Plans. Locations of proposed planting are shown on LEMP Appendix B Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) and planting schedules at LEMP Appendix C: Planting Schedules [APP-185].</p> <p>The location of vegetation loss in terms of project section is not linked to or used to derive significance of effects therefore this level of detail is not required as part of the ES.</p>
6.122 to 6.124	Environmental Areas	<p>The current Vegetation Reinstatement Plan includes areas that are not part of the landscape and visual mitigation measures, but compensation for lost habitats as part of the Biodiversity calculations (see LEMP). The Councils assume that these are the Environmental Areas, identified in the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176].</p>	<p>As stated in paragraph 8.2.1 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>), the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan in Appendix B (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) shows the location of proposed embedded planting at the GSP substation and around the cable sealing end (CSE) compounds, reinstatement planting, landscape softening, habitat compensation and additional planting required to mitigate an environmental effect.</p> <p>Environmental Areas as identified in the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176] are areas in which enhancement planting has been identified</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>The Environmental Areas are shown in grey on the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan, but are not clearly referenced (i.e., their ENV-xx numbers are not shown).</p> <p>The proposals for the Environmental Areas are high-level and not spatially reflected on the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan. This makes their effectiveness with regards to landscape and visual mitigation difficult to judge.</p>	<p>(not mitigation). The enhancement planting shown in the Environmental Gain Report is not included within the Management Plans as it will be delivered by alternative mechanisms outside of the main construction works with the evidence provided in accordance with Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>). BNG is covered within the Environmental Gain Report [<b>APP-176</b>] and is secured via Requirement 13 (Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)) of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p>
6.125 to 6.126	Impacts of above ground infrastructure	<p>The summary of landscape and visual effects during construction and operation demonstrates that, even with the proposed mitigation, the project results in a much larger number of long-term significant adverse effects than long-term significant beneficial effects.</p>	<p>As stated in Table 6.5 and sections 2.8 and 2.16 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [<b>APP-074</b>], there would be long term significant adverse effects on the central part of Burstall community area and on the central and northern parts of Hintlesham community area due to the presence of the new 400kV overhead line north of Hintlesham Woods. The southern part of both Burstall and Hintlesham community areas would however benefit from removal of the existing 132kV overhead line. All other long term significant effects are considered to be beneficial due to the removal of the existing 132kV overhead line and a section of existing 400kV overhead line (in the Stour Valley) in association with the underground cables through the AONB and the Stour Valley.</p> <p>As concluded in Chapter 10 of the Planning Statement [<b>APP-160</b>] while significant adverse effects to landscape and visual receptors weighs negatively in the overall planning balance for the project, it is noted that paragraph 5.9.8 of EN1 indicates '<i>virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have effects on the landscape</i>'. The project has been designed carefully and, having regard to siting constraints, the potential harm to the landscape has been reduced through the provision of reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate. In addition, this harm is offset in the overall planning balance by the beneficial visual effects which are likely to occur where the existing overhead lines in the landscape are removed. Weight should be afforded to the likely beneficial visual effects, and where applicable the beneficial effects on the setting of heritage assets, where existing overhead lines are removed and not replaced with new overhead line. This occurs where the existing 132kV overhead line is removed and not replaced with a new 400kV line in Dedham Vale AONB, part of the Stour Valley, and the stretch of Section AB within which the routes of the proposed 400kV overline and the existing 132kV overhead line diverge.</p>



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
6.127 to 6.129	Mitigation at Bramford Substation	<p>The Councils consider that off-site mitigation needs to be further explored around Bramford substation and towards Burstall.</p> <p>The Councils acknowledges that, in the vicinity of the substation, even with further mitigation, the accumulation of adverse impacts and effects on landscape and visual amenity are such, that they will not be capable of fully effective mitigation.</p> <p>Therefore, the Councils consider that the area around Bramford substation and Burstall should be included in landscape scale restoration, as part of the overall compensation required to make the scheme acceptable in landscape terms. A scheme for wider community benefits should also be developed.</p>	<p>The Applicant disagrees that further off-site mitigation is required.</p> <p>As stated in Table 6.5 and sections 2.8 and 2.16 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], there would be long term significant adverse effects on the central part of Burstall community area and on the central and northern parts of Hintlesham community area due to the presence of the new 400kV overhead line north of Hintlesham Woods. The southern part of both Burstall and Hintlesham community areas would however benefit from removal of the existing 132kV overhead line.</p> <p>The assessment of the Bramford community area, presented in ES Appendix 6.5: Assessment of Visual Effects on Communities [APP-108], concluded in paragraph 2.5.15 that the magnitude of change would be small and the effect would be at a non-significant level.</p> <p>The Applicant's comments on Community Benefits is provided in reference 15.9 of the LIR.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to the point regarding compensation in response to 6.12 to 6.16 of this table.</p>
6.130 to 6.131	Mitigation in the Brett Valley	<p>The Brett Valley, although not a designated landscape, shares the characteristics of an intimate valley comparable to the Dedham Vale AONB and Stour Valley, being highly sensitive to development, including to the proposed scheme. While acknowledging this sensitivity, the ES assessment does neither recognise the cultural significance of this landscape nor address the residual adverse impacts on the cultural associations of the landscape to artists and writers. The Councils consider that the Brett Valley should be included in landscape scale restoration and enhancement, as part of the overall compensation required to make the project acceptable in landscape terms. A scheme for wider community benefits should also be developed.</p>	<p>Section 3.4 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes [APP-098] sets out the assessment of effects on the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area (SLA). Section 3.4 and Table 6.5 of this report [APP-098] state that although the presence of the new 400kV overhead line when seen alongside the existing 400kV overhead line would continue to slightly intensify the presence of high voltage electricity infrastructure in the Brett Valley, the resultant effects would not be significant. The new 400kV pylons would increase the proportion of available views occupied by high voltage electricity infrastructure within the SLA but would be in the context of the continuing presence of the existing 400kV overhead line which would moderate the overall effect.</p> <p>Section 3.1 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on Landscape Character Area (LCA) 1 Suffolk Ancient Rolling Farmlands. LCA 1c covers the valley sides of the River Brett and its tributary valley. The assessment acknowledges the high value of this LCA which is partly based on its cultural associations, referring in paragraph 3.1.5 to John Constable and other artists. Section 3.5 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on LCA 5 Suffolk Valley Meadowlands. LCA 5b covers the valley floor of the River Brett. Both these assessments conclude that the removal of the existing 132kV overhead line and presence of the new 400kV overhead line would introduce noticeably</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			larger pylons within the Brett Valley and slightly increase the influence of high voltage electricity infrastructure within LCA 5b. The resultant effects would however not be significant.
6.132	Assington Neighbourhood Plan	Assington is located just north/north-east to the Stour Valley Project Area and north/north-west to the Dedham Vale AONB. The ES Appendix 6.5 – Assessment of Visual Effects on Communities acknowledges the Assington Neighbourhood Plan. It does not, however, reflect on how the scheme and the assessment of landscape and visual amenity relate to the Neighbourhood Plan policies ASSN7 - Area of Local Landscape Sensitivity (ALLS) and ASSN8 - Protected Views. The proposed scheme would have adverse effects on the ALLS, which it traverses, and potentially on several views that are protected by the Assington Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>Section 2.3 of ES Appendix 6.5: Assessment of Effects on Communities [APP-108] presents the assessment of effects on Assington community area. Table 2.3 of section 2.3 [APP-108] summarises the assessment of effects on the representative viewpoints which were used to inform the assessment, and which are presented at ES Appendix 6.4: Viewpoint Assessment Section F Part 5 [APP-105] and ES Appendix 6.4: Viewpoint Assessment Section G Part 6 [APP-106]. Viewpoint 22 equates to protected view 14 and F2.14 to protected view 6.</p> <p>A viewpoint selection document presenting representative viewpoints proposed for the assessment was issued to SCC/BMSDC on 16 June 2021 following a meeting in May 2021 and locations were updated in line with comments received.</p> <p>Section 3.6 of ES Appendix 6.2: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on the Stour Valley SLA which covers part of the Assington community area. Section 3.6 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-100] presents the assessment of effects on LCA 6b Suffolk Ancient Rolling Farmlands. Both these assessments conclude that removal of the 132kV overhead line, and presence of the new 400kV overhead line alongside the existing 400kV overhead line would give rise to adverse effects. However, but these would be limited to close proximity views, which are already affected by views of the existing overhead lines which would moderate the level of effect. Section 2 of ES Appendix 6.2: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on the Dedham Vale AONB which covers the southernmost part of Assington community area. The assessment concludes that the overall effect on the landscape of the AONB would be beneficial.</p> <p>Table D.1 in the Planning Statement [APP-160] provides details as to how the project has had regard to the relevant local planning policies including ASSN7 and ASSN8 of the Assington Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
6.133 to 6.134	Neighbourhood Plans	Several other communities potentially affected by the project have made, or are in the process of preparing, Neighbourhood Plans. The ES does not assess, how the proposals would affect Protected/ Important	A viewpoint selection document presenting representative viewpoints proposed for the assessment was issued to SCC/BMSDC on 16 June 2021 following a meeting in May 2021 and locations were updated in line with comments received.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		Views and Areas of Local Landscape Sensitivity or of Greater Landscape Value identified and secured by Neighbourhood Plan Policies, or what harm they would suffer.	<p>ES Appendix 6.5: Assessment of Visual Effects on Communities <b>[APP-108]</b> presents the assessment of effects on community areas. Reference is made to Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements in the relevant community area which included Aldham, Assington, Boxford, Bramford, Bulmer, Copdock and Washbrook, Elmsett, Gestingthorpe, Leavenheath, Little Cornard, Middleton and Newton. The information in these reports was used to inform the landscape and visual baseline for the community areas on which the landscape and visual impact assessment was based.</p> <p>Section 2.11 and 2.19 of ES Appendix 6.5: Assessment of Effects on Communities <b>[APP-108]</b> presents the assessment of effects on Elmsett and Leavenheath respectively and cross refers to the relevant representative viewpoints. Viewpoint AB-18 is close to Important View 7 in Elmsett.</p> <p>Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character <b>[APP-100]</b> present the assessment of effects on LCA 1b Suffolk Rolling Valley Farmlands and LCA 2b Suffolk Ancient Plateau Claylands respectively. These LCA cover Elmsett community area.</p> <p>Sections 3.1 and 3.6 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character <b>[APP-100]</b> present the assessment of effects on LCA 1b Suffolk Rolling Valley Farmlands and LCA 6b Suffolk Ancient Rolling Farmlands respectively. These LCA cover Leavenheath community area. Leavenheath Neighbourhood Plan View 4 is referred to in paragraphs 2.19.16 and 2.19.19 of ES Appendix 6.5: Assessment of Visual Effects on Communities <b>[APP-108]</b>.</p> <p>Section 2 of ES Appendix 6.2: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes <b>[APP-098]</b> presents the assessment of effects on the AONB which covers the south-eastern part of Leavenheath community area.</p> <p>The assessments conclude that removal of the 132kV overhead line, and presence of the new 400kV overhead line alongside the existing 400kV overhead line would give rise to adverse effects. However, these would be limited to close proximity views, which are already affected by views of the existing overhead lines which would moderate the level of effect. The effects are therefore considered not to be significant. The exception is LCA 2b Ancient Plateau Claylands where significant long term adverse effects are likely.</p> <p>Table D.1 in the Planning Statement <b>[APP-160]</b> provides details as to how the project has had regard to the relevant local planning policies. Elmsett Neighbourhood Plan was not specifically addressed in the</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
6.135 to 6.138	Impacts on key cultural assets	<p>The Councils welcome the assessment of the heritage asset of Hintlesham Hall (ES Appendix 8.2 Annex A: Hintlesham Hall Assessment [APP-128]).</p> <p>In contrast, other culturally significant assets are not given the appropriate attention in the ES. This includes Benton End House, Hadleigh, a Grade II* Listed Building, currently undergoing renovation with the aim to open the gardens to the public in 2026.</p> <p>Overbury Hall, a Grade II Listed Building, of which a pencil drawing by John Constable, from August 1815, is held in the Victoria and Albert Museum.</p> <p>Both assets, and the wider landscape they are set in (Brett Valley, see above), are particularly sensitive due to their associations with artists. These associations, and the potential impacts and effects on these, resulting from the project, have not been explored or assessed.</p>	<p>Planning Statement [APP-160] as it falls outside of the Order Limits for the project and, therefore, does not comprise part of the statutory development plan relevant to the project. However, the Applicant accepts that it is capable of being important and relevant.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the setting effects of the project on the Grade II* Benton End and Grade II Outbuildings in ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [APP-076] and ES Appendix 8.2: Historic Environment Impact Assessment [APP-127]. The Historic Environment assessment concluded that the project would result in a neutral effect (not significant) on this asset given that the buildings would have very limited intervisibility with the project.</p> <p>The Applicant has also assessed the setting effects of the project on the Grade II Overbury Hall in ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [APP-076] and ES Appendix 8.2: Historic Environment Impact Assessment [APP-127]. The Historic Environment assessment concluded that the project would introduce visual intrusion in front of the existing 400kV overhead line, resulting in a minor adverse effect (not significant).</p> <p>Section 3.4 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes [APP-098] sets out the assessment of effects on the Brett Valley SLA. Section 3.4 of this document states that although the presence of the new 400kV overhead line when seen alongside the existing 400kV overhead line would continue to slightly intensify the presence of high voltage electricity infrastructure in the Brett Valley, the resultant effects would not be significant.</p> <p>Section 3.1 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on LCA 1 Suffolk Ancient Rolling Farmlands. LCA 1c covers the valley sides of the River Brett and its tributary valley. The assessment acknowledges the high value of this LCA which is partly based on its cultural associations, referring in paragraph 3.1.5 to John Constable and other artists. Section 3.5 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on LCA 5 Suffolk Valley Meadowlands. LCA 5b covers the valley floor of the River Brett.</p> <p>Both assessments conclude that the removal of the existing 132kV overhead line and presence of the new 400kV overhead line would introduce noticeably larger pylons within the Brett Valley and slightly increase the influence of high voltage electricity infrastructure within LCA 5b. The resultant effects would not be significant.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
6.139	Residual impacts of Dedham Vale East CSE Compound	The Councils agree with the location in principle. However, for the detailed design it should be considered placing the CSE compound more centrally between Millwood Road and Heath Road, to reduce the visual effects experienced, when leaving Polstead Heath in a southerly direction (without increasing the adverse effects on the PRoW to the west of site).	<p>The Applicant notes that the Councils agree with the location for the Dedham Vale East CSE compound.</p> <p>The location of Dedham Vale East CSE compound balances engineering and environmental aspects. A location more central between Millwood Road and Heath Road would bring the CSE compound close to the existing 400kV overhead line being retained, which would increase the landscape and visual impacts. Embedded planting, shown in Sheet 12 of LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) would also help to visually screen the CSE compound.</p> <p>The community area of Polstead, assessed in ES Appendix 6.5: Assessment of Visual Effects on Communities [<b>APP-108</b>] would benefit from the removal of the 400kV overhead line, the CSE compound being located on the eastern edge.</p>
6.140 to 6.141	Residual impacts of Dedham Vale West CSE Compound	<p>The Councils agree with the location, in principle. It is welcome that the existing group of trees is to be retained, as this will aid screening/filtering of the views from the B1068. At the detailed design it will be important to ensure that the indicated access road and compound do not infringe on the rootzones of this tree group.</p> <p>The proposed screen planting appears insufficient. The eastern hedges shown to flank the access track should both continued to the north-western temporary access track. The Councils consider that, south of the existing tree group, a hedgerow mix that includes trees should be used. The roadside hedge along the north-western side of the B1068 should be reinforced and strengthened.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the Councils agree with the location for the Dedham Vale West CSE compound.</p> <p>Planting, shown in Sheet 15 of LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) would help to visually screen the CSE compound, although it is noted that due to the location of underground cabling, that scope for tree planting is limited in the section of hedgerow to the north-western side of the B1068.</p> <p>Requirement 9 (reinstatement planting plan) of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) prevents any stage of the authorised development from being brought into operational use until a reinstatement planting plan for trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows to be reinstated during that stage has been submitted to and approved by the 'relevant planning authority'. The reinstatement planting plan must be in general accordance with the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) approved under Requirement 4. Therefore, 'the relevant planning authorities' would have further input to the planting proposals, should these change, prior to implementation.</p>
6.142 to 6.143	Residual impacts of Stour Valley East CSE Compound	The Councils agree with the siting of the Stour Valley East CSE compound in principle. The site is largely screened from public viewpoints, in particular from PRoW to the south-east and east, because of landform and intervening vegetation (woodland). It will be essential to retain the currently existing screening vegetation.	<p>The Applicant notes that the Councils agree with the location for the Stour Valley East CSE compound.</p> <p>The area of woodland removal to the west of the CSE compound, shown on Sheet 19 of Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed Plans [<b>APP-017</b>] and LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans [<b>APP-183</b>] is due to the construction of the underground cables.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>There are concerns that the compound is located very close to retained trees. Further, it would appear that an area of woodland/scrub to the west of the compound would be removed instead of circumvented. The vegetation loss here is unclear and should be clarified and minimised. In the detailed design stage, HDD should be considered to retain high quality trees.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed Plans [APP-017], LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans [APP-183] and LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) show different tree loss in this area. As shown on the Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed Plans [APP-017] and LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans [APP-183] the tree and woodland / group of trees would be removed (including roots) in this location due to the construction activities associated with the underground cables.</p> <p>The assessment assumes that vegetation removed during construction would be reinstated, except where there are planting restrictions for example trees cannot be planted over the underground cables. The Applicant has submitted an updated LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) at Deadline 3 to remove the discrepancy between that and the Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed Plans [APP-017] and LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plans [APP-183].</p>
6.144 to 6.145	Residual impacts of Stour Valley West CSE Compound	<p>The vegetation reinstatement plan (Sheet 28) (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) does quote EM-G06: the design allows for an area of landscape planting around the Stour Valley West CSE compound. The embedded planting will be maintained for the life of the CSE compound.</p> <p>The Photomontage does not show any difference in screening between years 1 and 15; there appears to be no mitigative planting; this is insufficient; the Councils expect appropriate screen planting proposals for the CSE compound to be provided.</p>	<p>The photomontage presented for Stour Valley West CSE looks north from the footpath at Viewpoint G-07 and along the route of the proposed underground cabling into the CSE compound. It is not possible to provide planting in this area due to the underground cables and the visual effect is acknowledged in the viewpoint assessment for Viewpoint G-07 presented in ES Appendix 6.4: Viewpoint Assessment Section G Part 6 [APP-106].</p>
6.146 to 6.147	Impact of the GSP substation	<p>It is noted that the screening potential for planting along the western side of the A131 should be fully explored (as well as that west of the substation). The exact location and purpose for the proposed mounds (EM-H04, as quoted on LEMP Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>))</p>	<p>The GSP substation was subject to a separate planning application (planning application reference: 22/01147/FUL) which was approved by Braintree District Council in October 2022. The extent of the planting and mounding was included as part of that application and is also included as an embedded measure within the DCO.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		Sheet 23) requires clarification (are they necessary to aid screening?).	
<b>Document 7.8: Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)</b>			
6.148 to 6.152	Lack of detail in the LEMP	<p>The Councils do not consider the provided LEMP robust enough in its current form.</p> <p>The Councils consider that the Applicant should provide detailed information on retained, lost and proposed vegetation within the LEMP (i.e., linear meters of hedge (identifying important hedgerows), areas of woodlands, numbers of field boundary trees (identifying those, which are veteran or ancient).</p> <p>It would be useful to provide this information broken up into sections, in order to highlight requirements for further mitigation/compensation measures and aid identification of target areas.</p> <p>The LEMP does currently not quantify vegetation losses, and it is unclear, if, within the estimated 72m of permanently lost hedgerow (paragraph 5.3.1, Environmental Gain Report [APP-176]), visibility splays for permanent access points are fully accounted for.</p> <p>The LEMP lacks in detail with regards to establishment and maintenance prescriptions for various habitats/planting types and provides no programme, for example for the envisaged frequency of inspections, maintenance visits and management measures.</p>	<p>Table 7.9 in ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [APP-075] provides a summary of permanent loss, temporary loss, coppiced and pruned hedgerow HPI. Table 7.10 provides a summary of permanent and temporary Non Woodland HPI Impacts. ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [APP-075] concludes that there are no significant effects in relation to other habitats, once habitats have been reinstated, as shown on Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plans [APP-184]. All habitats affected have been quantified as part of the Defra Metric 3.1 presented in the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176].</p> <p>The LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [APP-183] shows all of the trees and hedgerows which will be affected by the works based on the Proposed Alignment. This includes the 72m of permanently lost hedgerow stated in paragraph 5.3.1 of the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176] and which is reported in Table 7.9 of ES Chapter 7 Biodiversity [APP-075] for the main project (42m of permanent hedgerow loss) and paragraph 7.6.171 of ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [APP-075] (the additional 30m of permanent hedgerow loss at the GSP substation).</p> <p>Locations of proposed planting are shown on LEMP Appendix B Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) and planting schedules at LEMP Appendix C: Planting Schedules [APP-185]. No further mitigation or compensation planting is therefore considered to be required.</p> <p>Section 8 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) provides details of the landscape and ecological reinstatement and Section 9 provides details of aftercare. As stated in the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] '<i>The Applicant has not yet appointed a Main Works Contractor to undertake the works and therefore specific details about the frequency of inspections is not known at this time. Paragraph 9.1.2 of the LEMP (document 7.8 (B)) states that 'periodic checks will be undertaken by a suitably experienced professional to check reinstatement and to replace species that have not taken'. Paragraph 9.2.2 states that 'Inspections will also be undertaken to any areas that were coppiced during construction to check that the coppicing is re-establishing. This will confirm that these areas are regenerating as planned or will identify the need for further measures, such as additional</i></p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p><i>planting where the coppicing is not leading to successful regrowth'. The LEMP is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO [APP-034].</i></p> <p>As stated in paragraph 6.3.3 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>), no ancient trees are recorded within the Order Limits or within a 15m buffer of these. No potential ancient trees have been identified during the arboricultural site surveys, therefore, ancient trees and potential ancient trees are not considered further within the LEMP.</p>
6.153 to 6.154 and 6.158 to 6.160	Landscape planting mitigation proposals, including timing, management and maintenance	<p>The Councils consider that the Applicant has not fully explored the potential for off-site mitigation planting to further reduce visual effects of the project.</p> <p>With regards to timing of any planting, this should be carried out as early as possible. Off-site mitigation planting should be implemented in the first planting season after agreements with the relevant landowners are achieved.</p> <p>Negotiations between the Applicant and Landowners should begin as soon as possible.</p> <p>If difficulties arise with the procurement of agreed planting stock, alternatives will need to be agreed (not only discussed) with the relevant planning authority (see LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>), paragraph 8.2.5).</p>	<p>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074] identifies the significant effects and the mitigation proposed. It is acknowledged that during operation, there would be long term significant adverse effects on LCA2: Suffolk Ancient Plateau Claylands, Burstall and Hintlesham community areas as the benefits of removing the existing 132kV overhead line would be outweighed by the presence of the new 400kV overhead line.</p> <p>As the effects are from the introduction of the 400kV overhead line, these cannot be fully mitigated.</p> <p>As described in paragraph 6.11.7 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], areas of planting have been proposed in these community areas in the vicinity of residential properties to soften the effects of the overhead line, in line with EN-5 (paragraph 2.8.11), it is considered that additional mitigation would not reduce the effects of the project in these areas.</p> <p>No other adverse significant effects have been identified during operation and therefore no requirement for additional mitigation of effects. All other long term significant effects are identified as beneficial.</p> <p>No off-site planting has been proposed as the Applicant does not consider this is needed to make the project acceptable.</p> <p>Requirement 9 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) prevents any stage of the authorised development from being brought into operational use until a reinstatement planting plan for trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows to be reinstated during that stage has been submitted to and approved by the 'relevant planning authority'. The reinstatement planting plan must be in general accordance with the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) approved under Requirement 4. Therefore, the Councils will have further input to the LEMP prior to implementation.</p>
6.155 to 6.156	Timing of reinstatement planting	Reinstatement planting should be implemented in the first planting season following completion of works in each	Reinstatement planting would only be undertaken once works have been completed at a location (including testing). Otherwise, there is a risk that the Main Works Contractor would damage or need to remove vegetation planted.



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>section, rather than delaying planting until this section will become operational.</p> <p>As weather patterns have been unreliable and hard to predict over the recent years, the Councils consider that all planting should take place in November and December, and no later than late February.</p>	<p>Paragraph 8.2.2 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) states that reinstatement planting will be undertaken during the planting season.</p>
6.157	Rabbit and deer proof fencing	<p>Rabbit and deer proof fencing has shown encouraging results and its use should be considered more widely. Where fencing is not appropriate, biodegradable tree and shrub guards should be used.</p>	<p>There may be instances where deer and rabbit proof fencing is not appropriate given the barrier it can create for other species moving throughout the area. Therefore, the specific location and requirements will be considered when identifying the need for fencing or alternative products. The Applicant will continue to seek to use sustainable products on its projects. However, it is noted that many biodegradable tree guard products are still being developed and tested and, therefore, it is not suitable to specify these at the current time.</p>
6.161-6.164	Woodland reinstatement planting proposals, including timing, management and maintenance	<p>The Councils are concerned about the proposals for natural regeneration of woodland. Although in favour in principle, the Councils consider that this may be only suitable for smaller areas, within or close to existing retained woodland, not, however for larger area as shown on Sheet 06 of the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) or areas that are relied upon for visual mitigation.</p> <p>The Councils do not consider the proposals for natural woodland generation to be robust. Neither the LEMP nor the dDCO include any specific prescriptions for the management and aftercare of natural regeneration areas to ensure success.</p> <p>Given the likely impacts caused by deer, rabbits and hares on potential saplings, deer and rabbit proof fencing would be essential to enable success. Badger gates and raptor posts would need to be included within such fences.</p> <p>The aftercare period for such areas would need to be a minimum of 15 years and</p>	<p>As stated in paragraph 4.8.4 of ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [<b>APP-075</b>], the Order Limits include additional areas for mitigation woodland creation, to compensate for this woodland lost or that which has been retained but modified/degraded. Natural regeneration of woodland is proposed at location MM10 as shown on LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan [<b>APP-184</b>].</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.3 of ES Appendix 7.1 Annex B Hintlesham Woods SSSI Assessment [<b>APP-111</b>] states that '<i>Mitigation area MM10 would provide an enhanced habitat connection between the southern aspects of Ramsey Wood and Hintlesham Little Wood. This includes natural regeneration of woodland habitats. Although this takes longer to create, this method was agreed with RSPB, Natural England and the relevant planning authorities in a meeting on 1 November 2021 as generating the best outcome for biodiversity, allowing the existing woodland to expand and limit the introduction of non-local/invasive species. The establishment phase would also have value and would provide additional habitat for species such as nightingale that prefer scrub type vegetation</i>'. </p> <p>Paragraphs 8.4.10, 8.4.11 and 8.4.12 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) set out the general principles for how reinstatement will be undertaken on the project for natural generation of woodland including that it is assumed that this will follow natural regeneration guidance from Flora Locale (2022). Paragraph 9.1.3 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) states that '<i>periodic checks will be undertaken by a suitably experienced professional to check reinstatement and to replace species that have not</i></p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		contingencies for supportive measures should be included in the LEMP, for the case that the natural regeneration should be unsuccessful.	<p><i>taken</i>'. Paragraph 9.2.2 states that '<i>Inspections will also be undertaken to any areas that were coppiced during construction to check that the coppicing is re-establishing. This will confirm that these areas are regenerating as planned or will identify the need for further measures, such as additional planting where the coppicing is not leading to successful regrowth</i>'. The LEMP is secured through Requirement 4 of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p> <p>Paragraph 8.2.2 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) states that planting areas will initially be protected from browsing rabbits and deer during establishment, for example using tree/shrub shelters or fencing.</p> <p>In accordance with good practice measure LV03 in the CoCP (<b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b>) and as stated in Requirement 10 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>), a five-year aftercare period will be established for mitigation planting and reinstatement. This is also secured through the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) and Requirement 4 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>). Chapter 9 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) sets out the proposals for maintenance and aftercare, which would include coppiced areas. The 5-year aftercare applies to areas of planting on third party land where the landowner would be responsible for the longer-term maintenance of vegetation.</p> <p>Five-years is considered appropriate for the types of reinstatement and mitigation planting proposed for the project (further details are set out below in respect to paragraphs 6.168-6.171. The reinstatement planting plan must be in general accordance with the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) approved under Requirement 4 which sets out aftercare in Section 9. This commits to appropriate measures for establishment of planting.</p>
6.165	Plant sizes	The Councils query the inclusion of standard trees, as listed in ES document 7.8.3. LEMP Appendix C – Planting Schedules [APP-185] within woodland schedules as well as for Individual tree planting, as these will likely be difficult to establish.	<p>A percentage (15%) of standard trees have been included within the woodland mix. This is normal practice to provide some variation in size and a more immediate effect at the year of planting within woodland area. A list of individual trees is also provided to allow for replacement of individual trees removed and for selected tree planting within hedgerows. These have been specified as standard trees, large enough to have immediate impact on planting, but not so large that establishment would be considered to be difficult.</p> <p>Planting would be maintained to ensure establishment. Good practice measure LV03 in the CoCP (<b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b>) commits the project to a five-year aftercare period for all reinstatement and mitigation planting.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
6.166	Hedgerow mix	<p>The species mixes, proposed sizes of planting stock, percentages of trees to be included in hedgerows, as listed in ES document 7.8.3. LEMP Appendix C – Planting Schedules [APP-185], are not considered appropriate and will require detailed discussion with the Applicant. However, the Councils are confident that this issue can be resolved.</p> <p>The Councils consider that flexibility should be built into the LEMP to allow detailed planting proposals to be fine-tuned with regards to species selection for different landscape character areas.</p>	<p>It is not clear from the LIR as to what is not appropriate about the planting schedules and the Applicant would be grateful for further clarification on this matter being provided.</p> <p>The species mixes proposed in the LEMP Appendix C: Planting Schedules [APP-185] were produced in conjunction with the ecological specialist to reflect species found during surveys. As set out in paragraph 1.2.1 of LEMP Appendix C: Planting Schedules [APP-185], in accordance with Requirement 9 of the dDCO (document 3.1 (C)), the Planting Schedules will be submitted to the 'relevant planning authorities' alongside the reinstatement plans for that stage.</p> <p>Requirement 9 of the dDCO (document 3.1 (C)) prevents any stage of the authorised development from being brought into operational use until a reinstatement planting plan for trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows to be reinstated during that stage has been submitted to and approved by the 'relevant planning authority'. The reinstatement planting plan must be in general accordance with the LEMP (document 7.8 (B)) approved under Requirement 4. Therefore, the Councils will have further input to the LEMP prior to implementation if the designs change.</p>
6.168-6.171	Management and Maintenance (Aftercare)	<p>The Councils do not consider the proposed 5-year aftercare period to be adequate.</p> <p>The Councils seek clarification from the Applicant regarding the statement that: In many locations, the land will be handed back to the relevant landowner at the end of reinstatement (LEMP paragraph 9.1.1).</p> <p>Further detail is required with regards to the frequency of aftercare visits, who would carry them out and how any remedial measures that may be required would be set into motion (LEMP paragraph 9.1.2 and paragraph 9.1.3).</p> <p>The final replacement planting requirement should be carried out as part of the aftercare period and not fall to the landowner (LEMP, paragraph 9.1.4).</p>	<p>Areas of embedded planting at the CSE compounds and the GSP substation, as listed in Table 2.1 of the REAC (document 7.5.2 (B)), would be maintained in perpetuity or until the land is no longer required for the operation of the project.</p> <p>Areas of planting proposed for biodiversity net gain, as described in the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176] would be subject to a 30-year management plan. The Applicant has also committed to a up to 30-year aftercare period for the mitigation planting MM09 at Hintlesham Woods, which is a priority site for development of mixed broadleaved native woodland planting, scrub planting and species rich grassland. The 30-year aftercare period for MM09 is considered necessary to enable the woodland planting to achieve the growth rates predicted and secure its long-term viability. Wording has been added to Section 9.1 of the LEMP (document 7.8(B)) at Deadline 3 to show the clear commitment from the Applicant in relation to this site.</p> <p>In accordance with good practice measure LV03 in the CoCP (document 7.5.1 (B)) and as stated in Requirement 10 of the dDCO (document 3.1 (C)), a five-year aftercare period will be established for mitigation planting and reinstatement. This is also secured through the LEMP (document 7.8 (B)) and Requirement 4 of the dDCO (document</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p><b>3.1 (C)</b>). Chapter 9 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) sets out the proposals for maintenance and aftercare.</p> <p>In terms of the time period proposed for aftercare, the Applicant notes that in respect of certain sites along the project route where the freehold has been, or is proposed to be acquired by the Applicant, landscape screening (incorporating reinstatement planting) is an embedded measure which will be retained for the lifetime of the transmission asset and, therefore, maintained on a permanent basis. This would be at the GSP substation and around the CSE compounds, as per embedded measures EM-D01, EM-F01, EM-G03, EM-G06 and EM-H02 set out within the REAC (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>). The Applicant has also committed to maintaining the environmental enhancement areas for a period of up to 30 years, as described in paragraph 7.3.1 in the Environmental Gain Report [<b>APP-176</b>].</p> <p>For those areas where reinstatement planting is identified in LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plans (<b>document 7.8.2(B)</b>), other than those areas mentioned above, in accordance with good practice measure LV03, and as stated in Requirement 10 of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1(C)</b>), a five-year aftercare period will be established for mitigation planting and reinstatement. By the end of that five-year period all planting delivered will be established. Following that time, the planting will be managed by the relevant landowner, as currently takes place in respect of existing planting on private land. The Applicant considers that five-years is appropriate in the context of these locations based on the types of reinstatement and mitigation planting proposed, which is typically hedgerow reinforcement and planting. Planting sizes and species have been selected based on those which would naturalise more easily than larger trees stock, for example, smaller whips and transplants.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed reinstatement planting is to replace what is removed, in order to maintain the existing baseline. Once the reinstatement planting is delivered and has been established through the five-year maintenance period the purpose of the reinstatement planting has been achieved. It is the Applicant's view that there should be no additional obligation on the Applicant (or private landowners) to manage or maintain planting on private land which forms part of the wider baseline, in the same way as the Applicant (or private landowners) would not be obliged to maintain existing baseline planting which is not affected by the project. In summary, the purpose of the reinstatement planting will not be undermined as its purpose is as replacement planting, and not as planting to be retained by the Applicant. There is also no justification for</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>the Applicant to permanently acquire land for the management of replacement planting in perpetuity or seek to agree long term management with a landowner, where that landowner would ordinarily be entitled to manage existing planting on their land as they consider appropriate. Management of replacement or mitigation planting following the five-year period is not considered directly related to the development or necessary on the basis that the planting required will have been delivered and its establishment secured, which is the purpose of the replacement planting.</p> <p>The 5-year aftercare applies to areas of planting on third party land where the landowner would be responsible for the longer-term maintenance of vegetation.</p> <p>Five-years is considered appropriate for the types of reinstatement and mitigation planting proposed for the project. The reinstatement planting plan must be in general accordance with the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) approved under Requirement 4 which sets out aftercare in Section 9. This commits to appropriate measures for establishment of planting.</p>

### Construction Environmental Management Plan and Draft DCO

6.172 to 6.178	Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)	<p>The Councils consider that language in the documents is vague and fragmentation of information relating to the same topic area across several documents appears to be counter-productive and makes accessing relevant information difficult.</p> <p>The additional mitigation measures set out in the REAC (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>) are not considered sufficient to address the residual landscape and visual effects identified in the ES.</p>	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the Management Plans in terms of ambiguous language as raised in Action Number AP20 from Issue Specific Hearing 1. The updated Management Plans have been submitted at Deadline 3 along with a Schedule of Changes to the Management Plans (<b>document 8.5.7</b>).</p> <p>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [<b>APP-074</b>] summarises the results of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. As stated in paragraph 6.12.1 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [<b>APP-074</b>] there would be residual effects on the landscape and views resulting from the project. The long term significant residual effects are very limited for a project of this scale, limited to effects on the central part of Burstall community area and on the central and northern parts of Hintlesham community area due to the presence of the new 400kV overhead line north of Hintlesham Woods. The southern part of both Burstall and Hintlesham community areas would however benefit from removal of the existing 132kV overhead line.</p> <p>Significant long term landscape and visual effects have been minimised through good design, routeing and undergrounding. The project also delivers significant beneficial effects in terms of landscape and visual impacts, with enhancements incorporated into the project. It is important to note that once the project is constructed, the significant adverse</p>
----------------	---	--	--

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>effects are outside the AONB and the significant benefits are within the AONB and the Stour Valley. Where adverse effects remained following site selection, they have then been mitigated where possible and appropriate.</p> <p>Draft NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.10.34 and NPS EN-1 (5.9.15) state<sup>1</sup>:  <i>'The scale of energy projects means that they will often be visible within many miles of the site of the proposed infrastructure. The Secretary of State should judge whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it is not offset by the benefits (including need) of the project...</i></p> <p>Draft NPS EN-1 5.10.36 states that: <i>'The Secretary of State should consider whether the project has been designed carefully, taking account of environmental effects on the landscape and siting, operational and other relevant constraints, to minimise harm to the landscape, including by appropriate mitigation'</i>. Again, the wording is very similar in NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.9.17 except for the use of the term 'IPC' and 'reasonable' mitigation rather than 'appropriate'.</p> <p>Given the size of the proposed 400kV pylons, they will be visible for some distance and it is not possible or necessary to avoid all significant landscape and visual effects of the new infrastructure. However, the adverse effects on the landscape (and all other adverse effects) do not outweigh the benefits of the project, including the benefits to the landscape. The scheme has been designed carefully and harm to the landscape has been minimised, including through mitigation. The project satisfies all the requirements of policy above, as well as delivering significant benefits, and it is therefore unclear why the measures incorporated would not be sufficient.</p>
6.179-6.180	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	<p>The Councils consider the dDCO requirement wording to be unacceptable in respect of landscape mitigation measures. It is unclear why some of the works listed in Schedule 1 contain references to landscaping, while others do not. It should be expected even in areas where obsolete powerlines are proposed to be dismantled, that this may result in adverse effects,</p>	<p>The landscaping referenced in Schedule 1 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) is the embedded measures included as part of the design. The dDCO does not include the reinstatement planting and mitigation planting identified through the ES. All embedded, reinstatement and mitigation planting is included within the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) and is shown on the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan in Appendix B (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>). The LEMP is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>). The vegetation that would be lost, for example from the removal of obsolete overhead lines, is shown on LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [<b>APP-184</b>].</p>

<sup>1</sup> In NPS EN-1 'IPC' is used instead of Secretary of State.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
6.181-6.182	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	<p>including vegetation loss, which would require mitigation and making good.</p> <p>The provisions for management and aftercare of tree and hedgerow planting is not adequately secured in the dDCO.</p> <p>Although the CEMP (<b>document 7.5 (B)</b>) does make provisions for Reinstatement, this does not appear to be sufficiently secured in the dDCO. There is also a lack of principles for work compounds and other temporary works. Such principles should include protection measures for rootzones of trees, potential archaeology, hedgerows and other vegetation.</p> <p>The Councils do not agree with the Applicant that temporary works, such as temporary bridges can be considered so minor, as not to warrant the inclusion of principles in the DCO with the aim of minimising the (temporary) impact and securing reinstatement. In particular, as temporary works are expected to affect highly sensitive areas, for example the temporary bridges and undergrounding within the AONB.</p>	<p>Section 9 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) sets out the reinstatement and aftercare proposals. The LEMP is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p> <p>In terms of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>), temporary works, such as temporary bridges are considered to be minor as they would be removed and reinstated at the end of construction. Regardless of this, the ES has assessed all temporary works as part of the assessment of the effects during construction.</p>

# 4. Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 7 (Biodiversity)

## 4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section provides the Applicant’s comments on Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraphs 7.1 to 7.3). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 7.4 to 7.27). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 7. Therefore, Table 4.1 covers the Applicant’s comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 7.28 to 7.44 of the LIR.

## 4.2 Comments Table

Table 4.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant’s Comments
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
7.28 to 7.30	Construction phase impacts	There would be material impacts upon ecological features. This would include an 80m wide swathe that would be disturbed due to the construction of underground cable sections of the route. Surface infrastructure construction would represent an intrusive feature that would impact ecology during construction.	ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [APP-075] sets out the likely significant effects on ecological features. This concludes in paragraph 7.12.1 that there are no likely significant residual effects in relation to biodiversity during construction or operation.  The 80m swathe required for underground cabling is, in the main, limited to cropland, modified grassland and other non-priority grassland habitats as shown on ES Figure 7.1.4 [APP-148], all of which are relatively quick to reinstate (from an ecological perspective) post installation.
7.31 to 7.33	Operational phase impacts	Ecological enhancements designed to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and other Natural Capital benefits would be in place and would over the operational life of the development increasingly enrich the area. This is a requirement included in the Ofgem RIIO- 2 determination.	The Applicant notes that the LIR states that there would be a positive operational phase impact with ecological enhancements designed to achieve BNG and other Natural Capital benefits. Further details on the Applicant’s proposals for net gain can be found in the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176].
7.34 to 7.36	Decommissioning phase impacts	There would be a material impact upon ecology. This would include parts of the 80m wide swathe that would be disturbed due to the removal of	As stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072], decommissioned underground cables could be left in the ground with any above ground structures such as link pillars removed.



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		underground cable sections of the route. Surface demolition would represent an intrusive feature that would impact ecology during decommissioning	Cables could also be removed from the ducts using the jointing bays. These works are anticipated to be localised and short term in duration. Therefore, decommissioning of the underground cables is unlikely to require a further 80m swathe as required during construction.
<b>Required Mitigation</b>			
7.37	Ecological mitigation	Ecological mitigation designed to avoid, minimise and compensate for impacts from the surface infrastructure and of the cable route and enhancements to achieve BNG will be required.	As detailed in Section 7 of the LEMP ( <b>document 7.8 (B)</b> ), vegetation removed during the construction phase would be reinstated post-construction. The development authorised by the DCO must be undertaken in accordance with the LEMP ( <b>document 7.8 (B)</b> ), pursuant to Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ). The LEMP includes Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan ( <b>document 7.8 (B)</b> ) and Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan ( <b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b> ) which are secured through Requirement 9 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ). Biodiversity Net Gain is addressed separately within the Environmental Gain Report [ <b>APP-176</b> ].
<b>Relevant Representations</b>			
7.38	Routeing of the proposed overhead lines to avoid Hintlesham Woods	The Council acknowledges that this routeing option would avoid potentially unacceptable impacts upon the Hintlesham Woods SSSI.	The Applicant notes this response in relation to the removal of Option 2 from the project.
7.39	Biodiversity Net Gain	Whilst the principle of Net Gain within the Order Limits is strongly supported, the Council considers more detailed information will be required within the relevant Management Plans.	Biodiversity Net Gain is covered within the Environmental Gain Report [ <b>APP-176</b> ]. As stated in paragraph 7.1.2 of the report, the environmental areas have been designed to demonstrate a proposal that is capable of delivering a minimum of 10% BNG. Further iterations of the designs are anticipated both through working with environmental bodies, discussions with landowners and ongoing detailed designs.
<b>Comments from Essex Place Services</b>			
7.40 to 7.41	Management plans	Draft Management Plans have been submitted including the CEMP, CoCP and LEMP. These will continue to be updated taking into account consultee feedback and ongoing design refinement and environmental assessment. LPAs will be consulted on all future versions as further details become available for this (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project) NSIP which would support discharge of Requirement 5 of the dDCO if approved.	The Applicant submitted four Management Plans with the application for development consent; these are secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ) and comprise a CEMP ( <b>document 7.5 (B)</b> ), Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ), Materials and Waste Management Plan (MWMP) ( <b>document 7.7 (B)</b> ), and LEMP ( <b>document 7.8 (B)</b> ). The Management Plans set out site specific measures and construction methodologies that are required to help avoid or reduce potential effects of the project on the environment during construction. The Management

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		Statements in Section 7 of the provide details of management measures for biodiversity during the construction phase of this project. All of the construction phase management measures in relation to biodiversity are contained in the Project Description (embedded design), CoCP (good practice measures) and ES mitigation (yet to be finalised). All of these mitigation measures in relation to biodiversity are set out in the LEMP.	Plans take into account feedback received on a consultation draft issued to relevant organisations in autumn 2022, as described in the respective management plan.  It is recognised that there may be minor refinements through the examination process as part of the application for development consent.  The Applicant does not understand what is meant by the LIR comment that the ES mitigation is yet to be finalised. The ES presents the likely significant effects and presents the additional mitigation proposed to avoid or reduce these effects.
7.42	LEMP	The structure of the draft LEMP will enable it to set out project specific measures for embedded design, good practice and mitigation on how ecological features such as watercourses, vegetation (including trees) and habitats will be protected and managed during the construction phase. The LEMP will need to also set out how land, vegetation and habitats will be reinstated following construction together with the subsequent aftercare and, where applicable, monitoring arrangements, particularly in relation to any licences issued by Natural England. The LEMP provides a mechanism to deliver all the construction phase measures relating to landscape and ecology which are secured by other documents e.g., CEMP and does not duplicate the measures set out within European Protected Species licences.	The LEMP ( <b>document 7.8 (B)</b> ) sets out site-specific measures and construction methodologies required to protect and manage landscape and ecological features such as landform, watercourses, vegetation (including trees) and habitats during construction. These measures are set out in Section 6 (Vegetation Retention) and Section 7 (Vegetation and Tree Removal) of the LEMP.  The LEMP also sets out how land, vegetation and habitats will be reinstated following construction (Section 8) together with the subsequent aftercare (Section 9) and, where applicable, monitoring arrangements (such as monitoring at designated sites and in relation to protected species) (Section 10). The Main Works Contractor will be responsible for implementing the measures outlined within the LEMP and associated Management Plans.  The Applicant welcomes further feedback from the Councils on any details they feel are missing from the LEMP so the Applicant can review this information to see whether changes are required.
7.43	BNG	Whilst the applicant is committed to delivery of at least 10% BNG on this project, this will need to be translated into ensuring that the biodiversity enhancements identified in the Environmental Gain Report. The latter will be delivered through alternative mechanisms outside of the main construction works. This is why the LEMP does not reference the biodiversity enhancement proposals.	The application makes a clear distinction between those habitats necessary for mitigation purposes (which are detailed within the ES and Management Plans) and Biodiversity Net Gain which is reported separately within the Environmental Gain Report [ <b>APP-176</b> ]. BNG is secured via Requirement 13 (Biodiversity Net Gain) of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ). Requirement 13 secures the provision of at least 10% biodiversity net gain, but it is not considered necessary to secure <u>how</u> this is achieved. Flexibility is required to accommodate finalisation of the detailed design and to be able to incorporate changes that may deliver additional environmental benefits if identified at a later date.
7.44	Advisory group	It is considered appropriate that an Advisory Group is set up to help inform decision making throughout	Requirement 9 (reinstatement planting plan) of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ) prevents any stage of the authorised development from being

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		the implementation of the LEMP with LPA representatives invited as appropriate.	<p>brought into operational use until a reinstatement planting plan for trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows to be reinstated during that stage has been submitted to and approved by the 'relevant planning authority'. The reinstatement planting plan must be in general accordance with the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) approved under Requirement 4. Therefore, the Councils will have further input to the LEMP prior to implementation.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant will also continue to engage with the Councils through the ongoing Host Authority meetings to inform them of progress on the project.</p>

# 5. Applicant's Comments on Chapter 8 (Historic Environment)

## 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This section provides the Applicant's comments on Chapter 8 Historic Environment of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraphs 8.1 to 8.5). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 8.6 to 8.29). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 8. Therefore, Table 5.1 covers the Applicant's comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 8.30 to 8.52 of the LIR. The comments on Annex B (Hintlesham Hall) are set out in Chapter 16 of this Document.

## 5.2 Comments Table

Table 5.1 – Applicant's Comments on Chapter 8 (Historic Environment) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Response
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
8.30 to 8.32	Construction phase impacts	There would be direct and indirect material impacts upon heritage assets. This would include an 80m wide swathe that would be disturbed due to the construction of underground cable sections of the route. Surface infrastructure construction would also have similar impacts during construction.	The Applicant concurs with the LIR which states that there would be direct and indirect material impacts upon heritage assets and this is assessed within ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [APP-076] and its accompanying appendices. The impact on archaeological remains would be mitigated through the measures set out within the OWSI [AS-001].
8.33 to 8.35	Operational phase impacts	Underground cable sections of the route would overtime meld into the landscape. Impacts upon the setting of heritage assets from surface infrastructure would remain throughout restoration.	The Applicant has assessed the effects on the setting of heritage assets in ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [APP-076]. Paragraph 8.9.1 states that (bearing in mind the best practice and embedded measures) the assessment has concluded that there are no likely significant effects in relation to the historic environment during operation. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures have been identified. Further details in relation to the setting of specific assets is presented in ES Appendix 8.2: Historic Environment Impact Assessment [APP-127].
8.36 to 8.38	Decommissioning phase impacts	There would be direct and indirect material impacts upon heritage assets. This would include potentially previously undisturbed areas of land that would be disturbed due to the removal of underground cable	As stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072], decommissioned underground cables could be left in the ground with any above ground structures such as link pillars removed.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Response
		sections of the route. Surface infrastructure demolition would also have similar impacts.	Table 4.9 in ES Chapter 4: Project Description [ <b>APP-072</b> ] states that the footprint of any decommissioning works is likely to be smaller than the ground disturbed during construction of the project. As the ground within this area would already have been disturbed during construction, it is unlikely that archaeological remains would be present. Therefore, there are unlikely to be any significant effects to archaeology during decommissioning.
<b>Required Mitigation</b>			
8.39	Written Scheme of Investigation	An archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation will be required which would set out a strategy for as appropriate the recording, preservation, interpretation and display of archaeological remains.	The OWSI [ <b>AS-001</b> ] sets out the proposed mitigation on the project in relation to archaeological remains. This states the need for Detailed Written Schemes of Investigation (DWSI) to be produced for specific packages or work. The OWSI and the DWSI are secured through Requirement 6 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ), which states that no stage of the authorised development must commence until a DWSI of areas of archaeological interest relevant to that stage (if any) as identified within the OWSI or identified through evaluation work as set out in the OWSI has been submitted to and approved by the County Archaeologist.
8.40	Setting of heritage assets	Landscaping of surface infrastructure and the cable route will be required to preserve the setting of heritage assets.	The Applicant has assessed the effects of the project on the setting of heritage assets in ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [ <b>APP-076</b> ]. Paragraph 8.9.1 states the assessment has concluded that there are no likely significant effects in relation to the historic environment during operation.  The heritage consultant has been involved in discussions on the location of the proposed planting as shown on LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan ( <b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b> ) and the planting proposals are not considered to have an adverse effect on the setting of heritage assets.
8.41	Micrositing of pylons	Micrositing of lattice pylons will also help mitigate impacts upon heritage assets.	As stated in paragraph 2.4.2 of the CEMP ( <b>document 7.5 (B)</b> ), subject to the grant of the DCO, the designs will continue to evolve and be refined within the parameters set by the LoD. The Applicant will employ environmental specialists (including but not limited to ecologists, archaeologists and landscape architects) to advise on the design refinements and the micro-siting of project components within the LoD.
8.42	Hintlesham Hall	Reinstatement of parkland associated with Hintlesham Hall would also compensate for the	ES Appendix 8.2 Annex A: Hintlesham Hall Assessment [ <b>APP-128</b> ] sets out the assessment of setting effects on Hintlesham Hall. As set out in Table 4.2 in ES Appendix Historic Environment Impact Assessment

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Response
		imposition of the additional overhead lines closer to the listed properties.	<p>[APP-127] there are only very limited views from the Grade II* Ancillary buildings north, towards the location of the proposed 400kV overhead line. The principal views from the Grade I Hintlesham Hall are towards the west. As a result, there would be very limited additional visual intrusion within the setting of the Hall from the proposed 400kV overhead line and the overall effects of the project are assessed to have a minor adverse effect on the Hall and its ancillary listed buildings.</p> <p>As an enhancement, the Applicant is seeking powers through the DCO to partially restore the original tree-lined avenue to the south-west of Hintlesham Hall, which would reinstate a small part of the historic character of Hintlesham Park visible on historic mapping. This is a proposed enhancement and is shown on Figure 1 in the Environmental Gain Report [APP-176]. The proposals aim to balance the aspirations of the Councils with the requirements of the landowner to continue to farm the land.</p>

### Relevant Representations

8.43	Micrositing in the vicinity of Hintlesham Hall	<p>The Council considers that the micro-siting of pylons is essential to minimise the impacts of the adjacent new 400kV overhead line in this location. The Council notes that the proposals are based upon the micro-siting of pylons agreed with the Applicant prior to the project being put on hold in 2013. However, the LoD proposed would allow pylons to move away from the agreed position which might result in significant harm to the setting of the listed buildings at this location. Any repositioning including height would need to be agreed.</p> <p>The Council also considers that more effective mitigation should be provided in relation to addressing/reducing the impacts on the settings of the heritage assets in and around Hintlesham Hall.</p>	<p>The Proposed Alignment to the north of Hintlesham Hall is based on the pylon locations from the optimised alignment discussed with English Heritage (now Historic England) and the Councils in 2013. ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [APP-076] and ES Appendix 8.2: Annex A Hintlesham Hall Assessment [APP-128] conclude that overall, the operational effects of the project on the Grade I listed Hintlesham Hall, its Grade II* listed ancillary buildings (associated service ranges) and Grade II listed lodge would be minor adverse, which is 'not significant' and would not require additional mitigation, taking into account the flexibility provided by the LoD.</p> <p>The assessment presented within Sections 8.6 to 8.10 of ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [APP-076] has assumed the Proposed Alignment, including pylon locations shown on ES Figure 4.1: The Project [PDA-002]. It should be noted that the Proposed Alignment is not fixed and could be subject to change within the defined LoD within the parameters shown on the Works Plans [APP-010].</p> <p>Sensitivity testing has been carried out to determine the potential for likely significant effects should alternative designs within the parameters defined by the LoD be taken forward. In the proposed overhead line sections, the assessment has concluded that the pylons could be located anywhere within the parameters of the LoD (including the vertical LoD) without resulting in significant effects to heritage assets. Archaeological remains identified from desk studies and archaeological</p>
------	--	--	---

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>investigation are of a low and medium value and the effects arising from construction work would not be significant. Adverse effects would occur, but these can be mitigated through implementing the preservation by record approach as set out in the OWSI [AS-001]. The archaeological mitigation in the OWSI is comprehensive and any movement of components potentially affecting different archaeological remains is subject to the mitigation strategy applied in the OWSI [AS-001].</p> <p>The Applicant recognises the concerns from the Councils and Historic England in relation to Hintlesham Hall and as a result has revised the commitment EM-AB01 wording to avoid positioning a pylon in the area most visible from the ancillary buildings. The wording below has been included in the updated REAC submitted at Deadline 3 (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>):</p> <p><i>“The Proposed Alignment to the north of Hintlesham Hall is based on the pylon locations from the optimised alignment discussed with English Heritage (now Historic England) in 2013. The Applicant will continue to work with Historic England as the designs develop to identify the most suitable location for the pylons in relation to the setting of Hintlesham Hall, taking into account the limits of deviation and technical considerations such as distance between conductor spans. In utilising the LoD, the Applicant will not position a pylon between the access track to Kennels Cottage (608112, 244204) and 100m to the south-west of the track (608027, 244151) in order to avoid its visibility in key views from the Grade II* listed ancillary buildings located to the north of Hintlesham Hall, which comprise the converted service ranges, stables, coach house and brewhouse.”</i></p> <p>The Applicant carries the liability of the design and construction of the project, and therefore needs to own and take responsibility for the final positioning of project components within the LoD set out with the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it practicable to involve third parties in the detailed designs and micro-siting of pylons as this will be determined by many factors involving engineering and safety requirements, landowner requirements as well as environmental constraints.</p>
8.44	Archaeological mitigation requirements	The Council welcomes the work that has been completed to date on the archaeological assessment however there is concern that the mitigation requirements are not appropriately represented within the REAC ( <b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b> ). The Council	The proposed mitigation for archaeology is set out within the OWSI [AS-001], which is secured through Requirement 6 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ). Therefore, the Applicant does not consider there is a need to duplicate this commitment in the REAC. However, as the Examining Authority has requested the REAC be extended to include all measures

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Response
		would want to see further requirements to secure the archaeological work appropriately.	relied upon in the ES, this measure has been added to the updated REAC provided at Deadline 3 ( <b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b> ) .
8.45	Archaeological evaluation	The archaeological evaluation within the undergrounding area is currently on going, because of this we have not had the report on the trenching submitted for review and decisions on appropriate archaeological mitigation cannot be made. There is also concern from the submitted OWSI that there is no further evaluation considered for the overhead sections of the proposal.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken trial trenching in the areas with the greatest soil disturbance i.e. the GSP substation, CSE compounds, the main construction compound in Section F and underground cables sections. The overhead lines would require less disturbance of soil, with excavations typically limited to the pylon bases, temporary compounds and where stone access routes are required.</p> <p>The pylon locations are not fixed within the application for development consent, due to the LoD, in order to retain flexibility during detailed design and construction for unforeseen circumstances. A watching brief will be employed in the overhead line sections where soil excavation is required. These areas would be typically limited to the pylon bases, temporary compounds and any stone access routes required, which could move within the LoD.</p> <p>Therefore, the Applicant considers it disproportionate to the risk to undertake trial trenching in the overhead line sections.</p> <p>The Archaeological Framework Strategy (AFS) [<b>APP-186</b>] set out the process that has been followed for the archaeological baseline surveys and the results of these surveys have informed the OWSI [<b>AS-001</b>]. The Applicant is undertaking a final phase of trial trenching in the remaining underground cable areas, the results of which will be included in an updated OWSI submitted into Examination at an appropriate Deadline.</p>
8.46	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation	A draft copy of the OWSI was submitted to SCC for review. The document submitted with the ES does not appear to have taken onboard our comments, and the OWSI requires amendments prior to being acceptable (Please see attached comments). It is essential that the document provides clarity on the overall process for further archaeological work, including further evaluation in the overhead sections and archaeological mitigation strategies. As the OWSI will be a standalone document that will be directly referenced in the DCO requirements it is paramount that the document is approved early in the examination process.	The Applicant reviewed the comments from the Local Authority Advisors when updating the OWSI for application [ <b>AS-001</b> ]. Updates were made to the OWSI including adding the definition of the roles of the advisors at paragraph 1.2.6 and adding reference to the East Anglian Archaeological Research Framework in paragraph 1.3.2. The Applicant cannot see the attached comments with the LIR. If these can be supplied, the Applicant will review these comments to see whether it is appropriate to make further changes to the OWSI.
8.46 to 8.52	Draft DCO and a DWSI	Currently the DCO wording for archaeology (Requirement 6), does not allow for reporting and	The OWSI [ <b>AS-001</b> ] is secured through Requirement 6 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ), which states that the authorised development must



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Response
		<p>archiving of the archaeological works. The Council has suggested revised wording to the Requirement wording, particularly in relation to what the DWSI must include and further details around analysis, publication and dissemination of results and the Updated Project Design.</p>	<p>be undertaken in accordance with the AFS and the OWSI. Section 2.4 of the OWSI sets out what the DWSI must include. This includes all of the items listed in the LIR.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the OWSI sets out how the results of the archaeology mitigation would see dissemination of the results and references the Post-Excavation Assessment Report and an Updated Project Design. As these are detailed in the OWSI, which is secured through Requirement 6 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>), the Applicant does not consider it necessary to amend the current wording in the dDCO.</p>

# 6. Applicant's Comments on Chapter 9 (Water Environment)

## 6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This section provides the Applicant's comments on Chapter 9 (Water Environment) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 9.3 to 9.19). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 9. Therefore, Table 6.1 covers the Applicant's comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 9.20 to 9.30 of the LIR.

## 6.2 Comments Table

Table 6.1 – Applicant's Comments on Chapter 9 (Water Environment) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
9.20 to 9.22	Construction phase impacts	Surface water has the potential to cause flooding during the construction phase.	The CoCP ( <b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b> ) contains a number of measures to reduce surface water run off during construction. With these measures in place, the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [ <b>APP-059</b> ] concludes that there would be no increased risk of flooding as a result of the project.
9.23 to 9.25	Operational phase impacts	On the assumption that field drainage is reinstated following construction, no impacts are identified.	GG07 in the CoCP ( <b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b> ) states that land used temporarily will be reinstated where practicable (bearing in mind any restrictions on planting and land use) to its pre-construction condition and use. This would include reinstating field drainage affected by the project.  Paragraph 9.3.36 of the CEMP ( <b>document 7.5 (B)</b> ) states that post-construction drainage plans will be created when it has been necessary to install new or diverted permanent drainage and that underdrainage (a system of pipes made of plastic or clay that are laid under agricultural land typically at a depth of 0.75 to 1.5m) may need to be installed on land currently supporting arable agriculture, where poor drainage areas resulting from construction are identified.
9.26 to 9.28	Decommissioning phase impacts	Surface water has the potential to cause flooding during the decommissioning phase.	As stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [ <b>APP-072</b> ], decommissioned underground cables could be left in the ground with any above ground structures such as link pillars removed. Cables could also be removed from

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>the ducts using the jointing bays. These works are anticipated to be localised and short term in duration.</p> <p>Table 4.9 in ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>] states that there could be the potential for short-term temporary effects to watercourses (e.g. pollution risks) and land drainage during decommissioning. However, these effects would be managed by standard good practice measures applied at the time. Therefore, there are unlikely to be any significant effects to the water environment during decommissioning.</p>
<b>Required Mitigation</b>			
9.29	Field drainage systems	During construction and decommissioning temporary drainage arrangements are required. Field drainage systems should be replaced as required after construction and decommissioning.	See the response to LIR comment references, paragraphs 9.23 to 9.25 above.
<b>Relevant Representations</b>			
9.30	Impacts of construction	The Council seeks reassurance that adequate catchment is made available for surface water run-off during construction.	The CoCP ( <b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b> ) contains a number of measures relating to the management of surface water run off including GG05 and AS05. The draft Order Limits include all of the land required to construct the project in accordance with the measures contained within the CoCP and the Management Plans.

# 7. Applicant's Comments on Chapter 10 (Geology and Hydrogeology)

## 7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This section provides the Applicant's comments on Chapter 10 (Geology and Hydrogeology) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraphs 10.1 and 10.5). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 10.6 to 10.30). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 10. Therefore, Table 7.1 covers the Applicant's comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 10.31 to 10.43 of the LIR.

## 7.2 Response Table

Table 7.1 – Applicant's Comments on Chapter 10 (Geology and Hydrogeology) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
10.31 to 10.33	Construction phase impacts	The project will include the use of locally sourced construction materials namely sand and gravel, asphalt and concrete from existing facilities and require the recycling or disposal of waste items therefore stimulating the local economy.	As the project involves the construction of an electricity transmission line, the key materials set out in Table 4.4 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072] would be steel for the pylons, aluminium for the conductors and cables, concrete for the foundations, stone for temporary access routes and cement bound sand. In terms of waste, Table 4.5 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072] notes that the main waste items would be steel from the pylons being removed and aluminium from the conductors, both of which would be recycled. The Applicant has not yet appointed a Main Works Contractor and, therefore, the exact sources of materials are not known at this stage and are also likely to change between now and when the project is constructed (subject to consent) due to fluctuations in the market. However, the MWMP ( <b>document 7.7 (B)</b> ) states in Section 5.2 that the Applicant will seek to source construction materials from local suppliers where practicable e.g. that materials meet the required technical specifications and are cost effective to meet the Applicant's duties to be economic and efficient.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
10.34 to 10.36	Operational phase impacts	The project would prevent underlying sand and gravel resources from being exploited for the foreseeable future. Although there are extensive spreads throughout the Stour Valley, the statutory AONB status means that in practice quarrying proposals would be unlikely to be acceptable to the Councils.	The Applicant notes that the Stour Valley is not part of the statutory Dedham Vale AONB and the project will be removing 27km of overhead line (much of which would be in a mineral safeguarding area) but otherwise has no further comment on this.
10.37 to 10.39	Decommissioning phase impacts	The project will require the recycling or disposal of waste items, therefore, stimulating the local economy. The removal of the project will potentially release sand and gravel resources.	Noted. The Applicant has no comment on this.

### Required Mitigation

10.40	Minerals	Where minerals are extracted on site during the course of construction then they should be used in the construction of the project where possible.	The Applicant is not intending to extract any minerals during construction. Any materials excavated as part of the cable trench or foundations of the pylons would typically be reused on the project and locally within the Order Limits, where this is suitable e.g. not contaminated, in accordance with Section 6.4 of the MWMP ( <b>document 7.7 (B)</b> ).
10.41	Waste hierarchy	Waste created during construction, operation and decommissioning should be treated in accordance with the waste hierarchy.	As stated in Section 6.2 of the MWMP ( <b>document 7.7 (B)</b> ) the project will follow the waste hierarchy, which starts with measures to avoid (prevent) the production of waste in the first place, through reuse, recycling and recovery, so that the least amount of waste is sent for disposal. The project will follow this hierarchy.
10.42	Decommissioning	All structures including buildings, foundations, plants and machinery should be removed within 12 months following the cessation of electrical transmission.	<p>As stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>], decommissioned underground cables could be left in the ground with any above ground structures such as link pillars removed. Cables could also be removed from the ducts using the jointing bays.</p> <p>Section 4.10 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>] states that in the event that, at some future date, the authorised development, or part of it, is to be decommissioned, a written scheme of decommissioning would be submitted for approval by the 'relevant planning authority' at least six months prior to any decommissioning works, as per Requirement 12 in the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>). The decommissioning works would follow the Applicant's (National Grid) processes at the time for assessing and avoiding or reducing any environmental impacts and risks.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Relevant Representation</b>			
10.43	Minerals safeguarding	The Council acknowledges that there are no detrimental impacts upon existing minerals and waste facilities. In terms of underlying sand and gravel resources, the national importance of the proposals outweighs the sterilisation of the affected regionally important minerals. Additionally, for much of the route, proposals for sand and gravel extraction would not be acceptable.	The Applicant concurs with the LIR that there are no detrimental impacts upon existing minerals and waste facilities, that the national importance of the proposals outweighs the sterilisation of the affected regionally important minerals and that mineral extraction in many locations would not be acceptable.

# 8. Applicant's Comments on Chapter 11 (Agriculture and Soils)

## 8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This section summarises the Applicant's comments on Chapter 11 (Agriculture and Soil) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraphs 11.1 and 11.4). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 11.5 to 11.19). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 11. Therefore, Table 8.1 covers the Applicant's comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 11.20 to 11.30 of the LIR.

## 8.2 Comments Table

Table 8.1 – Applicant's Comments on Chapter 11 (Agriculture and Soils) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
11.20 to 11.22	Construction phase impacts	There would be a reduction in Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land available during construction and field drainage would be disrupted.	Paragraph 11.6.7 of ES Chapter 11: Agriculture and Soils [APP-079] states that there would be a temporary impact on BMV land during construction. Good practice measure AS05 in the CoCP (document 7.5.1 (B)) states that a scheme of pre-construction land drainage will be designed with the intent of maintaining the efficiency of the existing land drainage system and to assist in maintaining the integrity of the working area during construction. Given that the impact is temporary, this would not constitute a loss of BMV land.
11.23 to 11.25	Operational phase impacts	There would be a neutral effect assuming field drainage is reinstated following construction. There would be a loss of BMV land available.	Paragraph 4.7.2 in the CEMP (document 7.5 (B)) states that a replacement drainage scheme will be installed within the working area, where appropriate. Permanent records of the land drainage locations will be made and passed to the landowners/occupiers. Paragraph 11.12.2 of ES Chapter 11: Agriculture and Soils [APP-079] states although there is a small permanent loss of BMV land as a result of the construction of the CSE compounds and the GSP substation, this is not considered to be significant in the context of the available BMV land within the region. As such, the requirements of NPS EN-1 are met.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
11.26 to 11.28	Decommissioning phase impacts	There would be a loss of BMV land available and field drainage would be disrupted.	<p>As stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>], decommissioned underground cables could be left in the ground with any above ground structures such as link pillars removed. Cables could also be removed from the ducts using the jointing bays.</p> <p>Table 4.9 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>] states that the footprint of the decommissioning works would affect a smaller area than the soils disturbed during construction of the project. Therefore, there are unlikely to be any significant effects on agriculture and soils during decommissioning.</p> <p>The Applicant disagrees that temporary effects on agricultural land during decommissioning constitutes a 'loss' of BMV land.</p>
<b>Mitigation</b>			
11.29	Field drainage	BMV land would require reinstatement. Field drainage systems should be replaced as required after construction and decommissioning.	<p>Chapter 11 of the CEMP (<b>document 7.5 (B)</b>) covers reinstatement of soil. Paragraph 11.3.35 states that land used temporarily will be reinstated to an appropriate condition relevant to its preconstruction condition and, where relevant, Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grade, including any subsoil drainage, unless otherwise stated within the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>).</p> <p>Paragraph 9.3.36 of the CEMP (<b>document 7.5 (B)</b>) states that post-construction drainage plans will be created where it has been necessary to install new or diverted permanent drainage. Drainage systems (land drains) will generally not be introduced into areas where they are not currently present. However, underdrainage (a system of pipes made of plastic or clay that are laid under agricultural land typically at a depth of 0.75 to 1.5m) may need to be installed on land currently supporting arable agriculture, where poor drainage areas resulting from construction are identified.</p>
<b>Relevant Representation</b>			
11.30	BMV land	The Council acknowledges the limited negative upon BMV land so long as appropriate soil handling techniques are guaranteed.	The Applicant agrees that the adverse impacts on BMV land are limited. The Applicant has included appropriate soil handling measures within the CEMP ( <b>document 7.5 (B)</b> ), which is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ).



# 9. Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 12 (Traffic and Transport including PRow)

## 9.1 Introduction

- 9.1.1 This section summarises the Applicant’s comments on Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport (including PRow) of the Councils LIR. Throughout the LIR a number of paragraphs are presented for information only or to introduce a representation in subsequent paragraphs, for example. Rather than detailing them in Table 8.1 only to note a ‘No Response on behalf of the Applicant’, the relevant sections impacted are noted here (paragraph 12.1, 12.3, 12.5, 12.6, 12.9, 12.10, 12.11, 12.12, 12.14, 12.17, 12.30, 12.38, 12.45, 12.46, 12.47, 12.63 (a-l), 12.101, 12.111). This accounts for the paragraph numbering not being continuous in the table below.
- 9.1.2 The Applicant has no comments to make on Table 10 of the LIR.
- 9.1.3 Paragraphs 12.112 to 12.115 relate to national policy and the Applicant has no further comment on these. Paragraphs 12.116 to 12.127 relate to local policies and the Applicant has no further comment on these.
- 9.1.4 From paragraph 12.128, these points raised relate to ‘Local Impact Assessment’; again, a number of these have not been commented upon by the Applicant owing to none being identified, for example. Rather than detailing them in Table 9.1 the relevant paragraphs are noted here (paragraph 12.128, 12.129, 12.133, 12.134, 12.135, 12.136, 12.137, 12.138). Again, this accounts for the paragraph numbering not being continuous in the table below.

## 9.2 Comments Table

Table 9.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 12 (Traffic and Transport Including PRow) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant’s Comments
<b>Summary</b>			
12.2	Traffic impacts	The Councils expect traffic and transport impacts, including the cumulative ones with other projects, to be fully assessed and mitigated.	Traffic and transport impacts have been avoided, reduced or mitigated through the design of the project, proposed access locations and through introduction of mitigation measures such as those in the CTMP. Design measures include construction of an access route to reduce the number of vehicles using the narrow, rural roads during the construction period. As a result of all measures introduced, there are not predicted to

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>be <u>any</u> significant adverse traffic and transport effects. Prior to mitigation, there was predicted to be one short-term significant adverse effect on walkers, cyclists and horse-riders using Church Road, Twinstead and additional mitigation is proposed in the form of temporary warning signs that would reduce this impact to minor (see ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [<b>APP-080</b>] for further details).</p> <p>In addition to the Transport Assessment, a cumulative effects assessment (CEA) was undertaken that considered traffic and transport impacts, this is set out in ES Chapter 15: CEA [<b>APP-083</b>] and summarised in Section 5.2 of the Transport Assessment [<b>APP-061</b>].</p> <p>The Applicant considers that all impacts have been fully assessed and mitigation incorporated into the project.</p>
12.4	Traffic impacts	The Council has significant concerns around the assessment method and the absence of relevant controls monitoring and enforcement to ensure that impacts do not exceed those that have been assessed. The Councils maintain disagreement with the assessment methodology and the measures and processes set out within the CTMP.	<p>The Applicant's response on assessment methodology is provided in response to specific points set out below.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that these concerns, including controls, monitoring and the CTMP content, have been discussed with the Councils in the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways.</p> <p>More details of the detailed forecast link-by link traffic flows that underpinned the Transport Assessment [<b>APP-061</b>] will be shared as part of this joint working. These are based on monthly flows by vehicle category i.e. Light Goods Vehicles (LGV), Other Goods Vehicle 1: 3.5 to 7.5 tonnes gross (OGV1) and Other Goods Vehicle 2 including rigid vehicles with four or more axles and all articulated vehicles. (OGV2).</p> <p>In response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP (<b>document 7.6 (B)</b>).</p>
12.7	Traffic impacts	A14/A12 Copdock. This location has significant impacts on the local highway network and so we would raise this as a concern as issues at the junction do have a material impact on the local road network.	<p>Impacts at the A14/A12 Copdock Interchange have been assessed in Appendix E of the Transport Assessment [<b>APP-061</b>], alongside other junctions across the study area. The Transport Assessment confirms that the traffic numbers at this junction would be very low, and concludes that the impact of project traffic on LRN capacity during periods of peak construction activity would not be substantial. In addition, the levels of project traffic assumed in the assessment would only be sustained for a relatively short period of time. Construction traffic generation in the peak month of August 2025 is forecast to be 7% higher than in any other month in the construction programme, and 13% higher than all but 5 other months.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.8	Road safety	The Applicant has included assessment of road safety within the application. The Councils are concerned this assessment has concentrated solely on clusters and not considered the frequency of collisions along routes such as the A1071.	<p>As set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-061] paragraph 4.3.8, personal injury collision data was analysed for all roads where the increase in daily total traffic flow due to the project is expected to be 5% or more of future baseline traffic flows over a five-year period (2015 – 2019). Where a road has exceeded the 5% threshold, the personal injury collision data for the whole road length was examined and reported upon. These criteria meant that data was analysed for 16 roads, and a total of nine collisions were identified along six of these roads during the assessed five-year time-period. Details of all the personal injury collisions (including analysis of vulnerable road users where relevant) are shown in the Transport Assessment [APP-061] in Table 4.1 and Appendix A.</p> <p>The Road Safety Engineering Manual (RoSPA, 2023) provides guidance for identifying collision hotspots. These are defined as locations where four or more collisions have occurred within a 100m diameter over a three-year period.</p> <p>No collision clusters were identified along the construction routes that would be affected by the project and therefore the project is very unlikely to exacerbate any existing road safety issues. It is considered that given the low number of accidents over the construction routes (a total of nine personal injury collisions over a five-year period) that it would be disproportionate to undertake any comparisons of accident rates with other parts of the UK.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that these concerns, have been discussed with the Councils in the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways.</p>
12.13	PRoW	The Councils have concerns over the timings of closures of the PRoW and the effect on the wider network. These cannot be assessed in isolation and require details on the sequence of closures for the impact on the routes within the DCO and the connecting network.	<p>The impact of temporary closures of PRoW have been assessed under the 'walkers, cyclist, horse rider (WCH) journey length' assessment, Table 2.1 in ES Appendix 12.1 [APP-134]. This summarises the expected durations of individual closures along all routes expected to be subject to individual closures of more than two weeks. In each case the expected duration of individual closures is clearly set out in the table as the basis for assessment.</p> <p>Requirement 3 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) includes the requirement for a Stage Plan to be submitted to the relevant local authorities prior to commencement. This will set out the sequencing of construction.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.15	DCO	In common with other recent DCOs, the Councils seek either protective provisions in the DCO or separate side agreements.	The Applicant proposes to enter into a framework highways agreement with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project.  Heads of Terms in respect of the framework highways agreement have been produced by the Applicant and currently remain with the Councils for review.
<b>Draft Development Consent Order [APP-034]</b>			
<b>Part 1: Preliminary</b>			
12.16	Site access and compounds	The Councils are concerned about the scope of works associated with establishing site construction compounds and temporary accesses which would not be covered by the CTMP.	The measures outlined in the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) applies to all site construction compounds and temporary access points using the public highway network.
12.18	Pre-commencement works	It is unclear what works are required and what transport movements will be generated for these works, for example haulage of aggregate for compound hardstanding.	Pre-commencement works, including importing stone for temporary works, are included in traffic forecasts set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [ <b>APP-080</b> ] and also in the Transport Assessment [ <b>APP-061</b> ].
12.19	Temporary works	It is unclear if 'temporary' means solely for pre-commencement works or if this refers to the temporary access in schedule 8.	All temporary measures to facilitate the delivery of the works are included.
<b>Part 3: Streets (Article 11: Street works)</b>			
12.20	Notice periods	The Councils consider that 56 days is a more suitable period for notifying the applicant of any decision in respect to street works. The Councils also consider that this period should be paused if the authority considers that additional information is reasonably required to make a decision.	The Applicant notes that a substantially similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraphs 17.16 to 17.19 of the LIR and therefore refers the reader to Section 14 of this Document which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
<b>Part 3: Streets (Article 13: Application of the 1991 Act)</b>			
12.21	Street works	The Councils cannot agree with removing powers under part 56 by undertaking works without the consent of the local highway authority. The Councils would accept this being managed through the street works permit process.	Section 56 of the New Roads and Street Works Act (NRSWA) 1991 allows a street authority to direct an undertaker as to the time at which street works can be carried out, in instances where the street authority believes that the works would otherwise cause serious disruption to traffic.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.22	Street works	The Councils would also find disapplication of Part 73C and Section 77 unacceptable if no alternative protective provisions or highways side agreement is agreed	<p>The Suffolk County Council Permit Scheme Order 2020 confirms (at Appendix B) that Section 56 of the 1991 Act is disapplied where that Permit Scheme has effect.</p> <p>Article 12(1) of the dDCO gives effect to the Permit Scheme (and indeed The Essex County Council Permit Scheme Order 2015 (SI 2015/37) (as varied by The Essex County Council (Permit Scheme) (Variation) Order 2015)) in connection with the construction and maintenance of the project, subject to the qualifications in paragraphs (2) and (3) of that Article.</p> <p>The general disapplication of Section 56 (pursuant to Article 13(3) of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) is necessary to address any instances where works executed pursuant to the dDCO fall outwith the scope and application of either Permit Scheme.</p> <p>Such disapplication is well precedented. See, for example, Article 15(2)(a) of the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022 and Article 12(3)(a) of the Southampton to London Pipeline Development Consent Order 2020.</p> <p>The Applicant would be pleased to discuss this matter further with the Councils through thematic Highways engagement meetings.</p> <p>Section 73C of the 1991 Act provides that the new road surface must conform, for a prescribed period after resurfacing, to any prescribed standards in terms of the materials and workmanship as well as any performance standards.</p> <p>However, and as is explained at paragraph 3.17.3 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>), Section 73C of the 1991 Act has not yet been enacted via Section 55 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. Section 55 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 is not yet in force, and no date for its enactment is currently specified. Section 73C has therefore been included in the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) on a pre-emptive basis.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Articles 17(1) and 17(2) already stipulate that works undertaken in respect of the construction, alteration and maintenance of streets must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority.</p> <p>Given the above, the Applicant would welcome clarification from the Councils as to the nature and extent of any concerns regarding Section 73C of the 1991 Act.</p> <p>Section 77 of the 1991 Act requires an undertaker to indemnify a highway authority for costs incurred in strengthening a highway or</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>repairing any damage caused to a highway in circumstances where that highway is used as an alternative route by traffic due to the closure of an existing highway which is necessary to allow street works to take place.</p> <p>The disapplication of Section 77 of the 1991 Act is precedented. See, for example, Article 15(2)(h) of the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022.</p> <p>In any event, the Applicant anticipates that this is a matter which would be readily capable of being addressed in the framework highways agreement (or similar) which the Applicant proposes to enter into with Essex County Council (ECC) and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project.</p>
<b>Part 3: Streets (Article 14: Power to alter street layout (1))</b>			
12.23	DCO	The statement in (1) appears to contradict requirement 11. The Councils would welcome further clarification to avoid any confusion during the delivery of this project.	<p>Article 14 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) permits the Applicant and anyone else with the benefit of the Order to alter, either permanently or temporarily, the layout of the streets listed in Part 1 (permanently) and Part 2 (temporarily) in Schedule 6 (streets subject to alteration of layout) to the Order for the purpose of the authorised development.</p> <p>Whilst Requirement 11 is primarily concerned with the exercise of powers pursuant to Article 16 (namely the power to provide or improve both permanent and temporary accesses at the locations specified in Schedule 8 (access to works)), Requirement 11 ultimately has effect in relation to all powers exercisable pursuant to the dDCO (where relevant).</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Applicant does not consider there to be a contradiction or incompatibility as between Article 14 and Requirement 11.</p>
<b>Part 3: Streets (Article 15: Temporary Stopping Up of Streets and Rights of Way)</b>			
12.24	DCO	The Councils will not accept closure of highways without acceptable diversion routes. The Councils consider the applicant should not provide a lower standard route as a diversion.	<p>The Applicant notes that a substantially similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraphs 17.23 to 17.24 of the LIR.</p> <p>Please therefore refer to Section 14 of this Document which sets out the Applicant's response on this point.</p>
12.25	DCO	The Councils note that in 15 (6) the applicant uses 'closed streets' and 'streets of public rights of way to be stopped up' as if they are the same. The Councils seek clarification as its understanding is that a	The Applicant notes that Article 15(6) of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ) previously referred to '.... temporarily <u>closed</u> street or public right of way...'

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		'closed' street or right of way restricts vehicle rights but protects other highway rights whereas a 'stopped up' street is no longer a public highway.	Article 15 (6) has now been amended to correctly refer to ' <i>...temporarily stopped-up street or public right of way...</i> ' This amendment ensures consistency with the remainder of Article 15 and Schedule 7.
<b>Part 3: Streets (Article 16: Access to Works)</b>			
12.26	DCO	The Councils consider that consent for accesses under article 16 (1) should be given by the Local Highway Authority.	Accesses are already controlled by the relevant highway authority virtue of Requirement 11 in Schedule 3 to the dDCO. Schedule 8 sets out the accesses as shown already as part of the application on the Access, Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation Plans [APP-012]. In respect of any other accesses, Article 16 (1)(b) provides that consent is to be given by the 'relevant planning authority', following consultation with the 'relevant highway authority'. This consenting arrangement is well precedented. See, for example, Article 14 of the National Grid (Richborough Connection Project) Development Consent Order 2017, Article 16 of the Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014 and Article 12 of the Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm Order 2023.
<b>Part 3: Streets (Article 17: Construction, alteration and maintenance of streets)</b>			
12.27	DCO	If the Local Highway Authority (LHA) is expected to maintain new altered or diverted streets, it should only be where it is in the position to approve the designs and inspect the construction of such works.	The Applicant is not intending to build any new streets, and proposed alterations are minor (for example localised widening on the A131 to accommodate a ghost lane). Diversions would be on existing maintained highways. The Applicant notes that Articles 17 (1) and 17 (2) already stipulate that works undertaken must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority. In any event, the Applicant anticipates that this is a matter which would be readily capable of being addressed in detail in the framework highways agreement (or similar) which the Applicant proposes to enter into with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project. Heads of Terms in respect of the framework highways agreement have been produced by the Applicant and currently remain with the Councils for review.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.28	DCO	In respect of the statutory defence (HA 1980 section 58) the LHA would consider its Highway Maintenance Operational Plan to be a minimum standard.	The Applicant will engage with the Interested Parties in the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to agree the arrangement in this respect.
<b>Part 3: Streets (Article 18: Agreements with street authorities)</b>			
12.29	DCO	The Councils welcome the inclusion of this article and would strongly recommend that the applicant begins negotiations now on the form and content of a template agreement to avoid disagreement at a later date.	The Applicant proposes to enter into an agreement with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project. Heads of Terms in respect of the framework highways agreement have been produced by the Applicant and currently remain with the Councils for review.
<b>Schedule (General Comments)</b>			
12.31	DCO	The Councils have checked some of the schedules against the street gazetteer for accuracy. These errors in the Council's view would invalidate the speed limits, parking restrictions and road closures.	The Applicant has undertaken a further detailed review of Schedules 5, 6, 7, 8 and 12 of the dDCO in light of the comments raised by the Councils. All necessary updates have been incorporated in the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ) published at Deadline 3.
<b>Schedule 3: Requirements</b>			
12.32	DCO	Requirement 4: any departure from the CTMP should be agreed by the local highway authority and not the local planning authority.	Requirement 4 refers to the plans being ' <i>agreed with the relevant planning authority or other discharging authority as may be appropriate to the relevant plan concerned.</i> ' For the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ), the Applicant considers that the Local Highway Authority would be a 'discharging' authority and the wording of the dDCO was updated at Deadline 2 to make this clear.
12.33	DCO	Requirement 7 of the dDCO constrains some working hours to between 0700 and 1900 on weekdays. This informs the assessment of traffic impacts, but vehicle movements are not controlled within those hours to the assessed shift patterns and so those impacts are not agreed.	The Transport Assessment [ <b>APP-061</b> ] is based on assumptions which provide a reasonable worst case for the traffic movements associated with the project. These assumptions have been benchmarked from similar projects.
12.34	DCO	Whilst the Councils welcome Requirement 11 the authority notes that this does not cover all highway activities and this supports the Council's justification	The Applicant notes the concern and will address the issue of other works' approval through Thematic Meetings on Highways so that a suitable agreement can be put in place.



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		for protective provisions or a highways side agreement.	The Applicant proposes to enter into a framework highways agreement with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project. Heads of Terms in respect of the framework highways agreement have been produced by the Applicant and currently remain with the Councils for review.

#### Schedule 12: Traffic Regulation Orders

12.35	DCO	Part 1: The proposed parking restrictions are between 7am to 7pm which aligns with the shift patterns but potentially not with AIL movements. The Councils would question why these are required. If parking restrictions are implemented, the Councils would recommend that where these start or end at a junction a distance of 10m from the junction in all directions is covered by the restrictions to ensure compliance with the Highway Code. It is unclear if these restrictions include loading or unloading.	The Applicant notes the issue and plans to examine this issue in Thematic Meetings on Highways in order that a suitable agreement can be put in place.
12.36	DCO	Part 3: Temporary Restriction of Movement. One-way movements on the A1071, B1070, B1068, A134, B1508, A131 would be unacceptable to the local highway authority unless implemented overnight with an acceptable diversion.	The Applicant notes the issue and plans to examine this issue in Thematic Meetings on Highways in order that a suitable agreement can be put in place.

#### Schedule 14: Protective Provisions

12.37	DCO	The Councils are seeking either protective provisions or suitable side agreements to ensure that its role as the highway authority is not compromised.	The Applicant proposes to enter into an agreement with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project. Heads of Terms in respect of the framework highways agreement have been produced by the Applicant and currently remain with the Councils for review.
-------	-----	--	--

#### 2.11.12 Design and Layout Plans: Temporary Bellmouth for Access [APP-030]

12.39	DCO	The plan in isolation does not show that the accesses proposed by the applicant are feasible or deliverable	The access junction form in Design and Layout Plans Temporary Bellmouth for Access [APP-030] is a generic form based on a 'worst case' approach at the outline design stage. LEMP Appendix A:
-------	-----	---	---

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		nor what impacts there will be in terms of vegetation clearance to provide safe visibility.	Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [APP-183] shows the vegetation that would be affected in terms of visibility splays.
12.40	DCO	No swept path analysis to show that the junction is suitable for the largest anticipated vehicle has been provided noting this is also dependant on the width of the existing road. Nor have the junctions on the access routes been assessed for suitability for construction vehicles, if any improvements are required and if these can be delivered within the highway boundary.	<p>The access junction form in Design and Layout Plans Temporary Bellmouth for Access [APP-030] is a generic form based on a 'worst case' approach at the outline design stage so swept path drawings for individual accesses are not necessary at this stage. The detailed design will include individual access development reflecting the specific vehicles to be accommodated, and the site-specific characteristics of each individual access including its connection to the adjacent link as requested at the Thematic Meetings on Highways. These designs for approval will also include drainage, construction details, any necessary access restrictions and other works and details of land ownership extents where they are outside the public highway.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the issue regarding junctions on access routes and would seek to discuss this issue in Thematic Meetings on Highways to provide assurance about the adequacy of the proposals in order that a suitable agreement can be put in place. All of the proposed construction vehicle routes are considered adequate for all of the construction vehicle types anticipated. Any improvements required would be identified, consulted on with the relevant highway authorities, and would be subject to their approval at the permit stage.</p>

### 2.11.1 Design and Layout Plans: Grid Supply Point Substation Layout [APP-019]

12.41	DCO	Shows an outline of an access at large scale but no details such as width, visibility, or construction materials are provided. Therefore, the LHA cannot comment on the feasibility, deliverability or acceptability of these proposals.	<p>The access junction form in Design and Layout Plans Grid Supply Point Substation Elevations [APP-019] is an outline design stage and the plan notes state '<i>The details in this drawing are indicative only. The final position and design will be within the parameters contained within the DCO with reference to the Work Plans</i>'.</p> <p>Requirement 11 of the dDCO states that: '<i>No work to construct, alter or temporarily alter any new or existing means of access to a highway to be used by vehicular traffic may commence until written details of design, layout and reinstatement of that means of access has been submitted to and approved by the relevant highway authority.</i>' Therefore, the detailed design of this access will be subject to approval by the Local Highway Authority.</p>
-------	-----	--	--

### 5.7 Transport Assessment [APP-061]

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.42	Transport Assessment, core working hours	Paragraph 2.3.1 references the core working hours for construction and Requirement 7 of the dDCO. The assessment of impacts on the basis of these shift patterns is not agreed.	The Applicant notes the issue and its connection to other concerns and plans to examine this issue in Thematic Meetings on Highways in order that a suitable agreement can be put in place.
12.43	Transport Assessment, traffic forecasts	Paragraph 2.5.1 sets out that the Transport Assessment is based at ES Appendix 4.2 [APP-091]. As the details provided are exceptionally limited, this cannot be checked.	See paragraph 12.4 above. More details of the detailed forecast link-by-link traffic flows that underpinned the Transport Assessment [APP-061] will be shared as part of the joint working through Thematic Highways Meetings.
12.44	Transport Assessment, weight given to emerging policy	Section 3.2 includes the policy review, whilst understanding not referenced due to the timing of its release; there is currently an ongoing consultation on the National Policy Statements. Within the EN-1 Consultation documents is enhanced consideration that needs to be given towards sustainable transport. Within EN-5, paragraph 2.5.1 is considered to be important in outlining the projects potential to improve the connection between people and the environment.	The draft replacement EN-1 sets out that achieving net zero by 2050, decarbonising the power sector, and security of energy suppliers are all key drivers of Government policy on energy and energy infrastructure development. The strategy is to transform the energy system, tackling emissions, while continuing to ensure secure and reliable supply and affordable bills for households and businesses. Consideration has been given to the emerging policy and it is considered that the project is compatible with the emerging draft replacement EN-1 and EN-5. In relation to Traffic and Transport specifically, ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [APP-080] assesses the potential effects of the project on local communities, pedestrians, motorists and users of public rights of way, and in particular, impacts to health in respect to temporary PRoW diversions, road restrictions, diversions, closures of the public highway and an increase in traffic. The assessment has concluded that there are no likely significant residual effects in relation to traffic and transport receptors.
12.48	Transport Assessment, Water-borne or rail transport	The Councils note the applicant does not refer to NPS EN-1 5.13.10: 'Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the project, where cost-effective'.	It would not be feasible to use water-borne or rail transport to directly support construction activities on the project. Construction work sites are not located in proximity to suitable navigable water routes or rail lines and are only accessible by road. The use of crew vans for staff travel means that onward connections to railway stations could be provided to facilitate sustainable staff travel if practicable.
12.49	Transport Assessment, staff requirement	Paragraph 6.2.5 identifies the staff requirements. These assumptions are not accepted.	Noted, further details on why they are not accepted would be required before a response can be issued.
12.50	Transport Assessment, construction vehicle forecasts	Paragraph 6.2.8 sets out the assumptions on construction vehicle forecasts. There are concerns with how these assumptions may have impacted the assessment, and they are not accepted.	Noted, further details on concerns and why assumptions are not accepted would be required before a response can be issued.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.51-12.54	Transport Assessment, assessment of staff construction vehicles	<p>Paragraph 6.2.9 provides a summary on the assumptions within the assessment of staff construction vehicles. There are strong concerns with how these assumptions may have impacted the assessment and the conclusions on this basis are not accepted.</p> <p>No evidence has been submitted that supports this breakdown nor why controls proposed that would limit these impacts.</p> <p>The assessment is built on a large number of assumptions without evidence or controls that support those assumptions, and so it is impossible to agree with the conclusions reached.</p>	The Transport Assessment [APP-061] is based on the estimated staff numbers, which are benchmarked against similar projects and include contingency. These assumptions provide a robust worst case for the traffic movements associated with the project to be assessed, with estimated daily peak numbers for on-site staff uplifted by 51%, using several layers of contingency.

#### 6.2.12 Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]

12.55	ES Chapter 12, traffic counts	Paragraph 12.4.11 and paragraph 12.4.12 reference traffic count surveys that have been undertaken. No outputs from these surveys have been provided.	<p>Figure 4 in the Transport Assessment [APP-061] summarises the results of the traffic survey programme in the network peak hours (0800-0900 and 1600-1700). The survey locations are provided in Figure 3 of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Figure 12.4 of the ES (ES Figures Part 9 [APP-154]) summarises the results of the traffic survey programme across a 24-hour day (in the two sheets entitled 'Daily Baseline Traffic'). The survey locations are provided in Figure 12.3 of the ES.</p> <p>The traffic flows reported on each road in Transport Assessment [APP-061] Figure 4 and ES Figure 12.4 [APP-154] are averages of flows recorded over survey periods between 9 and 22 May 2022 and between 23 November and 6 December 2022, as set out in paragraph 4.3.3 of the Transport Assessment. The data was reviewed to check for abnormal flows on any given survey day before averages were calculated.</p>
12.56	ES Chapter 12, construction schedule	Paragraph 12.4.20 refer to ES Appendix 4.2: Construction Schedule [APP-091]. This schedule impacts on the conclusions regarding the impacts of construction traffic, and the details provided are exceptionally limited.	The Construction Schedule [APP-091] has been used to provide a reasonable worst-case assessment, as it is based on the alternative scenario, which requires a greater number of activities to be undertaken concurrently than the baseline schedule and therefore a higher estimation of staff and traffic numbers.
12.57	ES Chapter 12, peak staff numbers	Paragraph 12.4.26 refers to a peak staff number of 350 and an average of 180. There are no controls on this assumption, and so it is not agreed.	The worker profile has been generated based on a worst-case scenario and allows flexibility during the construction phase of the works. The assessment uses a peak daily staff figure of 528, which is the figure of

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.58	ES Chapter 12, assessment methodology	Paragraph 12.4.29 sets out that the sensitivity of the receptors is based on Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA112. The Councils have previously raised concerns regarding the use of DMRB LA 112 and do not fully agree with the methodology.	<p>350 uplifted by 51%, through several layers of contingency. Once a Main Works Contractor has been appointed, and a detailed design completed, the worker numbers are expected to be lower.</p> <p>Whilst the numbers are considered likely to be a significant over-estimate, It is not considered appropriate or necessary to limit staff numbers required for the construction of an urgent, nationally significant infrastructure project. If staff numbers were 'controlled' it is challenging to see how this would be enforced.</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4: Assessment Criteria [<b>APP-096</b>] sets out the criteria that has been used for assessing the value and sensitivity of receptors in the traffic and transport assessment. The sensitivity of receptors for this assessment has been identified with reference to DMRB document Population and Human Health - LA 112 (Standard for Highways, 2020). It remains the Applicant's view that the DMRB is appropriate guidance for assessing the construction traffic and transport impacts of a linear infrastructure project such as the Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement (and has been used on other consented linear infrastructure projects such as the Richborough Connection project). The project has similar characteristics in this regard to a new road scheme (the location of construction site compounds, generation of construction traffic on the local road network, temporary closures of PRoW etc) which would also be assessed using the DMRB LA 112 criteria.</p> <p>The alternative to using the DMRB would be to use the GEART (IEA, 1993). This identifies that the following groups and special interests should be considered in the assessment of sensitivity to changes in traffic conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● People at home;</li> <li>● People in work places;</li> <li>● Sensitive groups including children, elderly and disabled;</li> <li>● Sensitive locations eg hospitals, churches, schools, historical buildings;</li> <li>● People walking;</li> <li>● People cycling;</li> <li>● Open spaces, recreational sites, shopping areas;</li> </ul>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites of ecological/nature conservation value; and</li> <li>• Sites of tourist/visitor attraction.</li> </ul> <p>GEART (IEA, 1993) does not identify specific descriptors or classifications for sensitivity. ES Appendix 5.4: Assessment Criteria [APP-096] sets out the sensitivity values that have been assigned to road segments and PRoW within the study area based on network characteristics and an assessment of the likelihood of their usage by WCH, particularly vulnerable users such as school children and the elderly. Land use within 500m of each road segment and PRoW was reviewed as part of this assessment. The groups and special interests as identified in the GEART (IEA, 1993) are similar those set out in the DMRB LA112 categorisations for sensitive receptors. It is therefore the Applicant's view that if GEART (IEA, 1993) was used to define receptor sensitivity, there would be no material impact on the outcome of the ES assessment.</p>
12.59 to 12.60	ES Chapter 12, Assumptions used in the Transport Assessment	Paragraph 12.4.43 provides a summary on the assumptions within the assessment on construction vehicles. Paragraph 12.4.44 provides a summary on the assumptions within the assessment on staff construction vehicles. There are concerns with how these assumptions may have impacted the assessment.	Noted, further details on specific concerns would be required before a response can be issued.
12.61	ES Chapter 12, assessment methodology	The assessment undertaken is purely based on daily traffic and not on the hours of greatest change. The Councils do not agree with this approach.	<p>The Transport Assessment [APP-061] assesses the impact of the project on traffic and transport during peak network hours (0800-0900 and 1600-1700) when background traffic in the study area is at its highest level. These hours were identified from surveys undertaken between 9 and 22 May 2022 and between 23 November and 6 December 2022, as set out in paragraph 4.3.3 of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [APP-080] relevant to traffic flow changes is covered in the topics 'WCH severance' and 'WCH amenity, fear and intimidation'. The initial basis for these assessments was the forecast change in daily traffic flow. In terms of construction vehicles, this is an appropriate approach as this traffic is expected to distribute relatively evenly across the working day, and significant contingency has been applied to the traffic forecasts as set out in section 6.2 of the Transport Assessment.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.62	ES Chapter 12, collision data	The applicant has examined the collision history of the local road network (LRN) focussing on clusters. In the Council's opinion it would be more relevant to assess the routes to see if collisions exceed national averages for similar roads or show specific groups are more vulnerable.	<p>It is noted that construction staff vehicle flows are assumed to concentrate between the hours of 0600-0830 (inbound) and 1730-2000 (outbound). However, this traffic generation would consist entirely of cars and crew vans, with no heavy goods vehicle movements generated, and the absolute volume of traffic would be very low (during peak construction activity, a total of 93 crew vans and 159 cars are forecast inbound across the 2.5-hour morning period, with the same number outbound across the 2.5-hour evening period across the entire study area), even accounting for the significant contingency added to the numbers (paragraph 6.2.5 and Table 6.1 in the Transport Assessment notes that, although a peak of 350 staff are expected on-site per day, the assessment forecast is effectively based on an assumption of 528 staff on-site per day).</p> <p>This means that the absolute volume of staff vehicles in any hour on any specific road will be very low. The assessments of WCH severance and WCH amenity, fear and intimidation require consideration of the absolute change in vehicle numbers on the road network as well as percentage changes. The figures above indicate that a focus on the hours of greatest change would not have resulted in a material change to the outcome reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [<b>APP-080</b>].</p> <p>As set out in the Transport Assessment [<b>APP-061</b>] paragraph 4.3.8, personal injury collision data over a five-year period (2015 – 2019) was analysed for all roads where the increase in daily total traffic flow due to the project is expected to be 5% or more of future baseline traffic flows. Where a road exceeded the 5% threshold, the personal injury collision data for the whole road length was examined and reported upon. These criteria meant that data was analysed for 16 roads, and a total of nine collisions were identified (spread across six of these roads) during the assessed five-year period. Details of all these collisions (including how they impacted vulnerable road users where relevant) are provided in the Transport Assessment in Table 4.1 and Appendix A.</p> <p>The Road Safety Engineering Manual (RoSPA, 2023) provides guidance for identifying collision hotspots. These are defined as locations where four or more collisions have occurred within a 100m diameter over a three-year period.</p> <p>No collision clusters were identified along the 16 roads described above and, therefore, the project is very unlikely to exacerbate any existing road safety issues. It is considered by the applicant that given the low number of accidents over the construction routes (a total of nine</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			personal injury collisions over a five-year period on roads above the 5% threshold) that it would be disproportionate to undertake any comparisons of accident rates with other parts of the UK.
<b>6.2.12 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-083]</b>			
12.64	ES Chapter 15, cumulative effects on transport network	Paragraph 15.4.14 references the consideration that a cumulative effect is only considered where both a spatial and temporal overlap exists. On this basis repeated staggered impacts on the transport network as a result of traffic management, closures to PRoW, and road closures would not be considered a cumulative impact in spite of their repeated impact on users.	As noted in ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072], the impacts on the road network are generally related to the installation of bellmouths at the start of construction and the removal of bellmouths at the end of construction. In both cases, the duration is likely to be approximately two weeks. The cumulative effect of these short-term closures is not anticipated to have a significant effect on the transport network.
12.65	ES Chapter 15, cumulative effects on transport network	Paragraph 15.6.9 concludes for traffic and transport that there would not be a significant inter project cumulative effect on amenity. As the Councils do not agree with the assessment method, we disagree with the conclusion. There are particular concerns around the frequency and scale of closures.	Noted. The Applicant will continue to engage and liaise with the projects ongoing in the locale as their respective programmes continue to evolve. The thematic meetings established by The Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement project will afford opportunities for the Local Highway Authorities to discuss any particular concerns.
<b>6.3.4.2 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.2 Construction Schedule [APP-091]</b>			
12.66	Construction schedule	No details are provided within the schedule that link construction works to construction vehicle or staff numbers, which would have allowed the quoted figures to be at least partially reviewed. There is also some concern that, as the assessment is based on quarterly activities, there is significant scope for variation on the assessed impacts.	See paragraph 12.4 above. More details of the detailed forecast link-by-link traffic flows that underpinned the Transport Assessment [APP-061] will be shared as part of the joint working through Thematic Highways Meetings. This would assist in the reviewing of the figures provided in the assessment.
<b>6.3.4.2 Environmental Statement Appendix 5.4 Assessment Criteria [APP-096]</b>			
12.67	Receptor sensitivity	The Councils do not agree with the method for determining receptor sensitivity. The Councils will look to identify those locations where we disagree with the Applicant and where it materially impacts on outcomes rather than cause delay by debating the idiosyncrasies of methodology.	Noted, the Applicant will wait for further information on the locations where the Councils disagree with the categorisation of receptor sensitivity.  It remains the Applicant's view that the DMRB is appropriate guidance for assessing the construction traffic and transport impacts of a linear infrastructure project such as the Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement. The project has similar characteristics in this regard to the construction of a new road scheme (for example the location of construction site



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>compounds, traffic generated on the LRN and temporary closures of PRoW).</p> <p>The alternative to the DMRB in terms of guidance on receptor sensitivity is the GEART (IEA, 1993). This identifies that the following groups and special interests should be considered in the assessment of sensitivity to changes in traffic conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● People at home;</li> <li>● People in work places;</li> <li>● Sensitive groups including children, elderly and disabled;</li> <li>● Sensitive locations eg hospitals, churches, schools, historical buildings;</li> <li>● People walking;</li> <li>● People cycling;</li> <li>● Open spaces, recreational sites, shopping areas;</li> <li>● Sites of ecological/nature conservation value; and</li> <li>● Sites of tourist/visitor attraction.</li> </ul> <p>GEART (IEA, 1993) does not identify specific descriptors or classifications for sensitivity. ES Appendix 5.4: Assessment Criteria [APP-096] sets out the sensitivity values that have been assigned to road segments and PRoW within the study area based on network characteristics and an assessment of the likelihood of their usage by WCH, particularly vulnerable users such as school children and the elderly. Land use within 500m of each road segment and PRoW was reviewed as part of this assessment. The groups and special interests as identified in the GEART (IEA, 1993) are similar those set out in the DMRB LA112 categorisations for sensitive receptors. It is therefore the Applicant's view that if GEART had been used to define receptor sensitivity, this would have had no material impact on the outcome of the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [APP-080].</p>

#### 6.3.4.2 Environmental Statement Appendix 12.1 Significance of Effects Tables [APP-134]

12.68	Magnitude of effect	Limited detail is provided on why certain changes in traffic flows are categorised with the magnitude of	The magnitude of impact categories used in the assessment are set out in ES Appendix 5.4: Assessment Criteria [APP-096] Table 1.2. These
-------	---------------------	--	--

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>impact identified; and further information on this would be beneficial.</p>	<p>categories provided the starting point for the assessment, it is noted that no quantifiable thresholds were provided for the assessment of 'WCH severance', this is addressed below in the discussion of this topic.</p> <p>In the case of the 'WCH journey length' topic, magnitude of impact was subsequently adjusted from the categories set out in Table 1.2 for PRow where individual temporary closures are expected to be four weeks or less. In these circumstances, magnitude of impact was categorised as 'small'.</p> <p>In the case of the 'WCH amenity, fear and intimidation' topic, magnitude of impact was set as 'negligible' if the peak construction vehicle forecast was less than 24 vehicles per day.</p> <p>In the case of the 'WCH severance' topic, the following traffic flow percentage change categories were applied to initially define magnitude of impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Large: &gt;60% change</li> <li>● Medium: 30-60% change</li> <li>● Small: 15-30% change</li> <li>● Negligible: &lt;15% change</li> </ul> <p>Magnitude of impact was subsequently downgraded on two roads (Church Road, Twinstead and Rands Road) where the absolute change in daily traffic due to the project was forecast to be very low.</p>
12.69	Amenity, fear and intimidation	<p>Section 4 provides details on the impacts on amenity and fear and intimidation. As the tables do not include an assessment of the hour of greatest changes; this might affect any conclusions reached.</p>	<p>The assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [APP-080] on 'WCH amenity, fear and intimidation' was initially based on forecast change in daily traffic flow. In terms of construction vehicles, this is an appropriate approach as this traffic is expected to distribute relatively evenly across the working day, and significant contingency has been applied to the traffic forecasts as set out in Section 6.2 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061].</p> <p>It is noted that construction staff vehicle flows are assumed to concentrate between the hours of 0600-0830 (inbound) and 1730-2000 (outbound). However, this traffic generation would consist entirely of cars and crew vans, with no heavy goods vehicle movements generated, and the absolute volume of traffic would be very low (during peak construction activity, a total of 93 crew vans and 159 cars are forecast inbound across the 2.5-hour morning period, with the same number outbound across the 2.5-hour evening period across the entire study area), even accounting for the significant contingency added to</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>the numbers (paragraph 6.2.5 and Table 6.1 in the Transport Assessment [APP-061] notes that, although a peak of 350 staff are expected on-site per day, the assessment forecast is effectively based on an assumption of 528 staff on-site per day).</p> <p>This means that the absolute volume of staff vehicles in any hour on any specific road will be very low. The assessment of WCH amenity, fear and intimidation require consideration of the absolute change in vehicle numbers on the road network as well as percentage changes. The figures above indicate that a focus on the hours of greatest change would not have resulted in a material change to the outcome reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [APP-080].</p>
<b>6.3.15.5 Environmental Statement Appendix 15.5 Inter Project Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-140]</b>			
12.70	Cumulative effects	When considering traffic and transport cumulative effects, the Applicant has reached the conclusion that any impacts are limited due to the Applicant's assessed impacts in the peak hours. As the assessment method is not agreed this conclusion cannot be agreed.	Noted. The Applicant considers the method to be suitable and is the same approach taken on many other NSIP.
12.71	Cumulative effects	The potential for a cumulative effect as a result of the East Anglia GREEN project is dismissed due to the project's peak being two years prior to the anticipated start date for East Anglia GREEN. Dismissal on this basis is not agreed, as it does not take into account any slippage in the project's programme.	<p>As set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-061] section 5.2, cumulative impacts related to the Norwich to Tilbury (formerly East Anglia GREEN) project could not be assessed quantitatively as no information was available on the traffic impacts of that project at the time when the assessment was completed. However, a qualitative assessment has been provided within ES Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-083].</p> <p>Programme slippage on the project is also very unlikely to occur. Any delays to the programme would lead to a series of planned outages on the transmission system to be missed, resulting in significant delays to the 2028 delivery date. Each individual outage in this series would have to be completed in order and all must be completed to commission the new transmission lines. The availability of transmission system outages must be co-ordinated with other outages taking place across the UK transmission system, and these are normally co-ordinated years in advance, with the outage dates for this project, starting in March 2027 already having been agreed. Following preliminary discussions with the National Grid Electricity System Operator, it has been indicated that</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			should the 2027 outages not be met the next clearly available outages would not be until 2032.
<b>7.6.1 Draft Statement of Common Ground [APP-168]</b>			
12.72	Methodology	As Per ID 3.8.3, the Councils do not agree with the methodology used for assessing the impacts.	See the Applicant's response to 12.67 above in relation to this matter.
12.73	Methodology	As per ID 3.13.11, the Councils do not agree with the methodology, commitment and measures set out in the CTMP.	See the Applicant's response to 12.67 above in relation to this matter.
<b>7.5.1. CEMP Appendix A Code of Construction Practice</b>			
12.74	Construction routes	It appears that those authorised construction routes would be agreed between the Applicant and the contractor without input, scrutiny or approval by any other stakeholder such as the LHA. This is not considered to be acceptable.	In response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ). It should be noted that the nature of the roads in the area means that there are limited options for construction routes and limited potential for change, therefore there is no need for an additional approval stage after a decision is made on the Application.
<b>CTMP (document 7.6 (B))</b>			
12.75	CTMP and pre-commencement activities	The activities covered by the CTMP apply to pre-commencement activities but the Councils are concerned about the time at which this plan will be finalised so that it can be assured that the measures in the CTMP are applied to all pre-commencement activities.	The Applicant notes the concern, confirms that CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) scope includes all works including pre-commencement works. The Applicant is intending for the CTMP to be finalised during Examination.
12.76	CTMP responsibility	It is stated that contractor will be responsible for implementing measures in CTMP (1.3.1 and 3.1.1). The Councils consider this does not remove the ultimate responsibility for the applicant to ensure compliance of all measures in the CTMP and this is not made clear in the document.	Agreed, the Applicant would retain overall responsibility for the works at all times.
12.77	CTMP and other consents	If pre DCO commencement works take place under other planning regimes there must be a clear	Any works that take place under other planning regimes would have their own consents, permissions and measures that would apply.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		boundary between measures applicable to such works to those permitted in the DCO.	
12.78	CTMP and structural repairs	Table 4.1. The Applicant has set out that they are not expecting significant numbers of HGVs during construction and they will not commit to any structural surveys and repairs. This will form an area of disagreement between the parties.	Section 5.2 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) sets out the proposed surveys and measures to establish network condition and how impact would be addressed.  The Applicant notes the concern and would seek to review this issue in Thematic Meetings on Highways to address any concerns and determine how this can best be resolved.
12.79	CTMP and controls	With regards to the Council's request for controls on routeing and numbers of HGVs, the Applicant has not committed to any controls as the Main Works Contractor is unknown. The Councils have been involved with numerous DCOs where this issue has not restricted other Applicants from committing to these controls, which are a critical requirement.	In response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ).  The Applicant is currently preparing further information regarding the traffic number assumptions to provide to the Councils to allow further discussions on this matter.
12.80	CTMP and worker numbers	Table 4.1. The Councils note that other NSIP projects do provide the number of workers on a daily basis. Without attendance data it will be impossible to show that the workforce remains within that assessed in the EA and Transport Assessment and that key embedded mitigation such as adherence to agreed shift times is realised.	Paragraph 4.4.54 ES Chapter 4: Project Description [ <b>APP-072</b> ] shows that the estimated worker numbers for the project are small (350 at peak and around 180 workers on average) and that these would be spread across the whole of the Order Limits. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider it proportionate or necessary for daily worker attendance numbers to be provided to the councils.
12.81	CTMP and discharging authority	The Councils maintain that it should be the discharging authority for the CTMP as per other recent DCOs.	The Local Highways Authority, as the relevant authority, would be the discharging authority for the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ). Requirement 4 of the dDCO was amended at Deadline 2 to make it clear than any changes to the CTMP would be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.
12.82	CTMP and preconstruction structural surveys	Paragraph 5.2.1 sets out that preconstruction structural surveys have been undertaken for the ALL routes. Whilst there has been discussion with our structures team neither the scope of the surveys nor appropriate routes yet agreed.	The Applicant notes the concern and would seek to review this issue in Thematic Meetings on Highways to address any concerns and determine how this can best be resolved.
12.83	CTMP and Special Types General Orders (STGO)	Section 5.3 includes reference to the STGO that will be required for the project. The Councils would recommend reaching agreement with the	As noted in paragraph 5.3.3 and 5.3.4 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6(B)</b> ), where an STGO applies to the project, this will be undertaken in accordance with Government guidance transporting abnormal loads. This may specify a requirement for escort vehicles. National Highways,

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		constabulary on resourcing given that numerous local NSIP that will require police escorts.	the relevant highway authorities and police will be notified of the abnormal indivisible loads (AIL) routes and appropriate forms will be completed for AIL routeing. The Applicant is engaging in discussions with the constabulary on policy escorts.
12.84	CTMP and construction routes	Paragraph 5.4.3 sets out that the construction routes will be agreed with the contractor. Whilst the Applicant can agree potential routes with contractors, the construction routes should be approved by the relevant highway authorities.	In response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ).
12.85	CTMP and larger vehicle movements	Paragraph 5.4.7 makes reference to the booking system, including recording and timing of all HGVs and LGVs. It is reasonable to assume that these movements on this basis can be controlled and that there should be a requirement to report these movements.	<p>There is a difference between recording movements and controlling them. The Applicant notes that deliveries will be coming from many locations with wide ranging materials, plant and servicing support for works compounds. These will be subject to potential delay on these journeys so arrival times at the site will inevitably be subject to some uncertainty and scope for control of timed arrivals in the area of the works is limited and could lead to unintended adverse effects such as vehicles waiting in laybys to meet their allotted time.</p> <p>The Applicant would seek to review control and notification issues in Thematic Meetings on Highways to address any concerns and determine how this can best be resolved.</p>
12.86	CTMP and road closures	Paragraph 5.5.4. The Councils consider that due to the limited road widths road closures will be needed for construction of accesses and the trench crossings for the cables.	Paragraph 5.7.2 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6(B)</b> ) states that it may be necessary to close local roads where these are very narrow and this has been factored into the traffic diversions shown on the Access, Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation Plans [ <b>APP-012</b> ].
12.87	CTMP and assessment in respect to mini-buses	Paragraph 7.2.2. The minibus is an assumption rather than a commitment and so the assessment cannot be considered to be worst case.	<p>The Applicant notes the observation, and that the Main Works Contractor will be developing proposals in line with the CTMP (<b>document 7.6 (B)</b>).</p> <p>A reasonable assumption has been made based on experience and engineering judgement that 70% of the workforce would be brought to site by minibus. Minibuses would primarily be used to bring work groups to site, collecting them from temporary accommodation or pick up points. As detailed in Section 6 'Travel Plan' of the CTMP (<b>document 7.6 (B)</b>) mobile work groups usually consist of between 4 and 6 employees, so a conservative figure has been taken to generate a worst-case traffic flow forecast. Parking would be situated at site compounds for minibuses, which would be specially equipped to function as the site welfare facilities for the works.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			The Applicant would seek to review this issue in Thematic Meetings on Highways to address any residual concerns and determine how this can best be resolved.
12.88	CTMP and site inspections and visits	Paragraph 7.2.4 makes reference to inspections and site visits; the Councils would query whether these movements between the site areas are included in the assessment.	The figures in the works traffic estimates include all activity required during construction, including inspections and site visits. In addition, a large amount of contingency has also been applied to the figures, as noted by the Applicant at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-024].
12.89	CTMP and travel survey	Paragraph 7.3.1. Clearly this does not form a commitment to undertake a travel survey, nor does it form a commitment to set targets.	Section 6.3 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) sets out the commitment to undertake a travel survey prior to construction. Paragraph 6.3.1 states that the results of the staff travel survey will inform the setting of project specific requirements, including staff travel routes and ways to encourage walking, cycling, public transport use and car sharing / reduction in car use.
12.90	CTMP and car sharing	The commitment to promoting car sharing is welcome; however, the Councils expects vehicle car share figures to match those used in the assessment.	Paragraph 6.3.5 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) states that staff will be required to sign in and out of each work location. These records will be used to assess vehicle movements and occupancy rates. The target is to achieve an average minimum occupancy of 1.3 personnel per vehicle over each six month monitoring period. Should the results of the monitoring be lower than this target, the Applicant will discuss the need for further measures with the contractor to see if additional measures are required. Regarding staff car use, the TA [APP-061] and ES Chapter 12 [APP-080] assumed one staff member per vehicle, which represents a worst case occupancy for the purpose of assessment.
12.91	CTMP and monitoring of targets	Paragraph 7.4.1. There is no commitment to achieve sustainable travel patterns, nor any control over changes made to the CTMP to reflect new targets.	Section 6.4 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) sets out how the Travel Plan will be monitored. Paragraph 6.4.2 states that the contractor will undertake quarterly reviews following the three-month audit to assess progress against the targets. The objective will be to measure the success of the project against its targets, and to identify the potential for refinements. It will also allow for the update of staffing numbers and the likely shift patterns and location of staff.
12.92	CTMP and construction routes	Paragraph 8.2.5. It appears that those authorised construction routes would be agreed between the Applicant and the contractor. This is not considered to be acceptable. The routes should be agreed through any updates to the CTMP, which should be discharged by the relevant highway authorities.	The construction routes are defined in the Transport Assessment [APP-061] and in response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) to secure these. Any alterations to those routes would be subject to the change process outlined in the CTMP.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.93 to 12.94	CTMP and monitoring and compliance	<p>Nowhere within the CTMP are any measures included to report or share compliance data with any organisation outside of National Grid and their contractors. The Council's view is the CTMP should be expanded to include the process of monitoring, reporting and enforcement with the LHA or LPA engaged throughout.</p> <p>The monitoring, reporting and enforcement measures across all Management Plans are considered by the Councils to be unacceptable.</p>	<p>The CTMP (<b>document 7.6 (B)</b>) sets out how the Applicant will monitor the traffic and worker numbers on the project against its targets. As the Applicant is not identifying any significant effects in either the Transport Assessment [<b>APP-061</b>] or within ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [<b>APP-080</b>], there is no requirement to report this data to third parties.</p>
<b>Specific Comments on Abnormal Indivisible Loads</b>			
12.95	Routes	<p>The application should provide that they have a feasible route from a port of origin and the relevant site access. The Applicant is expected to agree the scope of any such investigations or works and cover the SCCs reasonable cost in approving these. Contrary to the Applicants comments the LHA is not under any obligation to maintain structures for loads greater than those legally permitted.</p>	<p>In common with other NSIPs at this stage, the points of origin for goods vehicle are not all known at present as the Main Works Contractor would determine suppliers and therefore origins of incoming loads, materials and plant, and servicing for compounds, and destinations for outgoing waste and arising materials. The majority of construction vehicles will be within the restrictions set out in The Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986 (C&amp;U), and in that case no investigations or works are considered to be necessary.</p> <p>Regarding AIL, these represent different vehicle provisions. These vehicles are larger than C&amp;U limits but not necessarily higher vehicle, axle or wheel load limits reflected in C&amp;U.</p> <p>The Applicant will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the appropriate way to resolve these concerns.</p>
12.96	Detail	<p>The Councils are concerned that the lack of detail, such as routing of cable drums, does not make it possible for the authority to assess the potential impacts of the AIL movements.</p>	<p>As noted against reference 12.95 and the changes to CTMP (<b>document 7.6 (B)</b>), the routes shown in the application document have been reviewed for the relevant vehicle type.</p> <p>The design on which the proposals in the application documents and ES were based included assessment of AIL routes with a cable drum vehicle, a low loader with a piling rig and a 150-tonne crane to ensure that all routes were suitable for the specific needs of these AIL vehicles.</p>
12.97	Highway boundary data	<p>The Councils are concerned that the Applicant has not requested highway boundary details of the relevant junctions so that it can be confirmed that AILs movements, or works to facilitate them, do not</p>	<p>The route evaluation at the outline design stage did not identify any significant changes that might impinge on potential highway boundaries needed.</p>



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		extend beyond the public highway except where already identified.	The Applicant will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the appropriate way to resolve these concerns through detailed design stage.
12.98	Structural investigations	The Applicant claims in the CTMP (paragraph 5.2.1) that pre-construction surveys have been undertaken on routes that are anticipated to be used by AILs. Discussions are ongoing but the high-level survey have indicated that some structures have restrictions that would limit or prevent AIL movements. The Councils consider that further structural investigations are necessary together with swept path analysis at junctions or pinch points to show that there are feasible routes to the site accesses.	In response to the feedback received, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ). The Applicant considers that these routes are suitable for use on the project. Section 5.3 of the CTMP also sets out the process for agreeing AIL routes through STGO.

#### Specific Comments on Temporary Accesses

12.99	Detail on temporary accesses	The Councils position is that the Applicant must provide sufficient unambiguous information to enable the ExA to judge if the proposals are feasible, safe and deliverable for the purpose of the examination and for the Councils to assess if they are acceptable within the local highway network. Experience with NSIP in the delivery phase has shown that a lack of detail at examination can result in compromises having to be made during construction e.g. disruptive traffic management, reduced visibility splays or additional vegetation removal.	<p>The Applicant has provided a design plan Design and Layout Plans Temporary Bellmouth for Access [<b>APP-030</b>]. The access junction form shown is a generic form based on a 'worst case' approach at the outline design stage.</p> <p>The detailed design will include individual access development reflecting the specific vehicles to be accommodated, and the site-specific characteristics of each individual access, including geometry and constraints such as trees and hedgerows to minimise removal of vegetation and using crown-lifting in preference to tree-removal. This site-specific design will include both the bellmouth form and its connection to the adjacent link, and associated works such as drainage alterations. These site-specific design proposals, which will be submitted for approval by the Local Highways Authority will provide assurance that the shortfalls described would not occur.</p>
12.100	Side Agreement	The Councils expect the Applicant to enter into an agreement with the authority for any works within the highway.	The Applicant will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the appropriate way to define the appropriate forms of agreement for the above-mentioned design approvals.

#### Specific Comments on Permanent Accesses

12.102	Vegetation loss for permanent accesses	The Councils are concerned that the LEMP Appendix A – Vegetation and Retention Removal Plan does not	The Applicant disagrees with this statement, the LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [ <b>APP-183</b> ] does show the anticipated vegetation impacts required for access and their sightlines.
--------	--	--	---

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		clearly show vegetation that has to be removed for these accesses.	
12.102	Public highway adoption	No information been provided regarding what, if any, areas of the accesses are intended to become highway maintainable at public expense. No plans showing the general arrangement drainage, kerbing or construction details have been shared the authority in an accessible format.	See the Applicant's response to 12.99 above regarding site-specific design for each access, and the maintenance of the constructed works will be the responsibility of the Applicant while the accesses are in place. All of the temporary works accesses will be fully reinstated on completion and no permanent maintenance burden will fall on Local Highway Authorities .

### Specific Comments on Construction Routes

12.103	Structural deterioration of highway	The Councils note the Applicant's view that the highway authority is responsible for maintaining the highway. Under section 59 of the Highway Act 1980, a Highway Authority can recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic. The Councils would prefer to enter into an agreement with the applicant to survey appropriate roads on a regular basis to determine if structural deterioration results from the projects construction traffic and if so, obtain appropriate mitigation.	<p>Section 59 of the Highway Act 1980 covers 'extraordinary traffic' which is taken to mean: individual vehicles greater that C&amp;U limits (e.g. AIL), if they cause damage and/or excessive numbers of C&amp;U vehicles were they to cause damage.</p> <p>The view of the Applicant is that is that C&amp;U vehicle numbers are not significant and are not therefore likely to cause damage specifically by their use of the network.</p> <p>The approval process for AIL vehicle routeing, which will include where street furniture requires removal and any other enabling works, will be submitted to the Local Highway Authority for approval once planned by the Main Works Contractor.</p> <p>The Applicant will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the appropriate forms of agreement for this issue.</p>
12.104	Traffic signing	The Applicant's view is that signing for the project should be included in the permit system. The Councils would consider that the permits are issued for specific locations and a more holistic project wide signing strategy, perhaps secured through the CTMP is more appropriate.	Section 5.4 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) sets out the Applicant's proposals for construction route signage. The Applicant welcomes feedback from the Councils if they consider additional wording is needed in this section.

### Specific Comments on Management of Street Works

12.105	Permit Scheme	The Councils welcome the Applicant's intention to use the authority's street works permit scheme, particularly the commitment to co-ordinate such works with others. Recovery of costs for permits should be included in the protective provisions or highways side agreement.	The Applicants welcomes the suggestion and will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the appropriate forms of agreement for this issue.
--------	---------------	--	--

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
12.106	Traffic Regulation Orders	Experience as other NSIP are delivered shows that additional or revised orders are required. Whilst the authority would work with the Applicant to do so it would expect to recover any costs incurred.	The Applicant will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the appropriate forms of agreement for this issue.
12.107	Traffic Regulation Orders	The Applicant is requesting parking restrictions on many roads in Schedule 12 of the dDCO. The Councils question the need for these.	The parking restrictions set out in the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ) represent the worst case and may not be needed in practice by the Main Works Contractor. The Applicant will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the appropriate forms of agreement for this issue.
12.108	Traffic Regulation Orders	The Councils note that many of the streets are incorrectly referenced. The applicant should refer to the national street gazetteer.	The Applicant agrees that in some locations, referencing was incorrect. These references are being amended, as recorded in minutes of recent Thematic Meetings on Highways. The dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ) will be updated to reflect these changes, submitted at Deadline 3.
12.109	Road crossings	The Applicant in CTMP 5.7.2 states that where roads are wide enough open cut trenches can be undertaken in two halves. Almost all roads in Suffolk are narrower than this (example noted), hence most will require closure for the trenching works.	The Applicant agrees that many locations are too narrow to undertake work in two halves, as set out in paragraph 5.7.2 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ). This has been factored into the traffic diversions shown on the Access, Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation Plans [ <b>APP-012</b> ]. The detailed design will address these issues and can identify scope for no-cut crossings of the public highway where this is practical to further minimise disruption.
12.110	Traffic management	Although not stated, the temporary access design appears to rely on temporary speed limits of 30mph the reduce visibility and other design criteria. The Councils are concerned that to rely solely on a temporary speed limit to slow vehicles to provide safe working conditions could at many locations be unsafe.	The temporary access designs are proposed in many locations with a wide range of local characteristics. The detailed design will include individual access development reflecting the specific vehicles to be accommodated, and the site-specific characteristics of each individual access, and this will include whether different controls are considered necessary. Therefore, the temporary access designs do not all depend on a 30mph design speed and/or a temporary 30mph speed limit. Submission of final access designs is secured through Requirement 11 of the draft DCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ).
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
12.131 to 12.132	Working hours	Working hours covering seven days a week could have a detrimental effect on the PRoW network, with peak usage at weekends, including bank holidays.	Surveys have been undertaken on a large number of the PRoW across the Order Limits and on all routes likely to be affected for four weeks or more – this includes the 2023 PRoW surveys, details of which are

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>Table 4.3 of [APP-061] provides survey details during 2021. This covered only five PRoW over two days, providing a limited assessment of network usage. Consideration should be given to impact on tourism for the area, particularly regarding working hours during peak periods of weekends and bank holidays. The Councils is not content with the inclusion of Sundays and Bank Holidays as working days with justification that this is essential to delivery of the project.</p>	<p>provided in response to Action Point (AP) 16 and in Appendix C of [REP1-034]. The results of the survey have shown that there is very low usage on PRoW across the Order Limits, including on weekends. In all cases, the effects on PRoW are short term and temporary in nature with no effects during operation.</p> <p>Further details on the proposed working hours are set out below in response to paragraph 14.44.</p>
<b>Required Mitigation</b>			
12.139	Requirements	Where not included in the submitted proposals, requirements should be added requiring a Detailed CTMP, Detailed Port Traffic Management Plan, Detailed AIL Management Plan and temporary or permanent PRoW diversion orders.	Alterations to the CTMP are described in previous sections and a PRoW Management Plan has also been submitted at Deadline 3 ( <b>document 8.5.8</b> ). No Port or AIL Management Plans are considered necessary because as stated in the Traffic Assessment [APP-080] the traffic flows are relatively low, and specific procedures apply to AIL movements. The Applicant will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to address their concerns.
<b>Relevant Representation</b>			
12.140	Monitoring, controls and enforcement	Considering the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts, the Traffic and Transport section should include a statement around requiring more extensive monitoring, controls and enforcement for construction traffic. The transport impacts of the pre-commencement operations including the creation of temporary site accesses and construction compounds are also not referred to.	The Applicant can confirm that all pre-commencement activities are already included with the traffic numbers presented within the application. ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [APP-080] concludes that there are no residual significant effects in relation to this topic. The Transport Assessment [APP-061] also concludes that the peak traffic levels would be insubstantial. ES Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-083] also concludes that there are no likely significant effects in relation to traffic and transport. Based on this, the Applicant does not consider there to be a requirement for monitoring and control.
12.141	PRoW	The Council is disappointed that PRoW are not treated as a separate topic. Effective mitigation is needed for the impacts on recreational users of the PROW network, especially during the construction period.	<p>The Applicant does not consider that the way the Environmental Statement is structured would have any bearing on the outcome of the assessment on PRoWs.</p> <p>Surveys have been undertaken on a large number of the PRoW across the Order Limits and on all routes likely to be affected for four weeks or more. The results of the survey have shown that there is very low usage on PRoW across the Order Limits.</p>

---

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			The Applicant has submitted a PRow Management Plan ( <b>document 8.5.8</b> ) at Deadline 3. This sets out that the impacts on PRow are short term and temporary. Therefore, no addition mitigation is required beyond the good practice measures such as signage and notices during closures and diversions.

---

# 10. Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 13 (Air Quality)

## 10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 This section provides the Applicant’s comments on Chapter 13 (Air Quality) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraphs 13.1 and 13.2). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 13.3 to 13.16). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 13. Therefore, Table 10.1 covers the Applicant’s comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 13.17 to 13.30 of the LIR.

## 10.2 Comments Table

Table 10.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 13 (Air Quality) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant’s Comments
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
13.17 to 13.19	Construction phase impacts – air quality	Construction traffic has the potential to cause exceedances at the Sudbury air quality management area (AQMA). A detailed CTMP detailing lorry routeing is required.	Good practice measure AQ01 in the CoCP ( <b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b> ) states that construction traffic will not be routed through Sudbury AQMA. This is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ). The Applicant has included the construction routes in Appendix A of the updated CTMP at Deadline 3 ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ).
13.20	Construction phase impacts - dust	Soil stripping and the construction traffic have the potential to cause fugitive dust emissions. A detailed CEMP detailing dust mitigation measures is required.	Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1: Dust Risk Assessment [ <b>APP-135</b> ] sets out the potential effects of dust on the project. This concludes in paragraph 3.4.1 that the risk of dust would be reduced to negligible following the application of the good practice measures set out within Chapter 13 of the CEMP ( <b>document 7.5 (B)</b> ) and in the CoCP ( <b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b> ). The CEMP and CoCP are secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ).
13.21 to 13.23	Operational phase impacts	No issues identified.	The Applicant has no comment on this matter.
13.26	Decommissioning phase impacts – air quality	Decommissioning traffic has the potential to cause exceedances at the Sudbury AQMA. A detailed Decommissioning Traffic	As stated in paragraph 4.10.5 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [ <b>APP-072</b> ], in the event that, at some future date, the authorised development, or part of it, is to be decommissioned, a written scheme of decommissioning would be submitted for

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		Management Plan detailing lorry routeing is required.	approval by the 'relevant planning authority' at least six months prior to any decommissioning works, as per Requirement 12 in the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ) .
13.27	Decommissioning phase impacts – dust	Soil stripping and decommissioning traffic have the potential to cause fugitive dust emissions. A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan detailing dust mitigation measures is required.	See the Applicant's comments on reference 13.26 above.
<b>Mitigation</b>			
13.28	Management plans	During construction and decommissioning detailed CTMP and Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan arrangements are required.	The updated CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) has been submitted at Deadline 3. See the Applicant's comments on reference 13.26.
<b>Relevant Representation</b>			
13.29	Sudbury AQMA	The Council supports proposals to avoid construction traffic routeing via Sudbury AQMA	Good practice measure AQ01 in the CoCP ( <b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b> ) states that construction traffic will not be routed through Sudbury AQMA. This is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ).
13.30	Fugitive dust emissions	The Council supports proposals to use best practice measures to avoid fugitive dust emissions so long as the appropriate methodology can be guaranteed.	The good practice measures to avoid fugitive dust emissions are set out in Chapter 13 of the CEMP ( <b>document 7.5 (B)</b> ), which is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ).

# 11. Applicant's Comments on Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)

## 11.1 Introduction

11.1.1 This section provides the Applicant's comments on Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraph 14.1). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 14.2 to 14.33). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 14. Therefore, Table 11.1 covers the Applicant's comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation in paragraphs 14.34 to 14.44 of the LIR.

## 11.2 Comments Table

Table 11.1 – Applicant's Comments on Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Local Impact Assessment</b>			
14.34 to 14.36	Construction phase impacts	Construction operations have the potential to give rise to noise exceedances.	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-082] sets out the potential significant noise and vibration effects during construction.
14.37 to 14.39	Operational phase impacts	There are no impacts identified during operation.	The Applicant has no comment on this matter.
14.40 to 14.42	Decommissioning phase impacts	Decommissioning operations have the potential to give rise to noise exceedances.	Table 4.9 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072] states that the activities required during decommissioning, such as demolition of buildings at the GSP substation and the cutting and dismantling of pylons, could generate noise for short periods of time at a local level. However, this is unlikely to exceed the noise levels assessed within the construction phase. In addition, at a time when decommissioning takes place (at least 40 years hence) it is likely that improvements would have been made to vehicles and machinery to limit noise generated. If noise levels exceed thresholds, it is assumed that best practicable means would be employed, including mufflers to reduce effects at source. Therefore, there are unlikely to be significant effects on noise and vibration during decommissioning.



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
<b>Required Mitigation</b>			
14.43	Noise mitigation	Noise mitigation measures will be required during construction and decommissioning.	<p>Chapter 14 of the CEMP (<b>document 7.5 (B)</b>) sets out the noise mitigation measures proposed on the project. The CEMP is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 4.10.5 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>], in the event that, at some future date, the authorised development, or part of it, is to be decommissioned, a written scheme of decommissioning would be submitted for approval by the 'relevant planning authority' at least six months prior to any decommissioning works, as per Requirement 12 in the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) .</p>
<b>Relevant Representation</b>			
14.44	Proposed working hours	The Council objects to proposals set out in the dDCO Requirement 7 to allow any construction on Saturday afternoons, Sundays and Bank Holidays and outside of core construction times	<p>Environmental Statement Appendix 4.2: Construction Schedule [<b>APP-091</b>] sets out the construction programme required to achieve the 2028 delivery date. This is based on core working hours of 07:00 to 19:00 on weekdays and 08:00 to 17:00.</p> <p>The dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) contains (at Schedule 3), Requirement 7 (construction hours), which would allow for both weekday working and working each weekend. This latter aspect is intended to be in respect of areas where different work activities may overlap or interface, for example construction compounds or cable sealing end compounds. It also provides flexibility and contingency to recover any delays to ensure the critical path programme can be delivered. It is, however, generally anticipated that only alternate weekends would be worked in any specific geographical location (noting that the overhead line works and underground cable works would be in different locations (and with different contractors), save where they meet / overlap, as noted above), due to standard work shift patterns which would reduce disruption from construction activities. The expectation therefore is that such alternate weekend working by one contractor (for example for overhead line works), would generally be in different geographical areas (for example when compared to the underground cable works). Hence there might be work undertaken each weekend, but in different locations and hence with different receptors.</p> <p>Any delays to the programme would lead to a series of planned outages on the transmission system to be missed, resulting in significant delays to the 2028 delivery date. Each individual outage in this series would have to be completed in order and all must be completed to commission the new transmission lines. The availability of transmission system outages must be co-ordinated with other outages taking place across the UK transmission system, and these are normally co-ordinated years in advance, with the outage dates for this project, starting in March 2027 already having been agreed. Following preliminary discussions with the National Grid Electricity System</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>Operator, it has been indicated that should the 2027 outages not be met the next clearly available outages would not be until 2032.</p> <p>It should be noted that the bulk of the civils construction activities, including the new underground cables and overhead lines, are scheduled to be undertaken in 2025/26. Works before and after this date are focused around enabling and finishing works, respectively which by their nature would be less disruptive.</p> <p>The provision to work outside of the core working hours for a defined list of activities has been requested for several reasons, including to maintain programme in the event of unforeseeable delays, in the interests of health and safety, technical limitations, to minimise disruption caused, due to external constraints on the timing or duration of the works and to account for contractor shift patterns. Working outside of core working hours would be carried out by exception, it is not the intention to plan works outside of core working hours where this could reasonably be avoided.</p>

# 12. Applicant's Comments on Chapter 15 (Economic Development, Skills and Tourism)

## 12.1 Introduction

12.1.1 This section provides the Applicant's comments on Chapter 15 (Economic Development, Skills and Tourism) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraphs 15.1 to 15.9), which the Applicant comments on in Table 12.1. This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 15.10 to 15.28), which the Applicant has no comments on. Table 12.1 also covers the Applicant's comments on the Local Impact Assessment, Mitigation and Relevant Representation sections in paragraphs 15.29 to 15.80 of the LIR.

## 12.2 Comments Table

Table 12.1 – Applicant's Comments on Chapter 15 (Economic Development, Skills and Tourism) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
15.1	Summary on socio-economics and tourism	The Councils consider that the scoping out of economic development, skills and tourism was incorrect and that there are significant impacts in respect of these issues, especially tourism, that should be quantified.	The Scoping Report [APP-156] concluded that the project was unlikely to have significant effects on socio-economics and tourism and it was scoped out from being required as a standalone topic in the ES. The Planning Inspectorate agreed with this position in the Scoping Opinion [APP-159]. The Applicant has updated the baseline assessment regarding these topics within the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066], which confirms the conclusions presented in the Scoping Report regarding these topics. ES Chapter 15: CEA [APP-083] assesses the intra-project and inter-project cumulative effects on socio-economics and tourism and confirms that there would be no likely significant effects.
15.2	Supply chain and economic development	The Councils welcome the opportunity to strengthen and support the growth of local businesses through their involvement in a project such as this. However, to achieve any growth the promoter must be willing to engage collaboratively, as early as possible, with the economic development agencies within Suffolk.	Whilst it has been determined that there are no likely significant effects on socio economics and tourism associated with the project, the Applicant is committed to continuing discussions with the Host Authorities and other key stakeholders regarding their aspirations in respect of community benefits. These discussions would be outside of the DCO process whilst we await the outcome of the Government's consultation.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
15.3 to 15.4	Employment, skills and education	<p>There is an absence of reference to several key documents and sources of data that will enhance the provided socio-economic assessment. These include the Economic Strategy for Norfolk and Suffolk, the Technical Legacy Report for Norfolk and Suffolk along with the Suffolk County Council's Energy Infrastructure Policy and the Council's Energy and Climate Adaptive Infrastructure Policy.</p> <p>The Councils cannot fully determine the sufficiency of the approach to determining socio-economic impact ahead of the levels of expected employment, and the detailed workings supporting it, being provided and assessed by the promoter.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to continuing discussions with the Councils and other key stakeholders regarding their aspirations in respect of community benefits including employment, skills and education. These discussions would be outside of the DCO process whilst we await the outcome of the Government's consultation on community benefits.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the documents listed. These provide useful context and will help support the work the Applicant is doing more widely in relation to community benefits, working alongside the Councils outside the DCO process. However, the Applicant does not consider that referencing any of these documents would materially change the outcome or conclusions of the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066].</p> <p>The project is not creating a large number of jobs for the local area. Paragraph 4.3.22 of the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066] states that the majority of employment activities would require trained specialists who are qualified to work on high voltage electricity lines. These are typically sourced from the Applicant's existing pool of approved contractors. 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. This level of local employment, based on a peak monthly employment assumption of 350 workers, could result in the peak monthly local job demand being up to approximately 35 jobs locally, which could be accommodated from the local labour pool.</p>
15.5	Local employment opportunities	<p>We consider further work to be required by the promoter, including clearly setting out the expected number and nature of employment opportunities during each phase of the project. These employment opportunities need to be related to the expected availability of labour in the area.</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out the expected number of local employment opportunities within paragraph 4.3.22 of the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066]. This states that there are estimated to be approximately 35 jobs locally, , this is likely to include apprentices, security workers and delivery drivers. Paragraph 4.3.22 also states that the Applicant considers that these 35 jobs can be accommodated from the local labour pool.</p>
15.6	Employment, Skills and Education Strategy	<p>The Applicant's commitment to prepare and implement an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy is welcomed and the Councils are willing to work with the promoter to ensure that there is alignment between the strategy and ongoing local activity supporting education, skills and employment to ensure that the strategy can have as great an impact as possible.</p>	<p>The Applicant has not committed to preparing and implementing an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy, as it does not consider this is needed on this project given the low number of jobs that would be created and that many will require trained specialists who are qualified to work on high voltage electricity lines sourced from the Applicant's existing pool of approved contractors. However, the Applicant is committed to continuing discussions with the Councils and other key stakeholders regarding their aspirations in respect of community benefits. These discussions would be outside of the DCO process whilst we await the outcome of the Government's consultation on community benefits.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
15.7	Tourism and visitor numbers	The Councils anticipate that the project could have impacts upon visitor perception, and visitor numbers, both during construction and during operation, which, in particular in combination with other projects happening simultaneously in the area, could be significant.	<p>As noted in the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066], the Applicant acknowledges that there will be localised and short-term effects on tourism. The good practice measures set out within the CoCP (document 7.5.1 (B)) would reduce these effects. In addition, the linear nature of the project means that effects would be short term in most locations and effects would be contained to the construction phase. With these measures in place, it is unlikely that the project would result in significant effects on the tourism economy during construction.</p> <p>The construction activities would be sequenced and of a transient nature along a linear construction site which would be substantially screened by the rolling topography and high tree cover. Also, there are no public roads through the part of the AONB where the Order Limits lie and the only PRoW follows the Box Valley, so there are few public locations from where people would experience these effects and the surveys have shown that most PRoW have low usage.</p> <p>Taking a worst case, and not taking into account the rolling topography and high tree cover which would help screen the construction activities, the Order Limits cover approximately 0.49% of the total area of Dedham Vale AONB. The remaining designated area would be unaffected. Therefore, although there would be temporary, localised effects during construction, the Applicant considers that the impact on tourism would be limited and further mitigation is not required.</p> <p>As stated in Table 6.5 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], during operation there will be significant landscape and visual benefits due to the removal of the 132kV overhead line in association with the underground cables.</p>
15.8	Impacts on traffic and PRoW	<p>Due to the current absence of controls on vehicle movements, the impacts on traffic remain unclear. Whilst it is not envisaged that the scale of the project will relate in severe congestion as a result of development traffic, the development is proposing a large number of road closures, PRoW closures and associated traffic management to deliver the project.</p> <p>With potential cumulative impacts with other projects resulting in repeated closures over 3 to 5 years. The closures may result in a less reliable transport network, resulting in reduced investment in the area.</p>	<p>Construction activities would be transient given the linear construction site, with a rolling programme of works throughout the Order Limits.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3.21 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061] states that lane closures and temporary traffic management may be required during the construction and removal of the access points and bellmouths on larger roads (B roads and above). Smaller roads may require full closure with diversion routes provided where practicable. In both cases, works are assumed to take approximately two weeks during site set up, and a similar duration at the end to reinstate the bellmouth to the previous condition.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.5.14 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061] states that there would be 30 PRoW that would be temporarily impacted by project construction, requiring short term (typically less than four week) closures and diversions. Safe and alternative routes have been identified for each where practicable.</p> <p>Therefore, both the road and PRoW closures and diversions would be short term and there would be no likely significant effects associated with either. The Applicant</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			does not consider that these short-term effects would affect either users in the area or have significant cumulative effects with other projects in the area.
15.9	Community benefit and legacy	Community benefits should be additional to the required mitigation and compensation for the development, including those based on any emerging requirements from the recent consultation on Community Benefits for Electricity Transmission Network Infrastructure foreshadowed in the British Energy Security Strategy.	The Applicant is committed to continuing discussions with the Councils and other key stakeholders regarding their aspirations in respect of community benefits. These discussions would be outside of the DCO process whilst the Applicant awaits the outcome of the Government's consultation on community benefits.

### Local Impact Assessment

15.30 to 15.32	Construction phase impacts – supply chain and economic development	<p>While the overall impact of the proposal on supply chain and economic development is considered by the Councils as neutral, the Councils accept that the construction of the project could have minor positive short term impacts on the local supply chain.</p> <p>No data has been supplied to ascertain the numbers and types of workers. Therefore, the exact value of this additional spend cannot be determined until the Applicant has assessed the expected number of home-based workers compared to non-homebased workers.</p>	<p>The data on the estimated construction worker and types of workers is set out in the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066]. These numbers are based on the construction worker profile and are all assumed to be site based.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.3.22 of the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066] states that the majority of employment activities would require trained specialists who are qualified to work on high voltage electricity lines. These are typically sourced from the Applicant's existing approved contractors. 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. This level of local employment, based on a peak monthly employment assumption of 350 workers, could result in the peak monthly local job demand being up to approximately 35 jobs locally, which could be accommodated from the local labour pool.</p>
15.33 and 15.34	Construction phase impacts - Availability to regional businesses and supply chain	<p>The Councils consider there is a likely negative impact on workforce availability to regional businesses and supply chain due to workforce displacement and churn.</p> <p>In its impact assessment of this project, the Applicant has not considered the implications of these other projects and the cumulative impact of the projects on the local and regional workforce availability for businesses in the area.</p> <p>To mitigate this impact, the Applicant should work collaboratively with the</p>	<p>The LIR describes a potential impact of churn, where employees leave their current position to work on the project. As stated in paragraph 4.3.22 of the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066], the majority of construction workers are anticipated to be sourced from the Applicant's existing pool of approved contractors. The Applicant has estimated that based on 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. Given this and the relatively low numbers of local workers envisaged on the project, the Applicant does not consider there to be a risk of churn generated by the project and mitigation would not be required.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		Councils to ensure a strategic approach in order to help control the rate of workforce displacement.	
15.35	Construction phase impacts - Dedham Vale AONB	There would be material impacts upon the Dedham Vale AONB and other sensitive landscapes. There would be a consequential impact upon the perception of visitors in the area which is covered in the tourism paragraphs.	See the Applicant's response to LIR comment reference 15.7 above.
15.36 to 15.42	Construction phase impacts - Employment, Skills and Education	We welcome the Applicant's plans to produce an Employment, Skills and Education Strategy which will support maximising positive impacts of the project. To achieve positive impacts, the Applicant would need to identify the different skills required across their total workforce.	See the Applicant's response to LIR comment reference 15.6 above.
15.43	Induced employment opportunities	The Councils consider that there will be only negligible positive impacts because of indirect and induced employment opportunities.	Noted. The Applicant has no comment on this.
15.44 to 15.45	Workforce displacement and churn	The Councils consider there is a likely negative impact on workforce availability to regional businesses due to workforce displacement and churn.	See the Applicant's response to LIR comment reference 15.33 and 15.34 above.
15.48	Construction phase impacts - Tourism	Construction of this project is likely to have an impact on tourism business within 500m and up to 2km of the Order Limits. Particularly but not solely in the underground sections of the project, within the AONB and Stour Valley. Therefore, the Applicant should identify and characterise the tourism businesses within 2km of the Order Limits. Likely impacts on these businesses should be identified and a package of mitigation measures developed.	As stated in paragraph 6.6.9 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074] and also in Dedham Vale AONB Special Qualities and Statutory Purpose [REP1-032], the Applicant acknowledges that there would be localised short term adverse effects on the AONB and Stour Valley during construction. However, these effects would occur in an area where these qualities are already undermined by the presence of the existing 132kV and 400kV overhead lines and by proximity to commercial fruit farming.  The construction activities would be sequenced and of a transient nature along a linear construction site which would be substantially screened by the rolling topography and high tree cover. Also, there are no public roads through this part of the AONB and the only PRoW follows the Box Valley, so there are few public locations from where people would experience these effects.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			Taking a worst case, and not taking into account the rolling topography and high tree cover which would help screen the construction activities, this represents a small proportion of the designated area (the Order Limits cover approximately 0.49% of the total area of Dedham Vale AONB). The Order Limits include flexibility for application of the LoD, therefore the working area would be much less. The remaining designated area would be unaffected. Therefore, although there would be temporary, localised effects during construction, the Applicant considers that the impact on tourism would be limited and further mitigation is not required.
15.51 to 15.56	Operational Phase Impacts – Supply chain and economic development and employment, skills and education	No impacts identified.	Noted. The Applicant has no comment on this.
15.57	Operational Phase Impacts - Tourism	The removal of the existing 132kV overhead line in association with the 400kV underground cables in the AONB and Stour Valley is a significant benefit.	The Applicant concurs with the comment in the LIR that the removal of the existing 132kV overhead line in association with the 400kV underground cables in the AONB and Stour Valley will have a significant benefit.
15.59 to 15.61	Operational Phase Impacts - Tourism	Surface infrastructure would remain highly visible within the landscape. There would be a consequential impact upon the perception of visitors to the area. Therefore, the Applicant should identify and characterise the tourism businesses within 2km of the Order Limits. Likely impacts on these businesses should be identified and a package of mitigation measures developed.	As with any large infrastructure project, paragraph 4.1.2 of ES Appendix 6.2: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes [APP-098], acknowledges that there would be adverse significant effects at Year 1 post construction in some locations, while vegetation establishes. By Year 15 of operation, once vegetation matures, the effects would reduce to not significant.  As noted in ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074], there are likely to be significant benefits during operation as a result of removal of the 132kV overhead line and undergrounding the proposed 400kV line through Dedham Vale AONB and the Stour Valley. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider there to be a need to identify and characterise tourism businesses or provide mitigation measures.
15.61 to 15.67	Decommissioning phase impacts – Supply chain and economic development and employment, skills and education	No impacts identified.	Noted. The Applicant has no comment on this.



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
15.68	Decommissioning phase impacts – Tourism	This will have a positive impact due to the removal of any and all visual impact to the designated landscapes.	The existing 400kV would remain in situ as its use and operation is outside the scope of this project. In the AONB, transmission cables would be underground so visually, would have limited effects to the designated landscapes.
15.70 to 15.71	Decommissioning phase impacts – Tourism	Decommissioning of this project is likely to have an impact on tourism business within 500m and up to 2km of the Order Limits. Therefore, the Applicant should identify and characterise the tourism businesses within 2km of the Order Limits. Likely impacts on these businesses should be identified and a package of mitigation measures developed.	As stated in paragraph 4.10.8 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072], decommissioned underground cables could be left in the ground with any above ground structures such as link pillars removed. Cables could also be removed from the ducts using the jointing bays. These works are anticipated to be localised and short term in duration.  As stated in paragraph 4.10.5 of ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072], in the event that, at some future date, the authorised development, or part of it, is to be decommissioned, a written scheme of decommissioning would be submitted for approval by the 'relevant planning authority' at least six months prior to any decommissioning works, as per Requirement 12 in the dDCO (document 3.1 (C)).

#### Required Mitigation

15.72 to 15.75	Skills plan with financial investment	The Councils expect the Applicant to provide a positive strategy, with key targets for financial investment contribution towards the growth of local supply chains and businesses. The LIR sets out proposed measures and funding that it requests the Applicant to consider as part of a Skill Plan, which it suggests would be delivered through S111 and S106 legal agreements.	The Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066] and ES Chapter 15: CEA [APP-083] confirms that there would be no likely significant effects from the project on socio-economics, including from churn (as noted in the response to LIR comment references 15.33 and 15.34 above). Therefore, the Applicant does not consider there is a need for mitigation on the project in relation to financial investment or any S111 or S106 agreements. However, the Applicant is committed to continuing discussions with the Councils and other key stakeholders regarding their aspirations in respect of community benefits. These discussions would be outside of the DCO process whilst we await the outcome of the Government's consultation on community benefits.
15.78 to 15.79	Memorandum of Understanding	The Council agree with the Applicant's conclusion in relation to socio-economics. However, the Council considers that there are significant positive opportunities and expect the Applicant to actively engage with the Council via a Memorandum of Understanding, to secure benefits for and investment in local businesses and employment networks.	The Applicant is committed to continuing discussions with the Councils and other key stakeholders regarding their aspirations in respect of community benefits. These discussions would be outside of the DCO process whilst we await the outcome of the Government's consultation on community benefits.
15.80	Scoping out of tourism;	The Applicant has not included full consideration of tourism in the ES. The Council strongly objects to this as a serious	The Scoping Report [APP-156] concluded that the project was unlikely to have significant effects on tourism and it was scoped out from being required as a standalone topic in the ES. The Planning Inspectorate agreed with this position in

Reference Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
	<p>omission, and that an assessment of the impacts upon tourism should have been undertaken. The Council anticipates that the project could have significant impacts upon visitor perception and ultimately visitor numbers, hence it is not acceptable for this impact to remain unassessed. The Council expects the Applicant to develop initiatives to counteract the negative impacts upon tourism.</p>	<p>the Scoping Opinion [APP-159]. The Applicant has updated the baseline assessment regarding tourism within the Socio Economics and Tourism Report [APP-066], which confirms the conclusions presented in the Scoping Report regarding these topics. ES Chapter 15: CEA [APP-083] assesses the intra-project and inter-project cumulative effects on socio-economics and tourism and confirms that there would be no likely significant effects. Therefore, the Applicant can confirm that an assessment has been undertaken and that this concludes that there would be no significant effects requiring mitigation.</p>

# 13. Applicant's Comments on Chapter 16 (Public Health)

## 13.1 Introduction

13.1.1 This section provides the Applicant's comments on Chapter 16 (Public Health) of the Councils LIR. The LIR starts with a summary of the key matters included within the chapter (paragraph 16.1 and 16.2). This is followed by the national and local policy context (paragraphs 16.3 to 16.15). The Applicant has no comments on these sections of Chapter 16. No issues have been identified in either the 'Local Impact Assessment' section (paragraphs 16.16 to 16.24) or in 'Required Mitigation' section (paragraph 16.25). The section on the Relevant Representation (paragraph 16.26) states that the Council have been reassured that all recognised standards in respect of Electric and Magnetic Forces will be adhered to. Therefore, the Applicant has no comments to make on Chapter 16 of the LIR.

# 14. Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 17 (Draft DCO)

## 14.1 Introduction

14.1.1 This section provides the Applicant’s comments on Chapter 17 (draft DCO) of the Councils LIR. It is concerned with matters raised by the Councils in respect of the dDCO (**document 3.1 (C)**) and the draft Explanatory Memorandum (**document 3.2 (B)**). Table 14.1 should also be read alongside the Applicant’s comments to matters concerning landscape and ecology, archaeology, and traffic and transport as set out in Sections 3, 5 and 9 (respectively) of this Document.

## 14.2 Comments Table

Table 14.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Chapter 17 (Draft DCO) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant’s Comments
17.1	Summary of the Councils’ position	The Councils have provided comments in relation to provisions in the dDCO concerned with landscape and ecology, archaeology, and traffic and transport in Sections 6, 8 and 12 (respectively) of the LIR.	The Applicant’s responses to these particular matters are set out in Sections 3, 5 and 9 (respectively) of this Document.
17.1	Summary of the Councils’ position	The Councils note that the ExA posed a number of questions to the Applicant at ISH1 regarding certain matters in the dDCO.	The Applicant’s responses to these questions are set out in the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Representations to Issue Specific Hearing 1 [ <b>REP1-024</b> ] (see, in particular, Section 6) and the Applicant’s Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Action Points [ <b>REP1-034</b> ] (see, in particular, Section 2).
17.2 to 17.7	Article 2 (Interpretation)	The Councils would welcome further explanation as to which of the carve-outs included in the definition of “ <i>pre-commencement operations</i> ” are <i>de minimis</i> and which have minimal potential for adverse impacts.	<p><b>Overall Approach:</b></p> <p>The definition of “<i>commence</i>” adopted in the dDCO closely follows the equivalent definition used in previous National Grid projects, save that a decision was taken by the Applicant to list the “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” separately for reasons of clarity. This also broadly follows emerging drafting in the Yorkshire GREEN dDCO.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that there is recent and relevant precedent for each of the “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” listed in the dDCO.</p> <p>Further, the ability to undertake these “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” is of critical importance in the context of the anticipated construction programme for the project. An inability to do so would require a number of additional activities to be carried out as part</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>of an already constrained construction programme, and ultimately delay delivery of the project (the urgent national need for which is set out in the Need Case [APP-161]).</p> <p><b>Controls:</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 3.6.14 to 3.6.16 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>) explains how the Applicant anticipates that the definitions of ‘commence’ and “pre-commencement operations” will operate in practical terms, and in light of the control mechanisms set out in the Management Plans (comprising the CEMP (<b>document 7.5 (B)</b>) (which includes by way of appendix, the CoCP (<b>document 7.5.1 (B)</b>) and the REAC (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>), the CTMP (<b>document 7.6 (B)</b>), the MWMP (<b>document 7.7 (B)</b>), the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) and the Public Rights of Way Management Plan (<b>document 8.5.8</b>)).</p> <p>Compliance with the Management Plans is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO.</p> <p>In all cases, Requirement 4(3) requires that all “pre-commencement operations” must be carried out in accordance with the Management Plans unless otherwise agreed with the ‘relevant planning authority’ or other discharging authority as may be appropriate to the relevant plan concerned.</p> <p>The intention of Requirement 4(3) is to clarify for the avoidance of doubt that the Management Plans will automatically apply in respect of the ‘<i>pre-commencement operations</i>.’</p> <p>The CoCP in particular specifies measures relating to the establishment of construction compounds, and therefore will effectively control these excluded works and operations. Therefore, the Applicant considers that there is effective control over these excluded works and operations.</p> <p><b>Potential for adverse impacts:</b></p> <p>Whilst the ability to undertake the “pre-commencement operations” is essential for the reasons stated, the Applicant anticipates that the actual temporal window for undertaking these operations will be limited given the overall construction programme for the project. It is likely that most of the “pre-commencement operations” will be undertaken in parallel to other elements of the authorised development.</p> <p>In addition, where “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” are undertaken as such, it is also envisaged that they will be a rolling programme in geographically distinct locations, rather than across the entirety of the project route simultaneously. In particular, the Applicant would anticipate that the geographic focus of the “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” would be around the main construction compound and the two underground cable sections. Further, given the length of the project route and the anticipated size of the construction workforce, the Applicant does not consider it likely</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>that the “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” would be undertaken across the whole of the project route at the same time.</p> <p>As such, the Applicant remains of the view that the “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” have minimal potential to give rise to adverse impacts, and those works are already assessed as part of the ES (see below).</p>
17.2 to 17.7	Article 2 (Interpretation)	The Councils would also welcome an explanation as to where each of the “pre-commencement operations” has been assessed.	<p>As ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>] makes clear, the Applicant’s EIA has been undertaken with reference to both the baseline construction schedule and the alternative scenario presented within ES Appendix 4.2: Construction Schedule [<b>APP-091</b>].</p> <p>Both the baseline construction schedule and the alternative scenario make provision for the carrying out of the “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” as part of what is termed in Illustrations 2.1 and 3.1 of ES Appendix 4.2 as ‘general set-up’.</p> <p>The assessment undertaken has influenced the control mechanisms set out in the Management Plans and to which the “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” are subject in their entirety.</p> <p>The “<i>pre-commencement operations</i>” were all assessed as part of the project as noted above, rather than individually.</p>
17.9	Article 5 (1) (Limits of Deviation)	The Councils are concerned that the LoD relating to pylons and overhead lines in sensitive locations are too broad.	<p>As paragraph 3.9 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>) ) makes clear, the LoD sought in respect of the project are intended to provide the Applicant with a necessary and proportionate degree of flexibility, particularly during construction of the authorised development, thereby reducing the risk that the project as approved cannot later be implemented for unforeseen engineering or geological reasons.</p> <p>Vertical LoD for the proposed pylons are comparable to those successfully sought by the Applicant in the context of the National Grid (Hinkley Point C Connection Project) Order 2016 and the National Grid (Richborough Connection Project) Development Consent Order 2017, whilst vertical LoD for the overhead conductors (and fibre-optic earth wires) are necessarily constrained by the minimum statutory clearance restrictions contained within the Electricity Safety, Quality and Continuity Regulations 2002 (and are a function of tower height and span length between towers).</p> <p>The Applicant also refers to the response provided at Deadline 1 to Action Item AP4 arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1 (to which see Section 2 of the Applicant’s Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Action Points [<b>REP1-034</b>]). As the response to Action Item AP4 explains, it is necessary for the horizontal LoD for the proposed pylons and overhead conductors to take account of maximum conductor swing during high wind conditions. This is shown on the figure in Appendix A: Overhead Line LoD Principles Drawing in the Issue Specific Hearing 1 Action Points [<b>REP1-034</b>]). Therefore, the LoD associated specifically with the pylon bases would be limited and are not considered to be broad in sensitive locations.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
17.9	Article 5 (1) (Limits of Deviation)	<p>The Councils consider, as a minimum, the Limits of Deviation for Work No. 2 need to be refined so that the pylon siting remains in the locations previously agreed with SCC and Historic England.</p> <p>The Councils suggest the LEMP be revised to incorporate a need to prepare more detailed proposals which are then the subject of consultation with relevant bodies and approved by the relevant planning authority.</p>	<p>The Applicant's EIA takes account of the flexibility afforded by the LoD as currently proposed (see Table 4.1 in ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072]). As is recorded in the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025] at Page 75, the application of the current limits of deviation in a worst case scenario will not, on the whole, give rise to new or different significant adverse effects. (The only potential for new or different significant adverse effects is in respect of four noise sensitive receptors, for which mitigation is proposed).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that this comment overlaps with a similar comment made by the Councils at paragraph 8.4.3 (micrositing in the vicinity of Hintlesham Hall) and for which a response is provided in Section 5 of this Document.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant notes that the Proposed Alignment to the north of Hintlesham Hall is based on the pylon locations from the optimised alignment discussed with English Heritage (now Historic England) and the Councils in 2013. Table 4.2 in ES Appendix Historic Environment Impact Assessment [APP-127] assessed the impact of the proposals on Hintlesham Hall as having a minor adverse effect. This is because the views from the Grade I Listed Hall are westward and there are only very limited views from the Grade II* Ancillary buildings to the north, towards the location of the proposed 400kV overhead line. Effects are further reduced because the proposed overhead line would run along the same alignment as the existing 400kV overhead line at a distance of approximately 370m to the north of the Hall.</p> <p>As noted in the response to paragraph 17.9 above, the Applicant needs to maintain a necessary and proportionate degree of flexibility thereby reducing the risk that the project as approved cannot later be implemented. The limits of deviation take into account the conductor swing, as shown on the figure in Appendix A: Overhead Line LoD Principles Drawing in the Issue Specific Hearing 1 Action Points [REP1-034]. There is also a minimum distance required to offset the proposed overhead line from the existing 400kV overhead line. Therefore, the limits of deviation associated specifically with the pylon bases to the north of Hintlesham Hall are already constrained.</p> <p>However, the Applicant has taken into account the feedback received from the Councils and has updated embedded measure EM-AB01 in the REAC (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>) to avoid positioning a pylon in the area most visible from the ancillary buildings. The proposed amended commitment is as follows:</p> <p><i>'The Proposed Alignment to the north of Hintlesham Hall is based on the pylon locations from the optimised alignment discussed with English Heritage (now Historic England) in 2013. National Grid will continue to work with Historic England as the designs develop to identify the most suitable location for the pylons in relation to the setting of Hintlesham Hall, taking into account the limits of deviation and technical considerations such as distance between conductor spans. In utilising the LoD, National Grid will not position a pylon between the access track to Kennels Cottage</i></p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>(608112, 244204) and 100m to the south west of the track (608027, 244151) in order to avoid its visibility in key views from the Grade II* listed ancillary buildings located to the north of Hintlesham Hall, which comprise the converted service ranges, stables, coach house and brewhouse.'</p> <p>As the ES has concluded no significant effects to Hintlesham Hall, and as the Applicant has amended the commitment wording to reflect the feedback from the Councils and Historic England, the Applicant does not consider there to be a need to prepare more detailed proposals which are then the subject of consultation with relevant bodies and approved by the 'relevant planning authority'.</p>
17.10	Article 11 (2) (Street Works)	The Councils consider that provisions within the dDCO stipulating that approvals must not be unreasonably withheld or delayed and/or that consent is deemed to be given after a period of time are unprecedented or not well preceded in DCOs.	<p>The Applicant's approach to, and justification for, the 'deemed consent' provisions included in the dDCO is set out in paragraph 3.3 (Deemed approvals) of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>).</p> <p>As is noted in the Explanatory Memorandum, there is recent precedent for this approach in both the National Grid (Hinkley Point C Connection Project) Order 2016 and the National Grid (Richborough Connection Project) Development Consent Order 2017.</p> <p>There is further recent precedent for such provisions in the context of the exercise of street works powers in particular in the Southampton to London Pipeline Development Consent Order 2020 (see Article 11), the A57 Link Roads Development Consent Order 2022 (see Article 14), and the Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Order 2023 (see Article 12).</p>
17.11 and 17.14 to 17.15	Article 11 (2) (Street Works)	<p>The Councils consider that the deeming provisions included at Article 11 (3) (and elsewhere) negate the need for the dDCO to state that approvals must not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.</p> <p>A specific amendment, namely the deletion of the words "...which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed..." is therefore sought to Article 11 (2) (and also to Articles 14 (4), 15 (5)(b), 16 (1)(b), 19 (3) and 47 (2)) in order to address this point.</p> <p>The Councils also consider it excessive to potentially face criminal liability in these circumstances pursuant to section 161 (1)(b) of the Planning Act 2008.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has had due regard to those comments. Paragraph 3.3.4 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>) explains the steps taken by the Applicant in respect of the drafting of the deeming provisions included in the dDCO in response to the same.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the Applicant disagrees with the Councils that the inclusion of deeming provisions in the dDCO negates the need for the dDCO to also state that approvals must not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.</p> <p>Taking account of the critical national need for the project, the Applicant envisages that there may well be situations where a more straightforward or routine approval is sought from the relevant street authority and where it would therefore be reasonable to expect a decision to be proactively taken by the street authority at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The Applicant would, in practical terms, anticipate working closely with the relevant street authority to provide advance notice of such requests for approval where practicable.</p>



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
17.12	Article 11 (2) (Street Works)	The Councils have queried the precedent cited in paragraph 3.15.1 (c) of the Explanatory Memorandum in respect of Article 11 (2).	<p>The Applicant is grateful to the Councils for drawing attention to this point. Paragraph 3.15.1(c) of the Explanatory Memorandum should correctly refer to Article 10 of The Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014 (rather than to Article 11).</p> <p>This correction has been made in the updated version of the Explanatory Memorandum published at Deadline 3 (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>).</p>
17.16 to 17.19	Article 11 (3) (Street Works)	<p>The Councils consider that a 28 day decision-making period is unrealistic and potentially detrimental to the effective consideration of applications made pursuant to Article 11 (3) (and also Articles 14 (5), 15 (9), 16 (2), 19 (9), 21 (8), 47 (8) and 48 (5)). An alternative of 56 days is suggested in each case.</p> <p>The Councils also suggest that the 56 day period should be paused if additional information is reasonably required by the Councils to make a decision.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has had due regard to those comments. Paragraph 3.3 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>) explains why a period of 28 days remains appropriate and necessary in the context of the project.</p> <p>In addition to the precedent cited in the Explanatory Memorandum, the Applicant notes that there is extensive precedent for a 28 day period in a number of existing Orders, including: The Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014 (see, for example, Articles 18(9) and 19(8)), the A57 Link Roads Development Consent Order 2022 (see, for example, Articles 14(6) and 18(11)), and the Awel y Môr Offshore Wind Farm Order 2023 (see, for example, Articles 12(6) and 15(6)).</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that the suggested alternative of 56 days is conducive to the timely delivery of a project for which there is a critical national need (to which see the Need Case [<b>APP-161</b>]).</p> <p>In any event, the Applicant is committed to working closely with the relevant street and highways authorities to ensure that they are aware of when applications are proposed to be submitted.</p> <p>In this context, the Applicant anticipates that the process regarding the provision of additional information is a matter which would be readily capable of being addressed in the framework highways agreement (or similar) which the Applicant proposes to enter into with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project.</p> <p>The Applicant has also included the words “<i>unless otherwise agreed</i>” in each of the relevant deeming provisions within the dDCO. It is intended that such wording will allow for matters, including requests made by the Councils for further information, to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and in line with the terms of the framework highways agreement.</p> <p>Heads of Terms in respect of the framework highways agreement have been produced by the Applicant and currently remain with the Councils for review.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
17.20 to 17.21	Article 15 (Temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way)	The Councils have requested clarification as to what "a reasonable time" might be in the context of the temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way.	Section 5 of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) outlines the Applicant's intended strategy with regard to the management of temporary closures of existing streets and PRoW. The information in the CTMP is further supplemented by a PRoW Management Plan ( <b>document 8.5.8</b> ) published at Deadline 3. The Applicant also refers to the responses provided at Deadline 1 to Action Items AP16, AP17 and AP18 arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1 (to which see Section 2 of the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Action Points [ <b>REP1-034</b> ]). As the responses to Action Items AP16 and AP17 explain, no existing public right of way is anticipated to be closed for longer than 12 consecutive weeks.
17.22	Article 15 (Temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way)	The Councils have requested that any diversion must be open for use, and any street must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority, before the corresponding street or public right of way is temporarily stopped up, altered or diverted.	The PRoW Management Plan ( <b>document 8.5.8</b> ) published at Deadline 3 sets out the Applicant's intended approach in this regard. In addition, street closures would be subject to the permit system, and the Highways liaison would include keeping the Local Highways Authorities up to date to support reducing works impact on other activities and vice versa, as well as reducing conflicting closures as part of the proposed works in this application.
17.23 to 17.24	Article 15 (Temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way)	The Councils have requested that Article 15 (6) be amended to read as follows (emphasis added): <i>"(6) Where the undertaker provides a temporary diversion under paragraph (4), the temporary alternative route is not required to be of a higher standard <b>and must be of no lower standard</b> than the temporarily closed street or public right of way in columns (1) and (2) of Parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 7 (streets or public rights of way to be temporarily stopped up)."</i>	The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022. The Applicant has had due regard to those comments. Paragraph 3.19.5 of the Explanatory Memorandum ( <b>document 3.2 (B)</b> ) explains that Article 15(6) is intended to ensure that any temporary diversion is not required to be of a higher standard than the temporarily closed street or PRoW. Whilst the Applicant would intend to provide a temporary diversion on like-for-like basis, this may not always be practicable. Given the extremely temporary nature of certain of the diversions, it may not in certain instances be feasible nor practicable to provide a temporary replacement on an equivalent basis, taking into account the Applicant's duties to act economically and efficiently. Therefore, and noting the effect of section 161(1)(b) (breach of terms of order granting development consent) of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant cannot agree to include the additional wording in Article 15(6). Nonetheless, the Applicant anticipates that this is a matter which would be readily capable of being addressed in the framework highways agreement (or similar) which the Applicant proposes to enter into with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
17.25	Article 15 (Temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way)	The Councils wish to understand how the Applicant intends to inform them of any stopping up, and how it proposes to keep temporary working sites under Article 15 (2) to a minimum in terms of time and area.	The PRoW Management Plan ( <b>document 8.5.8</b> ) published at Deadline 3 sets out the Applicant's intended approach in this regard. In addition, street closures would be subject to the permit system, and the Highways liaison would include keeping the Local Highway Authorities up to date to support reducing works impact on other activities and vice versa, as well as reducing conflicting closures as part of the proposed works.
17.26	Article 16 (Access to Works)	The Councils consider that the works should be subject to the relevant highways authority's consent.	The Applicant notes that the exercise of powers pursuant to Article 16 is already subject to Requirement 11 (Highway Works) in Schedule 3 to the dDCO ( <b>document 3.1 (C)</b> ). The effect of Requirement 11 is summarised in paragraph 4.3.31 of the Explanatory Memorandum ( <b>document 3.2 (B)</b> ). As such, the Applicant does not consider that further amendments to Article 16 are necessary.
17.27 to 17.30	Article 17 (Construction, alteration and maintenance of streets)	The Councils have requested that any streets constructed, altered or diverted pursuant to the dDCO must be maintained at the undertaker's expense for a period of 12 months from the date of completion of the relevant works.	The Applicant anticipates that this is a matter which would be readily capable of being addressed in the framework highways agreement (or similar) which the Applicant proposes to enter into with ECC and SCC (each in its capacity as local highways authority) in order to regulate how street works and other highways powers would be exercised during construction of the project. Heads of Terms in respect of the framework highways agreement have been produced by the Applicant and currently remain with the Councils for review. The Heads of Terms in circulation reflect the Applicant's preference for a tiered approach in relation to maintenance in order to take account of the different categories of street works proposed.
17.32	Article 46 (Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance)	The Councils have asked the Applicant to reconsider references made to the Construction Environmental Management Plan in Articles 46 (1)(a)(ii) and (3).	The Applicant is grateful to the Councils for drawing attention to this point. Necessary amendments were made to Articles 46(1)(a)(ii) and (3) in the updated version of the dDCO published at Deadline 2 ( <b>document 3.1 (B)</b> ).
17.32 to 17.36	Article 47 (Traffic regulation)	The Councils have requested that Article 47 (1) is amended so that the consent of the traffic authority is required before the Applicant is able to exercise powers to regulate traffic on the roads and to the extent specified in Parts 1 to 7 of Schedule 12.	The Applicant does not agree that the prior consent of the traffic authority should be required in relation to the exercise of powers pursuant to Article 47(1). Unlike the equivalent power in Article 47(2), which is a traffic regulation power 'at large' and, therefore, rightly subject to control by the relevant traffic authority, the power exercisable pursuant to Article 47(1) is constrained to those particular geographic locations and circumstances specified in Parts 1 to 7 of Schedule 12 to the dDCO. The Applicant considers that the detail of Parts 1 to 7 of Schedule 12 is open to detailed scrutiny (including by the relevant traffic authorities) as part of the Examination of the project. Should the SoS be minded to grant development consent, it will be on

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>the basis that the detailed content of Parts 1 to 7 of Schedule 12 is deemed necessary and expedient in relation to the construction or maintenance of the project.</p> <p>In these circumstances, it is the Applicant's view that there is no need for an additional level of scrutiny to be applied at a later date. Indeed, the Applicant considers that such further scrutiny would be counterintuitive to the fundamental aims of the development consent order process and particularly so given the need to ensure the timely delivery of the project.</p>
17.37 to 17.38	Article 47 (Traffic regulation)	<p>The Councils are concerned that the consultation requirements under Article 47 are insufficient and consider they should better reflect the consultation regime set out in Regulation 6 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.</p> <p>As a minimum, the Councils consider that the consultation regime under Regulation 6 of the 1996 Regulations should apply and requests that costs incurred by the Councils are recoverable.</p> <p>The Councils also wish to know how any objections would be dealt with.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has had due regard to those comments.</p> <p>The Applicant's justification for the approach taken in respect of Article 47 is set out in paragraph 3.51 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>).</p> <p>As is noted in the Explanatory Memorandum, there is precedent for this approach in the National Grid (Hinkley Point C Connection Project) Order 2016 (see Article 40).</p> <p>There is further recent precedent in the National Grid (Richborough Connection Project) Development Consent Order 2017 (see Article 39) and indeed in the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022 (see Article 24).</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that SCC made substantially similar representations in respect of Article 24 of the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022, but that ultimately the SoS was not persuaded that any changes were necessary to the corresponding consultation requirements in order to reflect the consultation regime set out in Regulation 6 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.</p> <p>Given the above, the Applicant would welcome further clarification from the Councils as to (a) which aspects of the current consultation regime are considered insufficient and why, and (b) how the Councils have approached the recovery of related costs on other nationally significant infrastructure projects.</p> <p>As to the Councils' query regarding objections, the Applicant assumes that this is a reference to a refusal of the relevant traffic authority to provide consent to exercise the power 'at large' pursuant to Article 47 (2). In such circumstances, the Applicant anticipates that recourse would be had to the appeals mechanism set out at paragraphs 4 to 5 of Schedule 4 to the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p>
17.39	Article 47 (Traffic regulation)	<p>The Councils would encourage the Applicant to follow SCC's Consultation and Engagement Charter and welcome discussions on this point.</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes the suggestion and will liaise with Interested Parties through the ongoing Thematic Meetings on Highways to determine the actions needed and to ensure consistency across the multiple authorities affected.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
17.40	Article 48 (Felling or lopping)	The Councils request that the words "or near" are removed from Article 48 (1) as they are too vague.	<p>The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has had due regard to those comments.</p> <p>The Applicant's justification for the approach taken in respect of Article 48 is set out in paragraph 3.52 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>).</p> <p>Whilst there is no precise definition of 'near' in the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>), the power in Article 48 (1) is limited and of itself will define what 'near' means in the context of the given circumstances. More specifically, the Applicant notes that the power at Article 48 (1) may only be exercised for the specific statutory purpose(s) set out, namely to prevent an obstruction or interference with the construction, maintenance or operation of the 'authorised development' (as defined) or any apparatus used in connection with it, or to remove or prevent a danger to persons constructing, operating or maintaining the same.</p> <p>Therefore, as the distance from the Order limits increases, the more unlikely it will be for these statutory tests to be met.</p> <p>Other recent development consent orders have made similar provision. See, for example, Article 81 (1) of the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022, Article 35 (1) of the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Order 2021, and Article 32 (1) of the Cleve Hill Solar Park Order 2022.</p> <p>None of the Orders referred to included a definition of 'near'.</p>
17.41	Article 48 (Felling or lopping)	<p>The Councils would also like to see a plan showing the location of all trees and hedgerows that will be affected by the works, along with timings of the proposed removal.</p> <p>There needs to be an assessment procedure in place ahead of any tree or shrub works with respect to bats and nesting birds, and possibly dormice in relation to hedgerows.</p>	<p>The LEMP Appendix A: Vegetation Retention and Removal Plan [<b>APP-183</b>] shows all of the trees and hedgerows which will be affected by the works based on the Proposed Alignment.</p> <p>If this were to change, then an updated plan would be submitted to the 'relevant planning authority' in accordance with Requirement 8 (Retention and removal of trees, woodlands and hedgerows) of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p> <p>In terms of the timing of the removals, this will typically be undertaken in the autumn/winter preceding the works at any given location, in order to avoid impacts on nesting birds and protected species. The Main Works Contractor, when appointed, would be responsible for developing the detailed construction schedule.</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 2.2.7 of the CEMP (<b>document 7.5 (B)</b>), the final construction schedule will take into account timings relevant to the EIA. For example, vegetation with the potential to support breeding birds will be programmed to be removed outside of breeding bird season (March to August inclusive) where practicable (B02) and other seasonal restrictions set out within the ES or relevant European protected species licence. The CEMP is secured through Requirement 4 of the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
17.42	Article 48 (Felling or lopping)	A detailed compensation planting plan is also required, showing how any tree and hedgerow lost will be compensated, either within, or close to, the Order limits.	<p>The Applicant anticipates that this matter would be addressed by Requirement 9 (Reinstatement planting plan) in Schedule 3 to the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>).</p> <p>The purpose and effect of Requirement 9 is explained in paragraphs 4.3.27 and 4.3.28 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>). As such, the Applicant does not consider that further amendments to dDCO are necessary.</p>
17.43	Article 53 (Safeguarding)	The Councils are unconvinced that Article 53 is necessary and would welcome further justification for its inclusion in the dDCO.	<p>The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022. The Applicant has had due regard to those comments. The Applicant's justification for the approach taken in respect of Article 53 is set out in paragraph 3.57 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>).</p> <p>Without wishing to restate the explanation already provided, the Applicant notes that there is no other established statutory mechanism which would represent a sufficient safeguard to the integrity of the project during both its construction and operational phases. The risk of the project being affected by other, as yet unknown, third party developments is arguably more acute given the long linear nature of the project and its geographical location in an area where multiple other developments are anticipated.</p> <p>Article 53 is intended to overcome this risk to the proper delivery and functioning of a critical national infrastructure project. In that context, the Applicant is of the view that the obligations placed on the Councils in this article are not onerous, and fulfil a valid planning function.</p>
17.44	Schedule 1 (Authorised development)	<p>The Councils look forward to the Applicant's response to Action Point 21 of the ExA's record of Action Points from ISH1.</p> <p>In particular, the Councils would expect to see the main construction compounds included in the Works Plans, potentially with their own LoD if necessary to allow reasonable flexibility to the contractor.</p>	The Applicant refers to the response provided at Deadline 1 to Action Item AP21 arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1 (to which see Section 2 of the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Action Points [ <b>REP1-034</b> ]).
17.45	Schedule 1 (Authorised development)	The Councils are concerned at the breadth of Associated Development that would be authorised within the Order limits, and the lack of any mechanism for scrutiny of the siting, nature, or extent of that development.	<p>The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects (DCLG, 2013) (the Guidance) makes clear that the classification of works as associated development is a matter for consideration on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The lists of works which may be considered to be associated development set out in Annex A, generally, or in Annex B, for particular types of NSIP, including an electricity line, are non-exhaustive and should be read in accordance with the core principles set out in the Guidance.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>Schedule 1 of the dDCO sets out a list of works in sub-paragraphs (a) to (r) which are considered by the Applicant to constitute associated development. It is the Applicant's view that each of the works listed may be classified as associated development.</p> <p>All of the associated development satisfies the core principles in the Guidance insofar that it has a direct relationship with the principal development, its aims are subordinate to the principal development, it is not necessary as an additional source of revenue and nor is its nature or scale disproportionate to that of the principal development.</p> <p>However, to ensure that the provisions are not overly expansive and to provide necessary safeguards, the provisions are constrained by the requirement that the associated development must be <i>"necessary or expedient for the purposes of or in connection with the construction or maintenance of the above Work Nos."</i></p> <p>As with all associated development, these works cannot be undertaken outside of the Order limits.</p> <p>All of the works listed in provisions (a) to (r) will also be subject to the controls provided within the Requirements, including the Management Plans pursuant to Requirement 4 of Schedule 3.</p>
17.45	Schedule 1 (Authorised development)	The Councils consider that the Associated Development should be subject to an approval process by the local authority or authorities, and would welcome discussions with the Applicant as to how that approvals process is established.	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the Associated Development should be subject to a further local-level approvals process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the absence of obvious precedent for such an approach, the Applicant would point to Section 115(1) of the Planning Act 2008 which provides that, in addition to the development for which development consent is required under Part 3 of the Act, consent may also be granted for associated development.</p> <p>Approval or authorisation for the Associated Development sought in respect of the project is therefore a matter within the jurisdiction of the SoS as the determining authority pursuant to Section 103 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Within this context, the Applicant notes that the Associated Development included in Schedule 1 to the dDCO is open to detailed scrutiny (including by the 'relevant local authorities') as part of the Examination of the project. Should the SoS be minded to grant development consent pursuant to Section 115(1), it will be on the basis that the detailed content of the Associated Development included in Schedule 1 is deemed necessary and expedient in relation to the construction or maintenance of the project.</p> <p>Therefore, it is the Applicant's view that there is no need for an additional level of regional or local scrutiny to be applied at a later date. Indeed, the Applicant considers that such further scrutiny would be counterintuitive to the fundamental aims of the development consent order process and particularly so given the need to ensure the timely delivery of the project.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
17.46 to 17.50	Schedule 1 (Authorised development)	The Councils have queried the drafting included at sub-paragraph (r) of Associated Development in Schedule 1 of the dDCO.	The Applicant is grateful to the Councils for drawing attention to this point. Necessary amendments were made to sub-paragraph (r) in the updated version of the dDCO published at Deadline 2 ( <b>document 3.1 (B)</b> ).
17.51 to 17.53	Schedule 3 (Requirements): paragraph 1 (2)	The Councils have suggested that paragraph 1 (2) should make reference to an approval or agreement given by the 'relevant highway authority'.	The Applicant agrees that an amendment of this nature would be helpful. Necessary amendments were made to paragraph 1(2) (and also to paragraph 1(3)) of Schedule 3 in the updated version of the dDCO published at Deadline 2 ( <b>document 3.1 (B)</b> ).
17.54 to 17.56	Schedule 3 (Requirements): paragraph 1 (4)	The Councils have queried the use of the words " <i>is unlikely to</i> " in the context of paragraph 1 (4). In the absence of further explanation from the Applicant, it is suggested that the words " <i>do not</i> " should be used instead.	<p>Paragraph 1(4) of Schedule 3 reads as follows (emphasis added):</p> <p><i>"Where an approval or agreement is required under the terms of any Requirement or a document referred to in a Requirement, or any Requirement specifies "unless otherwise approved" or "unless otherwise agreed" by the 'relevant highway authority' or the relevant planning authority, such approval or agreement may only be given in relation to minor or immaterial changes and where it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the 'relevant highway authority' or the relevant planning authority that the subject matter of the approval or agreement sought <b>is unlikely to</b> give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the Environmental Statement."</i></p> <p>The Applicant considers use of the words "<i>is unlikely to</i>" to be entirely appropriate in this context given the future temporal nature of this element of the provision. As with all environmental assessment, it is impossible to anticipate with a degree of absolute certainty the likelihood or otherwise of a future environmental effect actually occurring. Noting also the effect of section 161(1)(b) (breach of terms of order granting development consent) of the Planning Act 2008, the Applicant does not consider it practicable and/or appropriate to constrain the practical operation of paragraph 1 (4) by introducing a significantly higher – and arguably unachievable – evidential threshold. Indeed, and as the Councils note, there is precedent for the approach as drafted. The Applicant would refer, by way of example, to the Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014, the National Grid (Hinkley Point C Connection Project) Order 2016, and the National Grid (Richborough Connection Project) Development Consent Order 2017.</p>
17.57	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Management Plans (Requirement 4)	The Councils consider that the Applicant has structured the dDCO so that there are 'high level' Management Plans that are to be certified documents but which are light on detail and leave too many matters at large and yet the dDCO does not require any further approval process in relation to	<p>The Applicant used detailed Management Plans prepared for other projects as a template when drafting the Management Plans for this project.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the Management Plans are of a sufficient level of detail to avoid or mitigate likely significant effects that have been identified in the ES, or that they contain other controlling measures, for example reference to Section 61 Consents for noise referenced in Chapter 14 of the CEMP (<b>document 7.5 (B)</b>) and reference to</p>



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		matters which are not satisfactorily specified in the Management Plans. The Councils do not see this as acceptable and would ask the Applicant to review its approach in this regard.	the Flood Risk Activity Permits which would be applied for in relation to the works at main rivers. The Applicant has, on a number of occasions, asked the Councils to provide tangible examples of details which they consider to be missing from the current Management Plans. Once this information is provided, the Applicant will identify whether further changes are required to the Management Plans.
17.58	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Management Plans (Requirement 4)	The Councils have requested that Requirement 4 (3) should be amended to provide that any departure from the Construction Traffic Management Plan should be agreed with the 'relevant highway authority'.	The Applicant agrees that an amendment of this nature would be helpful. Necessary amendments were made to Requirement 4(3) (and also to Requirement 4 (1) of Schedule 3 in the updated version of the dDCO published at Deadline 2 ( <b>document 3.1 (B)</b> )).
17.59	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Archaeology (Requirement 6)	The Councils have referenced the proposed amendments to this Requirement which are set out in Section 8 of the LIR (at paragraphs 8.45 to 8.52).	The Applicant's responses to these particular matters are set out in Section 5 of this Document.
17.60 to 17.65	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Construction Hours (Requirement 7)	Notwithstanding established precedent, the Councils are seeking further justification from the Applicant as to need for the core working hours included in sub-paragraph (1) of Requirement 7.	The Applicant refers the Councils to the justification for the core working hours which is provided in the following documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ES Chapter 4: Project Description [<b>APP-072</b>] and particularly paragraphs 4.4.19 to 4.4.25 which provide an overview of the construction hours sought in respect of the project;</li> <li>• The response provided in respect of Item 4.3 (Construction Schedule) at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (to which see the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Representations to Issue Specific Hearing 1 [REP1-024]); and</li> <li>• The Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-025], and particularly Section 2.18 of the same which addresses comments made by other interested parties in respect of the necessity for the core working hours listed in sub-paragraph (1) of Requirement 7.</li> </ul> <p>The dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) contains (at Schedule 3), Requirement 7 (construction hours), which would allow for both weekday working and working each weekend. This latter aspect is intended to be in respect of areas where different work activities may overlap or interface, for example construction compounds or cable sealing end compounds. It also provides flexibility and contingency to recover any delays to ensure the critical path programme can be delivered. It is, however, generally anticipated that only alternate weekends would be worked in any specific geographical location (noting that the overhead line works and underground cable works would be in different</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>locations (and with different contractors), save where they meet / overlap, as noted above), due to standard work shift patterns which would reduce disruption from construction activities. The expectation therefore is that such alternate weekend working by one contractor (for example for overhead line works), would generally be in different geographical areas (for example when compared to the underground cable works). Hence there might be work undertaken each weekend, but in different locations and hence with different receptors.</p> <p>Any delays to the programme would lead to a series of planned outages on the transmission system to be missed, resulting in significant delays to the 2028 delivery date. Each individual outage in this series would have to be completed in order and all must be completed to commission the new transmission lines. The availability of transmission system outages must be co-ordinated with other outages taking place across the UK transmission system, and these are normally co-ordinated years in advance, with the outage dates for this project, starting in March 2027 already having been agreed. Following preliminary discussions with the National Grid Electricity System Operator, it has been indicated that should the 2027 outages not be met the next clearly available outages would not be until 2032.</p> <p>It should be noted that the bulk of the civils construction activities, including the new underground cables and overhead lines, are scheduled to be undertaken in 2025/26. Works before and after this date are focused around enabling and finishing works, respectively which by their nature would be less disruptive.</p>
17.66	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Construction Hours (Requirement 7)	The Councils are particularly concerned by the duration of core hours for weekends and Bank Holidays and their impact on public amenity and tourism. For instance, there are numerous residential and tourist facilities along the project route, including Polstead Heath village near to the CSE compound and Hintlesham Hall, which is a well-known wedding venue.	A response is provided above at 17.60 to 17.65.
17.67 to 17.71	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Construction Hours (Requirement 7)	<p>The Councils consider Saturday hours should be between 0800 and 1300 (rather than 1700) and there should be no working on Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p> <p>While the hours are shorter than sought by the Applicant, sub-paragraph (1) would still allow the Councils to approve departures</p>	<p>A response is provided above at 17.60 to 17.65.</p> <p>The Applicant also considers that reliance on the “unless otherwise approved” wording in sub-paragraph (1) would materially inhibit the timely delivery of a critical nationally significant infrastructure project and ultimately run contrary to the fundamental aims of the development consent order process.</p> <p>Indeed, and as the Councils have noted (at paragraphs 17.16 and 17.82), “SCC will be receiving a considerable number of requests for approval across several nationally</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		from the core hours, providing flexibility in the event it is required.	<p><i>significant infrastructure projects.</i>" Notwithstanding the practical implications of needing to seek approval from the Councils on each and every occasion where a departure from the core working hours is sought, the Applicant is concerned as to the time which it is likely to take in order for approvals to be authorised.</p> <p>In the Applicant's opinion, this risk can be avoided by retaining the core working hours as currently drafted.</p>
17.72 to 17.74	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Construction Hours (Requirement 7)	The Councils would welcome an explanation of why the operations listed in Requirement 7 (2) should be able to take place outside the already extensive core hours. (The Councils do not consider an explanation is required in respect of exception (h): " <i>activity necessary in the instance of an emergency where there is a risk to persons or property.</i> ")	<p>Exceptions to the core working hours specified in Requirement 7(1) are proposed in respect of the operations listed in Requirement 7(2) for the following reasons:</p> <p><i>Trenchless crossing operations including beneath highways, railway lines, woodlands or watercourses:</i> may require working outside of core hours in case the drilling operation could not be stopped safely, or if further time was required to complete the drill shot. This is due to the risk of equipment becoming stuck, or the bore collapsing if work is halted at certain stages during the Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) operation, which, without a main works contractor having been appointed is the trenchless crossing method that has been assumed. A drill shot refers to the initial full-length pilot bore or a subsequent reaming pass to enlarge the bore. The final stage of the HDD process is to pull the pipe or duct through the enlarged bore</p> <p><i>The installation and removal of conductors, pilot wires and associated protective netting across highways, railway lines or watercourses:</i> given operational and safety constraints, it is likely that these operations will need to take place at times when highways, railways and/or watercourses are not in heavy use.</p> <p><i>The jointing of underground cables (save for the cutting of underground cables):</i> cable jointing is required to be a continuous operation to prevent contamination of the site. Out-of-hours working may therefore be needed to complete the task if works overrun during daytime periods.</p> <p><i>The completion of operations commenced during the core working hours which cannot safely be stopped:</i> this provision is included to cover the eventuality that operations have to overrun for safety and practical reasons due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. extreme weather events; delays during activities such as concrete pouring; cable pulling; pylon construction etc.)</p> <p><i>Any highway works requested by the highway authority to be undertaken on a Saturday, Sunday or a Bank Holiday or outside the core working hours:</i> for certain works traffic management measures will be required to restrict access and movement of traffic, some of which will need a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO). The highways authority may request these measures be implemented at less disruptive times, including overnight, at weekends and on bank holidays.</p> <p><i>The testing or commissioning of any electrical plant installed as part of the authorised development:</i> whilst every endeavour is made to complete testing and commissioning in normal working hours, some aspects of the tests may need to be completed in a</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>continuous phase so that the equipment is returned to a safe and reliable condition. These activities would not give rise to more noise than normal operation of the equipment, which, once in use, would be in operational use at all times.</p> <p><i>The completion of works delayed or held up by severe weather conditions which disrupted or interrupted normal construction activities:</i> delays to the programme would need to be recovered to avoid missing a series of planned outages on the transmission system, that would result in significant delays to the 2028 delivery date.</p> <p><i>Activity necessary in the instance of an emergency where there is a risk to persons or property: no explanation requested by the Councils:</i></p> <p><i>Security monitoring:</i> would be required outside of core working hours as its purpose is to ensure the security of the site at these times.</p> <p><i>Surveys:</i> undertaking survey works outside of core working hours is required, as some areas, including roads and railways would only be accessible at these times. Some surveys, such as CCTV survey of sewers may only be possible during periods of low demand. Non-intrusive surveys are not classified as construction works and would not be likely to cause disturbance.</p>
17.75 to 17.77	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Implementation and maintenance of reinstatement planting scheme (Requirement 10)	The Councils consider that the 5 year 'aftercare period' in Requirement 10(3) should be extended to 10 years in order to provide greater ecological improvements.	<p>The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that in respect of certain sites along the project route where the freehold has been, or is proposed to be acquired by the Applicant, landscape screening (incorporating reinstatement planting) is an embedded measure which will be retained for the lifetime of the transmission asset and, therefore, maintained on a permanent basis. This would be at the GSP substation and around the CSE compounds, as per embedded measures EM-D01, EM-F01, EM-G03, EM-G06 and EM-H02 set out within the REAC (<b>document 7.5.2 (B)</b>). The Applicant has also committed to maintaining the environmental enhancement areas for a period of up to 30 years, as described in paragraph 7.3.1 in the Environmental Gain Report [<b>APP-176</b>]. The Applicant has also committed to a up to 30-year aftercare period for the mitigation planting MM09 at Hintlesham Woods, which is a priority site for development of mixed broadleaved native woodland planting, scrub planting and species rich grassland. The 30-year aftercare period for MM09 is considered necessary to enable the woodland planting to achieve the growth rates predicted and secure its long-term viability, and due to the importance of this site in meeting an objective to improve habitat connectivity between Ramsey Wood and Wolves Wood. Wording has been added to Section 9.1 of the LEMP (<b>document 7.8 (B)</b>) at Deadline 3 to show the clear commitment from the Applicant in relation to this site.</p> <p>For those areas where reinstatement planting is identified in LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plans (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>), other than those areas</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>mentioned above, in accordance with good practice measure LV03, and as stated in Requirement 10 of the draft DCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>), a five-year aftercare period will be established for mitigation planting and reinstatement. Following that time, the planting will be handed back to the relevant landowner, as currently takes place in respect of existing planting on private land.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that five-years is appropriate in the context of these locations based on the types of reinstatement and mitigation planting proposed, which is typically hedgerow reinforcement and planting. Planting sizes and species have been selected based on those which would naturalise more easily than larger trees stock, for example, smaller whips and transplants.</p> <p>The purpose of the proposed reinstatement planting is to replace what is removed, in order to maintain the existing baseline. Once the reinstatement planting is delivered and has been established through the five-year maintenance period the purpose of the reinstatement planting has been achieved. It is the Applicant's view that there should be no additional obligation on the Applicant (or private landowners) to manage or maintain planting on private land which forms part of the wider baseline, in the same way as the Applicant (or private landowners) would not be obliged to maintain existing baseline planting which is not affected by the project. In summary, the purpose of the reinstatement planting will not be undermined as its purpose is as replacement planting, and not as planting to be retained by the Applicant. There is also no justification for the Applicant to permanently acquire land for the management of replacement planting in perpetuity or seek to agree long term management with a landowner, where that landowner would ordinarily be entitled to manage existing planting on their land as they consider appropriate. Management of replacement or mitigation planting following the five-year period is not considered directly related to the development or necessary on the basis that the planting required will have been delivered and its establishment secured, which is the purpose of the replacement planting.</p>
17.78	Schedule 3 (Requirements): Highway Works (Requirement 11)	The Councils consider that Requirement 11 should be amended to cover all highway works.	<p>Requirement 11 relates to the approval of details of design, layout and reinstatement of accesses to be constructed or altered (either permanently or temporarily). 'Access' in this context is taken to mean all enabling highway works, for example street furniture removal to accommodate AIL movements; localised alterations to accommodate swept paths.</p> <p>The Applicant anticipates that the framework highways agreement will be the vehicle through which any necessary additional controls are imposed on the carrying out of highway or street works in respect of the project.</p>
17.79 to 17.83	Schedule 4 (Discharge of	Notwithstanding the justification already provided by the Applicant, the Councils consider that the timescales set out in	The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
	Requirements): Timescales	Schedule 4 (in respect of the discharge of Requirements) are too short, and that a 56 day decision-making period is reasonable.	<p>The Applicant has had due regard to those comments and acknowledges that the time limits included in Schedule 4 (in relation to the determination of applications made pursuant to the Requirements and any requests made by the relevant discharging authority for further information) do differ from those recommended in Advice Note 15 (Planning Inspectorate, 2018).</p> <p>However, the Applicant remains of the view that the timescales set out in Schedule 4 are entirely appropriate and necessary in the context of the project, noting both the justification and precedent set out in paragraph 4.4 of the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>). It is also noted that Advice Note 15 (Planning Inspectorate, 2018) is advisory only in nature.</p> <p>From a practical perspective, the Applicant would intend to work closely with the relevant discharging authorities to ensure that the timescales set out in Schedule 4 of the dDCO can be met.</p> <p>In particular, the Applicant anticipates that close future engagement will be facilitated by a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA). It is envisaged that, as part of a future PPA, pre-application 'shadow' submissions to the relevant discharging authority would be made by or on behalf of the Applicant. Comments raised by the relevant discharging authority as part of that pre-engagement process would, where appropriate, be addressed by the Applicant prior to the formal submission of the application pursuant to Schedule 4.</p> <p>This process, which the Applicant would be pleased to discuss in detail with the relevant discharging authorities, will allow all future applications to be determined swiftly and within the timescales set out in Schedule 4 to the dDCO.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Applicant does not consider that the suggested alternative of 56 days is conducive to the timely delivery of a project for which there is a critical national need (to which see the Need Case [<b>APP-161</b>]). Whilst a maximum period of 56 days was sought in the context of the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022, the Applicant submits that the two projects are not comparable in terms of scale, complexity or the number of future approvals which will be required. The Applicant would therefore welcome further clarification from the Councils as to why a period of 56 days is considered appropriate in the context of this particular project – or whether the Applicant's approach as detailed above provides sufficient comfort.</p>
17.84	Schedule 4 (Discharge of Requirements): Fees	The Councils consider that the fee proposed in paragraph 3 (1) is unreasonably low and needs to be increased.	<p>The Applicant notes that similar comments were made by the Councils in respect of an early draft of the DCO which was shared with each of the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has had due regard to those comments and understands that the fee of £116 per request included in paragraph 3 (1) of Schedule 4 reflects the Councils' standard fee for applications to discharge a planning condition.</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			In any event, the Applicant anticipates that the proposed PPA will make provision for the reimbursement of any additional reasonable financial costs which are likely to be properly incurred by the Councils in respect of the consideration and determination of any requests for approval, consent or agreement made pursuant to the dDCO.
17.85	Schedule 4 (Discharge of Requirements): Fees	The Councils consider that paragraph 3 (2) is unreasonable and should be deleted.	<p>The Applicant has had due regard to the Councils' comments.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact that substantially similar provisions are found in the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022 and the Southampton to London Pipeline Development Consent Order 2020, the Applicant is content to remove paragraph 3 (2) from the dDCO.</p> <p>Necessary amendments were made to Schedule 4 in the updated version of the dDCO published at Deadline 2 (<b>document 3.1 (B)</b>).</p>
17.86	Schedules 7, 8 and 12	The Councils request the Applicant confirms that the streets and PROW referred to in these schedules have been described in accordance with the street gazetteer and the definitive map.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a further detailed review of Schedules 5, 6, 7, 8 and 12 of the dDCO in light of the comments raised by the Councils.</p> <p>All necessary updates have been incorporated in the dDCO (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>) published at Deadline 3.</p>
17.87	Relevant Representation	Suffolk County Council remains concerned about numerous matters raised in comments in November 2022 in respect of an early draft of the DCO.	<p>The Applicant was grateful to receive comments from the Councils on an early draft of the DCO which was shared with the Councils on a without prejudice basis in August 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has had due regard to all comments received.</p> <p>As has been noted, a number of points raised by those Councils were subsequently incorporated in the dDCO submitted with the application for development consent (<b>document 3.1 (C)</b>). Where changes were not ultimately capable of being incorporated, the Applicant considers that necessary justification for the approach taken has been provided in the Explanatory Memorandum (<b>document 3.2 (B)</b>).</p> <p>The Applicant would also refer to the Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations [<b>REP1-025</b>] published at Deadline 1, as well as the detailed responses set out in this Document.</p>

# 15. Applicant's Comments on Annex A (Brett Valley)

## 15.1 Introduction

15.1.1 Table 15.1 provides the Applicant's comments on Annex A (Brett Valley) of the SCC and BMSDC LIR.

## 15.2 Comments Table

Table 15.1 – Applicant's Comments on Annex A (Brett Valley) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
N/A	Cultural value of the Brett Valley	The LIR notes that the Connections Options Report (COR) describes the cultural association of the Brett valley but that the terminology used in the COR neither captures the significance of the East Anglian School of Painting and Drawing based at Benton End Farm, nor the qualities of the Brett Valley which warrant its status as a Special Landscape Area. The relationship between the landscape and the various nationally renowned artists who worked at Benton End is also insufficiently analysed and consequently the significant cultural value of the landscape is not properly recognised.	<p>The Connections Option Report (COR) [APP-164] reflected the level of detail required to inform an options appraisal process and there is no intention to update this document. As noted in the Evolution of the Project [APP-166], following a period of project pause, in 2020, the baseline environment, planning policy, and National Grid's guidance, which may affect the indicative route alignment or the extent of undergrounding, was reconsidered. This concluded that previous appraisal work remained generally robust.</p> <p>The EIA process has continued since this time and a landscape and visual impact assessment has been undertaken as part of the ES. The landscape and visual impact assessment has influenced the design decisions. The assessment on the Brett Valley is presented in the ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Landscape Character [APP-100].</p> <p>Section 3.1 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on Landscape Character Area (LCA) 1 Suffolk Ancient Rolling Farmlands. LCA 1c covers the valley sides of the River Brett and its tributary valley. The assessment acknowledges the high value of this LCA which is partly based on its cultural associations, referring in paragraph 3.1.5 to John Constable and other artists.</p>
N/A	Benton End and the Maggi Hamblin Statement	While the COR recognises that Benton End has a setting which is informed by its cultural associations, this is not expanded to explain the significance or extent of that, nor how an overhead line would affect that; instead the Assessment of Effects reverts to consideration of	The Connections Option Report (COR) [APP-164] reflected the level of detail required to inform an options appraisal process and there is no intention to update this document. The EIA process has continued since this time.



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>the impact on the setting of Benton End Farm as a listed building only, as opposed to the wider landscape setting.</p> <p>Consequently, the councils consider the following work needs to be undertaken.</p> <p>The curves of the Brett are flanked by a vast rolling sweep of fields rising up to Constable's sky. The imposition of more large pylons would certainly ruin the Brett Valley – a landscape clearly as important as those of the Dedham Vale and the Stour. This would amount to an act of vandalism, not only upon a unique environment but upon a significant part of our cultural heritage for generations to come.</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the setting effects of the project on the Grade II* Benton End and Grade II Outbuildings in ES Chapter 8: Historic Environment [APP-076] and ES Appendix 8.2: Historic Environment Impact Assessment [APP-127]. The Historic Environment assessment concluded that the project would result in a neutral effect (not significant) on this asset given that the buildings would have very limited intervisibility with the project.</p> <p>Section 3.4 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Designated Landscapes [APP-098] sets out the assessment of effects on the Brett Valley SLA. Section 3.4 of this Document states that although the presence of the new 400kV overhead line (following removal of the existing 132kV overhead line) when seen alongside the existing 400kV overhead line (which will remain closest to the property) would continue to slightly intensify the presence of high voltage electricity infrastructure in the Brett Valley, the resultant effects would not be significant.</p> <p>Section 3.1 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on LCA 1 Suffolk Ancient Rolling Farmlands. LCA 1c covers the valley sides of the River Brett and its tributary valley. The assessment acknowledges the high value of this LCA which is partly based on its cultural associations, referring in paragraph 3.1.5 to John Constable and other artists. Section 3.5 of ES Appendix 6.3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character [APP-098] presents the assessment of effects on LCA 5 Suffolk Valley Meadowlands. LCA 5b covers the valley floor of the River Brett.</p> <p>Both assessments conclude that the removal of the existing 132kV overhead line and presence of the new 400kV overhead line would introduce noticeably larger pylons within the Brett Valley and slightly increase the influence of high voltage electricity infrastructure within LCA 5b. The resultant effects would not be significant.</p>

# 16. Applicant's Comments on Annex B (Hintlesham Hall)

## 16.1 Introduction

16.1.1 Table 16.1 provides the Applicant's comments on Annex B (Hintlesham Hall) of the SCC and BMSDC LIR.

## 16.2 Comments Table

Table 16.1 – Applicant's Comments on Annex B (Hintlesham Hall) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
N/A	Option 3 (the Proposed Alignment)	The local authorities accept that Option 3 would marginally reduce the impact of the scheme upon the setting of Hintlesham Hall a Grade 1 listed building and lessen the impacts upon other listed buildings, notably College Farm, and the impacts on Square Pastures covert.	The Proposed Alignment shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018] uses 'Option 3' that was discussed with the Councils in 2013.
N/A	Mitigation and undergrounding at Hintlesham Hall	<p>While Option 3 and the associated mitigation measures are welcome, the local authorities do not consider that they are commensurate with the scale of the impacts that would be created by the proposal. The interaction of the project with the baseline (existing line) does not appear to have been fully taken into account.</p> <p>In the absence of a comprehensive mitigation scheme which provides for the meaningful assimilation of the additional overhead line into the landscape the local authorities remain of the view that the proposal will have an adverse impact upon the setting of Hintlesham Hall. The local authorities therefore consider that the additional overhead line should be placed beneath ground in this section of the route.</p>	<p>Underground options were considered in the COR [APP-164] in terms of Section AB: Bramford Substation / Hintlesham. The Applicant also considered undergrounding of a partial underground alignment in the Study Area AB Preferred Alignment (National Grid, 2013). The outputs of this study in February 2013, led to the discussions on the three alignments noted in the LIR.</p> <p>In this study, the Applicant concluded that a partial underground cable option would avoid the effects on the setting of Hintlesham Hall. There would, however, be effects on the parkland, due to the removal of hedgerows and trees in order to accommodate the cable alignment. The eastern CSE compound would also affect the settings of other Grade II listed buildings and would be visible in views from Hintlesham Park. There would also be greater effects on buried archaeology and habitats than an overhead option. Therefore, the Applicant considered that the benefits of a partial underground cable option would be outweighed by other factors and that such an option should not be taken forward.</p> <p>In addition, ES Appendix 8.2 Annex A: Hintlesham Hall Assessment [APP-128] sets out the assessment of setting effects on Hintlesham Hall. This takes into account that there is an existing 400kV overhead line within the baseline setting and paragraph 2.1.8 notes that the existing 400kV overhead line was installed after the listing of the Hall and the ancillary buildings in 1955.</p>

Reference Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		<p>Table 4.2 in ES Appendix 8.2: Historic Environment Impact Assessment [APP-127] states that there are only very limited views from the Grade II* Ancillary buildings to the location of the proposed 400kV overhead line, whilst the principal views from the Grade I Hall are westward. There would be very limited additional visual intrusion within the setting of the Hall from the proposed 400kV overhead line, as this would run along the same alignment as the existing 400kV overhead line, approximately 370m to the north of the property. Therefore, the Applicant disagrees with the Councils and does not consider there to be a need for additional mitigation at this location.</p>

# 17. Applicant's Comments on Annex C (Design Principles)

## 17.1 Introduction

17.1.1 Table 17.1 provides the Applicant's comments on Annex C (Design Principles) of the SCC and BMSDC LIR.

## 17.2 Comments Table

Table 17.1 – Applicant's Comments on Annex C (Design Principles) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
C1	Design principles	The following preliminary design principles are offered by SCC and BMSDC, in order that good design can be embedded at every stage of the project, in accordance with both current and emerging policy in the NPS.	The Applicant confirms that design principles in general accordance with those identified in Annex C have been followed throughout the development of the project as demonstrated within the submitted documentation, including the Route Corridor Study (RCS) [APP-163] and the COR [APP-164]. Further evidence is provided in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered [APP-071] and ES Appendix 4.1: Good Design [APP-090]. Appendix A and B of the Planning Statement [APP-160] demonstrate compliance with the relevant NPS. As set out in the Planning Statement [APP-160] the assessment of the application for development consent should be made primarily against the extant (2011) National Policy Statements (NPS) (EN-1 and EN-5), albeit the Applicant acknowledges that the emerging 2023 drafts are likely to be important and relevant matters.
C.2	Location of CSE compounds and substations.	It is considered that there are opportunities for effective placemaking at the four CSE compounds and two substations, that should be fully exploited to ensure effective mitigation, as well as biodiversity and environmental net gain in accordance with the requirements laid down by Ofgem for both new projects, and in respect of the performance of National Grid's non-operational land.	Adopting a placemaking approach implies creating the right to public access which is not proposed for any of the CSE compound locations. The Applicant has already undertaken a detailed option appraisal on each of the CSE compounds and the GSP substation, as summarised in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered [APP-071]. The locations chosen make use of both natural landform and existing vegetation to help screen the sites and further embedded planting has been included. The embedded planting is shown on the Vegetation Reinstatement Plan in Appendix B of the LEMP (document 7.8.2 (B)), which is secured via Requirement 4 of the dDCO (document 3.1 (C)). The Applicant has also committed to delivering at least a 10% biodiversity net gain on the project, which is secured through Requirement 13 of the dDCO (document 3.1 (C)). Therefore, the Applicant can confirm that the project is in accordance with the requirements laid down by Ofgem in relation to new projects.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			Finally, the Applicant would like to make clear that the project only proposes one new GSP substation. Bramford Substation is already an operational substation which the project connects into.
C.3	Placemaking and host communities	There is an opportunity for the Applicant to enable the participatory engagement of host communities in the process of placemaking for the project as a whole and in these locations in particular.	See the Applicant's comments on reference C.2 above.
C.4 to C15	Siting of transmission pylons, buried cables and CSE compounds	The Councils list a number of receptors and features that should be considered when locating project components in order to minimise or eliminate permanent adverse impacts on the environment.	The RCS [APP-163] and the COR [APP-164] provide evidence on the environmental considerations that were considered during the option appraisal and routing. Further evidence is provided in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered [APP-071]. Where impacts cannot be avoided, these have been assessed within the ES (Volume 6.2 of the application for development consent) and mitigation provided where required.
C.11b	Siting of transmission pylons, buried cables and CSE compounds	Detailed discussions on the alignment around Hintlesham Hall have yielded landscape and visual benefits. It is recognised that this approach would not be practicable for the whole of the over ground section of the route, however sensitive areas, for example, the Brett Valley or the setting of the AONB, require a more detailed iterative approach, in the same way as that used at Hintlesham, which tests the engineering possibilities, to minimise the landscape and visual impacts of the development.	<p>The Applicant needs to maintain flexibility provided by the LoD to take into account unknown factors that may arise during detailed design and construction. The Applicant carries the liability of the design and construction of the project, and therefore needs to own and take responsibility for the final positioning of project components within the LoD set out with the DCO. The Applicant does not consider it practicable to involve third parties in the detailed designs and micro-siting of pylons.</p> <p>The ES assesses the effects of the Proposed Alignment as shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018] and includes sensitivity testing any different effects for the flexibility provided within the LoD should the LoD be utilised. The ES presents the likely significant effects for each topic (including those from utilising the LoD) and where a significant effect has been identified, where appropriate additional mitigation is proposed. This is considered appropriate for managing the likely significant effects of the project. Flexibility within the LoD has been considered for landscape and visual effects in Section 6.11 of ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP-074] and this has confirmed that there would be no new or different likely significant effects to those identified in the baseline scenario assessed (i.e. the Alignment as shown on the General Arrangement Plans [APP-018]). This included consideration of the lateral and longitudinal movement of pylons as discussed in Table 6.6 of ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual [APP-078].</p> <p>Overhead line design in the UK is undertaken in accordance with current British and European standards. Therefore, in undertaking the engineering design of the overhead line route, the siting of the pylons must account for the design parameters applicable to the route location and the design limitations of the pylons being utilised at each point.</p> <p>This places limits on the maximum (and minimum) span lengths and angles of deviation that can be utilised and as the position of one pylon can impact the siting of</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			<p>an adjacent pylon it is usually necessary to take a holistic view of the design rather than positioning each pylon in isolation from the position of adjacent pylons.</p> <p>It is also customary to avoid many deviations (changes in direction) in the route as this will necessitate the use of angle pylons, which are larger in size and heavier than the suspension pylons used in a straight line, and thus are more visually noticeable. Other design constraints on the positioning of pylons can include ground conditions, road/rail crossings, tall objects that might encroach within safety distances of the overhead line for example trees and structures.</p> <p>Whilst there is some flexibility in how to implement the engineering design this needs to be balanced against other project constraints. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider it practicable to involve third parties in the detailed designs and micro-siting of pylons, as this will be determined by many factors involving engineering and safety requirements, landowner requirements as well as environmental constraints.</p>
C.16 to C18	Cable corridors, temporary access routes and compounds	Cable corridors, associated temporary access routes and compound areas should avoid sensitive features such as landscape features, habitats and public and private amenity site.	The RCS [APP-163] and the COR [APP-164] provide evidence on the environmental considerations that were considered during the option appraisal, including the cable routing. Further evidence is provided in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered [APP-071]. The ES has considered the location of compound areas and temporary access routes and the impacts have been assessed in the relevant ES Chapters. Where impacts cannot be avoided, these have been assessed within the ES (Volume 6.2 of the application for development consent) and mitigation provided where required.
C.19 to C22	Design and landscaping of substations and CSE compounds	<p>Whilst it is recognised that the design of the majority of the infrastructure for this project will be shaped by engineering necessity, the Applicant should identify any elements that are capable, in principle, of design treatment.</p> <p>The landscape design should seek to integrate the components as far as possible into the fabric of the landscape.</p> <p>Lighting should wherever possible be eliminated or minimised. Where lighting is necessary, light spill and sky glow should be effectively controlled.</p>	<p>The design presented in the ES has taken into account existing environmental features. The planting proposals shown on LEMP Appendix B: Vegetation Reinstatement Plan (<b>document 7.8.2 (B)</b>) take into account the fabric of the landscape.</p> <p>As described in ES Chapter 4: Project Description [APP-072], permanent lighting would be limited to security lighting at the GSP substation, which would be motion-sensor activated and only triggered in exceptional circumstances.</p>

# 18. Applicant’s Comments on Annexes D to F (Traffic and Transport)

## 18.1 Introduction

- 18.1.1 This section provides the Applicant’s comments on Annexes D to F (D - Traffic and Transport Chapter 12, Detailed Comments, 2023; E – Traffic and Transport, Chapter 12, Short Description of the Local Highway Network within the Study Area, 2023; F – Traffic and Transport, Chapter 12, Review of Site Accesses, 2023). As per the comments on Chapter 12 of the Councils LIR, some paragraphs have been considered as not requiring a response owing to being just for information or leading into a comment for resolution. These are detailed here (paragraph D.2, D.5, D.19, D.20, D.23, D.25, D.31, D.36, D.40, D.42, D.53, D.54, D.55, D.56, D.57, D.62, D.64, D.71, D.79, D.97, D.117). In doing so, this accounts for the gaps in numbering presented in the table below. Specifically in relation to paragraph D59 (a and b) these relate to National Guidance, whilst D.61 (a-f) relate to Local Guidance for which the Applicant has no comment.
- 18.1.2 The Applicant has no comments in relation to Table D1: Comments on Assumptions made in the Transport Assessment. This is because the Council Requirements to Address have been captured through Table 17.1 in respective paragraphs. Annex E provides a short description of local highway network within the study area. Annex F includes the Council’s review of site accesses. The Applicant has no comment to make on either of these annexes, but welcome the contributions provided.

## 18.2 Comments Table

Table 18.1 – Applicant’s Comments on Annexes D to F (Traffic and Transport) of the Host Authorities LIR

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant’s Comments
D.1	Pre-commencement activities	Pre-commencement: The Councils are concerned that although these activities are covered by Management Plans dDCO Requirement 4 (3) it is unclear if the final versions of these plans would be approved before these works start.	The Applicant has submitted updated Management Plans at Deadline 3. If the Councils have further comments to make on the updated management plans, comments should submit into Examination for the Applicant to consider before the close of Examination.
D.3	Pre-commencement activities	Pre-commencement operations: It is unclear what works are required and what transport movements will be generated for these works, for example haulage of aggregate for compound hardstanding.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.18 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant’s comments on this point.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.4	Pre-commencement activities	It is unclear if temporary means solely for pre-commencement works or if this refers to the temporary access in schedule 8.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.19 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.6	Article 11: Street Works	The Councils would consider that 56 days is a more suitable period for notifying the applicant of any decision in respect to street works, the Councils also consider that this period should be paused if the LHA considers that additional information is reasonably required to make a decision.	The Applicant notes that a substantially similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraphs 12.20 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point. Reference should also be made to 17.16 to 17.19 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.7	NRSWA	The Councils cannot agree with removing powers under part 56 (power to give direction regarding timing of street works) by undertaking works without the consent of the local highway authority, as this unacceptably fetters its role co-ordinating street works. The Councils would accept this being managed through the street works permit process.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.1 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.8	NRSWA	The Councils would also find disapplication of Part 73C (materials, workmanship and standard of resurfacing) and section 77 (liability for cost of use of alternative route) if no alternative protective provisions or highways side agreement are agreed. It is noted that whilst article 13 is the same as that in the Sizewell C order 2022 this applicant entered into a deed of obligation that protected the LHA position with regard to these and other matters	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.22 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.9	Article 14: Power to alter street layout	The statement in (1) 'that the undertaker may, without the consent of the street authority, and for the purposes of carrying out the authorised development, permanently or temporarily alter the layout of, or carry out any works in, a street specified in column (1) of Part 1 or 2 of Schedule 6 (streets subject to alteration of layout) in the manner specified in relation to that street in column (2)' appears to contradict requirement 11 that 'no work to construct, alter or temporarily alter any new or existing means of access to a highway to be used by vehicular traffic may commence until written details of design, layout and reinstatement of that means of access has been submitted to and approved by the relevant highway authority'. The Councils would welcome further clarification to avoid any confusion during the delivery of this project (if consented).	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.23 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.10	Article 15: Temporary Stopping Up of Streets and Rights of Way	Temporary Stopping Up of Streets and Rights of Way – The Councils would also like to understand what the definition of ‘any reasonable time’ is with respect to stopping up the highway.	The Applicant notes that a substantially similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraphs 17.20 to 17.21 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 14 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.11	Article 15: Temporary Stopping Up of Streets and Rights of Way	The Councils would like an explanation as to why the roads cannot be ‘closed’ to traffic rather than ‘stopped up’ as the latter implies removal of all highway rights. In addition, the Councils would like to understand the difference between managed temporary stopped up streets and those that are not managed.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.25 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.12	Article 15: Temporary Stopping Up of Streets and Rights of Way	The impacts of this are difficult to ascertain as duration or coincidence of the closures or the diversion routes have not been provided. Whilst the local highway authority accepts that diversions should not be a higher standard, nor should they be a lower, unacceptable standard. The Councils would also like to understand what the definition of ‘any reasonable time’ is with respect to stopping up the highway.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.24 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.13	Article 15: Temporary Stopping Up of Streets and Rights of Way	The Councils note that on 15(6) the applicant uses ‘closed streets’ and ‘streets of public rights of way to be stopped up’ (Schedule 7) as if they are the same. The Councils seek clarification as its understanding is that a ‘closed’ street or rights of way restricts vehicle rights but protects other highway rights whereas a ‘stopped up’ street is no longer a public highway.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.25 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.14	Article 15: Temporary Stopping Up of Streets and Rights of Way	The Councils would consider that 56-days is a more suitable period for notifying the applicant of any decision in respect to an application for consent to close a highway right of way.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.20 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.15	Article 16: Access to works	Access to works – It is also unclear if this power is applicable to accesses that may be required for pre-commencement, the impacts of which may not be included in assessment or covered by Management Plans.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.26 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.16	Article 17: Construction, alteration and	Construction, alteration and maintenance of streets	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.27 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
	maintenance of streets		
D.17	Article 17: Construction, alteration and maintenance of streets	In respect to statutory defence (HA 1980 section 58) the local highway authority would consider its Highway Maintenance Operational Plan to be a minimum standard	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.28 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.18	Article 18: Agreements with street authorities	The Councils welcome inclusion of this article and would strongly recommend that the applicant enter into agreements with the authority to formalise highway issues to avoid disagreement at a later date. This follows the president of EA1(N), EA2 and SZC.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.29 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D21 (a-h)	Article 18: Agreements with street authorities	The Applicant will not undertake any works to any highway or highway asset that is the responsibility of LHA until a PPA has been agreed with the Councils which will allow the Councils to recover reasonable costs.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraphs 17.79 to 17.83 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 14 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.22	Article 18: Agreements with street authorities	Notwithstanding the above, the LHA is not unreasonably refused access to inspect or maintain the highway in accordance with its duties.	Article 12(1) of the dDCO gives effect to the Suffolk County Council Permit Scheme Order 2020 (and indeed The Essex County Council Permit Scheme Order 2015 (SI 2015/37) (as varied by The Essex County Council (Permit Scheme) (Variation) Order 2015)) in connection with the construction and maintenance of the project, subject to the qualifications in paragraphs (2) and (3) of that Article.  The Applicant notes that Paragraph 17 of the Permit Scheme addresses the position in respect of the undertaking of inspections of works carried out pursuant to the same.
D.24	Article 47: Traffic Regulation	The applicant should ensure that any traffic regulation is signed to the satisfaction of the local highway authority and chief officer of police (or other enforcing agency noting that in Suffolk parking enforcement has been devolved to district / borough authorities).	The Applicant confirms that signing proposals are part of the design which will be subject to approval by the Local Highways Authority before the relevant work commences.
D.26	Schedule 3: Requirements	Requirement 4: CTMP should be discharged by the local highway authority not the local planning authority (note that (3) refers to discharging requirements not entering into a highway agreement e.g. HA 1980 s278).	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.32 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.27	Schedule 3: Requirements	Requirement 7 constrains some working hours to between 0700 and 1900 on weekdays. This informs the assessment of traffic impacts, but as vehicle movements are not controlled within the	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.33 of the LIR. Please therefore refer

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		management plans nor have the impacts that have been assessed within those hours and so those impacts are not agreed.	to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.28	Schedule 4: Discharge of Requirements	Schedule 4: Discharge of Requirements – SCC as local highway authority would seek specific fees to cover its costs consenting and inspecting highway works.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraphs 17.79 to 17.83, 17.84 and D21 (a-h) of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 14 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.29	Schedule 5: Streets Subject to Street Works	Schedule 5: Street Subject to Street Works – The Councils have not yet checked the schedules against the street gazetteer for accuracy but notes that significant errors were identified when checking the location of accesses and their description against the street gazetteer.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.31 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.30	Schedule 6: Streets subject to alteration of layout	Schedule 6: Streets subject to alteration of layout – Mentions 'white' lines, not road markings which may prevent implementation of parking or other traffic restrictions (I.e. yellow lines)	All references to 'white lines' in Column 2 of Part 1 and Part 2 of Schedule 6 have been amended to refer instead to 'road markings'.
D.32	Schedule 6: Streets subject to alteration of layout	Schedule 7: Part 1 – If road closures coincide with each other some diversion routes may use the same roads. How will this be managed?	The scheduling of temporary closures, including avoidance of conflicting impacts on sections of the network, is a matter for the Main Works Contractor in liaison with Local Highways Authorities.
D.33	Schedule 7: Part 2. Streets or Public Rights of Way to be Temporarily Stopped up for which no Diversion is to be Provided	Schedule 7: Part 2 – The Councils question the use of the term 'stopped up' rather than 'road closed'. See comments under article 15.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.25 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.34	Schedule 7: Part 2. Streets or Public Rights of Way to be Temporarily Stopped up for which no	Schedule 7: Part 2 - The Councils have not yet checked the schedules against the street gazetteer for accuracy but notes that significant errors were identified when checking the location of accesses and their description against the street gazetteer.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.31 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
	Diversion is to be Provided		
D.35	Schedule 7: Part 4: Prohibition of overtaking	Schedule 7: Part 4 – The local highway authority are not sure why this is required or will be enforced?	The Applicant would welcome clarification on this point, noting that Schedule 7 does not include a Part 4.
D.37	Schedule 12: Traffic Regulation Orders	Part 1: The proposed parking restrictions are between 7am to 7pm which aligns with the shift patterns but potentially not with ALL movements. Note these will be single yellow lines with signs or traffic cones. The Councils would question why these are required. In the case of obstruction, this is a criminal act that can be enforced whereas a parking offence is now decriminalised and enforced by the district councils on behalf of the LHA. If parking restrictions are implemented, the Councils would recommend that where these start or end at a junction a distance of 10m from the junction in all directions is covered by the restrictions to ensure compliance with the Highway Code. It is unclear if these restrictions include loading or unloading.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.35 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.38	Schedule 12: Traffic Regulation Orders	Part 3: Temporary Restriction of Movement. One-way movements on the A0171, B1070, B1068, A134, B1508, A131 would be unacceptable to the local highway authority unless implemented overnight with an acceptable diversion.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.36 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.39	Schedule 12: Traffic Regulation Orders	Note: The Councils have not yet checked the schedules against the street gazetteer for accuracy but notes that significant errors were identified when checking the location of accesses and their description against the street gazetteer.	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.31 and D.29 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.41	Schedule 14: Protective Provisions	The Councils are seeking either protective provisions or suitable side agreements to ensure that its role as the highway authority is not compromised. Side agreements are an accepted part of recent DCOs (e.g., Sizewell C, EA1(N), EA2, Sunnica).	The Applicant notes that a similar comment was raised by the Councils in paragraph 12.37 of the LIR. Please therefore refer to Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ) which sets out the Applicant's comments on this point.
D.43	Drawings/plans	Drawings 2.11.12 - Bellmouth drawing [APP-030]. The Councils note that the bellmouth drawing [APP-030] is very generic and makes no allowance for the nature of the existing highway.	Please see the Applicant's comments on paragraph 12.39 and 12.40 in Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.44	Drawings/plans	Drawings 2.11.12 - Bellmouth drawing [APP-030]. No swept path analysis to show that the junction is suitable for the largest anticipated vehicle has been provided noting this is also dependant on the width of the existing road. Nor have the junctions on the access routes been assessed for suitability for construction vehicles, if any improvements re required and if these can be delivered within the highway boundary.	Please see the Applicant's comments on paragraph 12.40 in Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.45	Drawings/plans	Drawings 2.11.12 - Bellmouth drawing [APP-030] - Layers are usually stepped rather than sloped. Nor would the construction be practical for placing a geotextile on a slope as shown (section B-B). Without some form of transverse edge restraint, the transition from bound to unbound pavement in section C-C is likely to deteriorate quickly.	Please see the Applicant's comments on paragraph 12.39 and 40 in Section 9 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.46	Drawings/plans	Drawings 2.11.12 - Bellmouth drawing [APP-030] - The use of AC 20 material may be acceptable for short duration use but as it is not designed as a surfacing material lacks surface texture and skid resistance whilst being prone to fretting or spalling due to weather and traffic.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.39 and 12.40 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.47	Drawings/plans	Drawings 2.11.12 - Bellmouth drawing [APP-030] - Position of gates needs to be shown. These are usually located an appropriate distance from the highway so that the largest type of vehicle likely to use the junction can safely pull entirely off the highway. For the same reason gates should open into the site.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.39 and 12.40 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.48	Drawings/plans	Drawings 2.11.12 - Bellmouth drawing [APP-030] - No details are given regarding levels and / or drainage. Appropriate drainage shall be provided to avoid water, mud or other debris flowing or being trafficked onto the highway.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.39 and 12.40) of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.49	Drawings/plans	Drawings 2.11.12 - Bellmouth drawing [APP-030] - Highway boundary details are required where the order limits do not include the highway to avoid a requirement for visibility splays to be across third party land.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.39 and 12.40 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.50	Drawings/plans	2.11.14 Temporary Culvert for Access [APP-032] - Pipe surround should be specified. Usually at least the bed should be self-compacting.	The plan shows the pipe to be bedded and surrounded in granular material, e.g. stone to give minimum cover.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.51	Drawings/plans	2.11.14 Temporary Culvert for Access [APP-032] - Note that consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) will be required for permanent or temporary culverting of ditches.	In accordance with Table 2.1 of the CEMP ( <b>document 7.5(B)</b> ) the Applicant will apply for Ordinary Watercourse Consents from the LLFA for works to ordinary watercourses where works have the potential to impede flow.
D.52	Drawings/plans	2.11.1 Design and Layout Plans: GSP Substation Layout [APP-019]	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.41 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.58	Transport Assessment	Transport Assessment [APP-061] National Guidance. Enhanced consideration that needs to be given towards sustainable transport, as set out at paragraphs 5.14.7 and 5.14.21.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.44 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.60	Transport Assessment	Transport Assessment [APP-061] National Guidance. The Councils note the applicant does not refer to NPS EN-1 5.13.10: 'Waterborne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the project, where cost-effective'	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.48 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.63	Local Guidance	Draft DCO Requirement 7 paragraph 2.3.1	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.42 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.65	Local Guidance	Paragraph 2.5.1 Transport Assessment [APP-091]	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.43 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.66	Local Guidance	Paragraph 5.2.1 identified that growth was forecast using TEMPRO, at a high level this is considered reasonable; however, there is concern that if further assessment is needed at specific junctions, then further consideration of the specific impacts of large scale development in that area, may need to be undertaken.	As set out in section 5.2 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061], committed developments were reviewed as the first step in defining the future baseline. This review indicated that it is likely that there would be some limited increases in baseline traffic flows due to new development in certain areas but concluded that Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPRO) was an appropriate basis for the definition of future baseline traffic flows.
D.67	Local Guidance	Whilst it is recognised that limited information is available, the absence of consideration of impacts of East Anglia GREEN does mean that the potential exists for unassessed impacts, particularly if the works were to slip by 12 months.	Noted. The Applicant will continue to engage with proposed developments in proximity to the project. As indicated in section 5.2 of the Transport Assessment [APP-061], no information on construction impacts associated with the Norwich to Tilbury project (formerly known as East Anglia GREEN) was available at the point of Transport Assessment authoring.
D.68	Local Guidance	Paragraph 6.2.5 of Transport Assessment	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.49 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.69	Local Guidance	Paragraph 6.2.8 of Transport Assessment	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.50 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.70	Car occupancy	Paragraph 6.2.9 of Transport Assessment	A response has already been provided in paragraphs 12.51 to 12.54 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.72	Car occupancy	It is difficult to corroborate the figures provided at Table 6.1 and Table 6.2 of the Transport Assessment with the outputs shown on Figure 7 for Traffic Flow diagrams. This is partly because of the merging of LGV movements with staff vehicle movements. It would be beneficial if greater clarity was provided by the Applicant on this. With such uncertainty, the Councils would also recommend that the numbers of vehicles assessed is included as a cap to clarify this matter and provide conformation that the assessed values will not be exceeded.	Further details on the breakdown of construction vehicles and staff vehicles on the network during peak hours was provided by the Applicant during ISH1 (see Table 4.1 – Item 5.1(i) 'Scope of the TA' in <b>[REP1-024]</b> ). Also see response provided in paragraph 12.4 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.73	Calculation of transport movements	The application does not include details of how the numbers of movements have been calculated to enable the authority to review these calculations and examine the sensitivity of the numbers to change, such as concentration of the construction program or coincident of a number of activity peaks. A key principle of the application is that the final construction details will only be known once a contractor is appointed. Therefore, it is imperative that controls are placed on vehicle movements to ensure that these do not exceed those assessed in the ES and Transport Assessment.	See response provided in paragraph 12.4 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.74	Calculation of transport movements	It would have been helpful to the Councils to see a daily profile of construction traffic to better understand the impacts on the local network. A cumulative total of HGVs would also assist in considering the potential impacts on the structural condition of local highway.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.4 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.75	Capacity Modelling	Section 6.3 and 7.3 provides details on the junction capacity assessment methodology, given that the Councils do not agree with the elements of determining the development impact, it is not possible to comment on the junction modelling method.	Noted – further information would be required on the referenced elements that the Councils do not agree with before the Applicant could respond.
D.76	Capacity Modelling	As the assessment method is not agreed, the conclusions on impacts on the bus network as set out at Section 7.4 cannot be agreed.	Noted – further information would be required on why the assessment method is not agreed before the Applicant could respond.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.77	Road Safety	<p>Areas of concern to the Councils are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A) A1071 from the Beagle Roundabout to the east of the bends near Hintlesham Hall including a potential cluster near the junction of the A1071 and the Timperleys in Hintlesham.</li> <li>B) A1071 Hadleigh Bypass including the Aldham Mill Hill and A1141 junctions.</li> <li>C) A134 / B1187 Bear Street junction in Nayland.</li> </ul>	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.8 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.80	Transport Assessment	The assessment is built on a large number of assumptions without evidence or controls that support those assumptions, and so it is impossible to agree with the conclusions reached.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.54 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.81	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	Paragraph 12.4.11 and paragraph 12.4.12 references traffic count surveys that have been undertaken. No outputs from these surveys have been provided, and as they form the basis for the conclusions of the assessment; those conclusions cannot be agreed. Speed surveys at access locations would aid decision making when considering the design of the access, particularly the visibility splays.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.55 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.82	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	Paragraph 12.4.20 refers to the ES Appendix 4.2: Construction Schedule [APP-091]. This schedule impacts on the conclusions regarding the impacts of construction traffic, as the details provided are exceptionally limited and no information that shows the relationships between construction activities and construction vehicle movements is provided; this cannot be checked.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.56 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.83	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	Paragraph 12.4.21 references the core working hours for construction and Requirement 7 of the draft DCO; this requirement sets out the maximum working hours and does not control the working hours within the 12-hour period to those assessed within the Environmental Statement. This would particularly impact any assessment of the hour of greatest change, but this assessment has not taken place. The assessment of impacts on the basis of these shift patterns is not agreed.	Noted – further information would be required on why the assessment is not agreed before the Applicant could respond.
D.84	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and	Paragraph 12.4.26 refers to a peak staff number of 350 and an average of 180. There are no controls on this assumption, and so	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.57 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
	Transport [APP-080]	it is not agreed. As a result the potential exists for construction traffic impacts to exceed those assessed.	
D.85-D.89	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080] - All locations need to be considered at a local level on a case-by-case basis, and so the Councils will look to identify those locations where we disagree with the Applicant and where it materially impacts on outcomes rather than cause delay by debating the idiosyncrasies of methodology. The Councils have previously requested that a plan be provided showing the link sensitivities; and this has not been provided making any review very difficult and the potential for confusion and misunderstanding more likely.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.58 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.90	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080] paragraph 12.4.31 identifies the criteria used for assessing impacts on WCH journey length; again, these are based on LA 112 which presents concerns to the Councils.	It remains the Applicant's view that the DMRB is appropriate guidance for assessing the construction traffic and transport impacts of a linear infrastructure project such as the Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement (and has been used on other consented linear infrastructure projects such as the Richborough Connection project). The project has similar characteristics in this regard to the construction of a new road scheme (for example the location of construction site compounds, traffic generated on the LRN and temporary closures of PRoW).
D.91	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080] paragraph 12.4.34 sets out the methodology for assessing severance. However, as this is only applied to the downgrading of severance, and it remains somewhat unclear how increases in severance have been assessed. (The methodology) As a high-level rule does not appear unreasonable, again noting that it would need to be considered on a case by case basis.	<p>The magnitude of impact categories used in the assessment are set out in ES Appendix 5.4: Assessment Criteria [APP-096] Table 1.2. It is noted that no quantifiable thresholds were provided for the assessment of 'WCH severance'. To clarify, the following traffic flow percentage change categories were applied to initially define magnitude of impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Large: &gt;60% change</li> <li>● Medium: 30-60% change</li> <li>● Small: 15-30% change</li> <li>● Negligible: &lt;15% change</li> </ul> <p>Magnitude of impact was then subsequently downgraded on two roads (Church Road, Twinstead and Rands Road) where the absolute change in daily traffic due to the project was forecast to be very low. This is documented in ES Appendix 12.1 [APP-134] Table 3.1. Significance of Effect was then</p>

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			defined for each road section from the Magnitude of Impact category and the Receptor Sensitivity ratings in Table 3.1 using the matrix in Illustration 5.1 in ES Chapter 5 [APP-073].
D.92	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	Paragraph 12.4.43 provides a summary on the assumptions within the assessment on construction vehicles. There are concerns with how these assumptions may have impacted the assessment. Particularly that the shift patterns will remain consistent across the year, which results in limited peak hour impacts and that no data is provided that evidence the construction projects traffic generation, nor importantly no controls committed to that limit the impacts, which is discussed much further in our comments on Construction Management Plan. As no data is provided, the use of 12.5% uplift on construction, whilst welcome, is difficult to comment on its potential to address variation.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.59 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.93	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	Paragraph 12.4.44 provides a summary on the assumptions within the assessment on staff construction vehicles. There are concerns with how these assumptions may have impacted the assessment. Particularly that the shift patterns will remain consistent across the year, which results in limited peak hour impacts and that no data is provided that evidence the construction projects traffic generation. The assessment is based on 70% of staff travelling between the site and overnight accommodation by minibus (four staff members per minibus), and there is no evidence that supports this assessment method nor is any commitment included to achieve this form of mode share, which is discussed much further in our comments on Construction Management Plan.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.60 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.94	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	The assessment undertaken is purely based on daily traffic and not on the hour of greatest change. The Councils do not agree with this approach. The Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic set out that the detailed assessment of impacts is therefore likely to concentrate on the period during which the absolute level of a impacts is at its peak, as well as the hour at which the greatest level of change is likely to occur. As the most Bramford to Twinstead Local Impact Report Annexes Page 38 significant impacts occur in one-hour periods, the assessment of a 24-hour period significantly reduces the proportional change in traffic. The need to undertake an assessment of the hour of greatest change is consistent with other recent DCOs.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.61 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.95	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080] - The assessment does not take into consideration the impact of delays associated with any traffic management. Nor is this assessed in combination with other impacts to severance such as repeated PRow closures. It would be beneficial if a plan showing the total transport network closures is provided and the length of the closures to give an indication of the scale of the impact, which is very unclear.	As set out in the EIA Scoping Report [APP-156-158], thresholds based on EIA requirements for assessing air quality impacts of road schemes have been set for the assessment of any temporary road closures. None of the temporary road closures exceed the thresholds and therefore require any further assessment.  All PRow where the duration of individual closures is expected to be longer than two weeks are listed in Table 2.1 of ES Appendix 12.1 [APP-134]. This table lists out the number and duration of all expected closures.  The main works contractor will develop coordination proposals and works will be subject to notification and approval by the highway authorities affected.
D.96	ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [APP-080]	The Councils are also concerned about the impact of repeated closure and disruption to the highway and rights of way network recently and planned for the future. Such disruption reduces the value of the rights of way network in the long term by discouraging users.	A response has already been provided in D.32 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.98	ES Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-083]	Paragraph 15.4.14 references the consideration that a cumulative effect is only considered where both a spatial and temporal overlap exists. On this basis repeated staggered impacts on the transport network as a result of traffic management, closures to PRow, and road closures would not be considered a cumulative impact in spite of their repeated impact on users.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.64 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.99	ES Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-083] - paragraph 15.4.37	Paragraph 15.4.37 identified that growth was forecast using TEMPRO, at a high level this is considered reasonable; however, there is concern that if further assessment is needed of the junctions at west Ipswich of the A1214 / A1071 and B1113 then further consideration of the specific impacts of largescale development in that area, most notably Wolsey Grange, may need to be undertaken.	Cross reference to response provided in D.66 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.100	ES Chapter 15 Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-083] –	Paragraph 15.6.9 concludes for traffic and transport that there would not be a significant inter project cumulative effect on amenity as there would be no significant effects on the local road network, including delays and congestion and on PRow due to closures. As the Councils do not agree with the assessment method, we disagree with the conclusion. There are particular	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.65 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
	paragraph 15.6.9	concerns around the frequency and scale of closures and in particular temporary severance of the wider PRoW network.	
D.101	ES Appendix 4.2 Construction Schedule [APP-091]	Whilst helpful in showing which elements of the project would potentially be delivered commensurately, no details are provided within the schedule that link construction works to construction vehicle or staff numbers, which would have allowed the quoted figures to be at least partially reviewed. There is also some concern that, as the assessment is based on quarterly activities, there is significant scope for variation on the assessed impacts.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.66 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.102	ES Appendix 5.4 Assessment Criteria [APP-096]	Table 1.1 provides details on the assessment of receptor sensitivity, with regards to construction routes. At a high level the methodology for determining receptor sensitivity does not appear unreasonable when looking at the consideration of receptors, however, there are concerns when considering that only locations without footways can be considered high sensitivity, and only locations with narrow footways would be categorised as medium sensitivity. This does not reflect other recent DCOs. The Councils do not agree with the method. That being said all locations need to be considered at a local level on a case-by-case basis, and so the Councils will look to identify those locations where we disagree with the Applicant and where it materially impacts on outcomes rather than get bogged down in the idiosyncrasies of methodology.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.67 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.103	ES Appendix 5.4 Assessment Criteria [APP-096]— Table 1.2	Table 1.2 provides details on the assessment of magnitude of impacts. With regards to change in severance, there is very limited detail on how judgements have been made on changes, albeit it is assumed from Appendix 12.1 Traffic and Transport Significance Effects Tables [APP-134] that anything lower than 30% has been treated as small and anything lower than 15% as negligible. As a high-level rule this does not appear unreasonable, again noting that it would need to be considered on a case by case basis.	Cross reference to response provided in D.91 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.104	ES Appendix 5.4	ES Appendix 5.4 Assessment Criteria [APP-096] – With regards to change in pedestrian amenity, fear and intimidation, as a high level starting point the method used does not appear unreasonable, noting that it would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Noted – the criteria set out in Appendix 5.4 [APP-096] provided the starting point for the assessment. Each road location listed in Table 4.1 of ES Appendix 12.1 [APP-134] was reviewed to check the validity of the resultant Significance of Effect category.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.105	ES Appendix 12.1 Significance of Effects Tables [APP-134]	Section 3 provides details on the assessment of severance. As previously requested, a plan would have made reviewing the sensitivity of links much simpler, and would be beneficial.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.68 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.106	ES Appendix 12.1 Significance of Effects Tables [APP-134]	Limited detail is provided on why certain changes in traffic flows are categorised with the magnitude of impact identified; and further information on this would be beneficial to understanding the professional judgment used.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.68 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.107	ES Appendix 12.1 Significance of Effects Tables [APP-134]	Section 4 provides details on the impacts on amenity and fear and intimidation; given the majority of impacts are minor or neutral as a result of traffic changes, agreement on sensitivity is of limited value; however, as the Tables do not include an assessment of the hour of greatest change; this might affect any conclusions reached.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.69 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.108	ES Appendix 15.5 Inter Project Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-140]	When considering traffic and transport cumulative effects with the East Anglia Three, the A120 Widening scheme and the East Anglia Green projects, the Applicant has reached the conclusion that any impacts are limited due to the Applicant's assessed impacts in the peak hours. As the assessment method is not agreed this conclusion cannot be agreed. There is some potential for increases at Strategic Road Network junctions in particular as a result of the numerous projects in the area.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.70 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.109	ES Appendix 15.5 Inter Project Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-140]	The potential for a cumulative effect as a result of the Norwich to Tilbury (was East Anglia Green) project is dismissed due to the project's peak being two years prior to the anticipated start date for Norwich to Tilbury. Dismissal on this basis is not agreed, as it does not take into account any slippage in the project's programme, nor has any evidence been submitted that associated the programme with construction traffic, which might give some indication of potential overlap.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.71 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.110	Draft Statement of Common Ground	As Per ID 3.8.3, the Councils do not agree with the methodology used for assessing the impacts, which has been set out in detail within this response.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.72 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.111	Draft Statement of Common Ground	As per ID 3.13.11, the Councils do not agree with the methodology, commitment and measures set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.73 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.112-113	CEMP	Good Practice Measure TT02 sets out that the contractor would be required to install GPS tracking on the Heavy Goods Vehicles to check for compliance with the authorised construction routes. It appears that those authorised construction routes would be agreed between the Applicant and the contractor without input or scrutiny by any other stakeholder. This is not considered to be acceptable.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.74 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.114	CTMP	The CTMP should be approved by the local highway authority, specifically any changes (1.2.5)	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.32 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.115	CTMP	It is stated that contractor will be responsible for implementing measures in CTMP (1.3.1 and 3.1.1). The Councils consider this does not remove the ultimate responsibility for the applicant to ensure compliance of all measures in the CTMP and this is not made clear in the document. In Table 3.1 the only National Grid role is that of Environmental Clerk of Works. It should be clear who in the applicant's organisation (National Grid) is ultimately responsible for compliance with the CTMP and other management plans.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.76 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.116	CTMP	If pre DCO commencement works take place under other planning regimes there must be a clear boundary between measures applicable to such works to those permitted in the DCO. The Councils would be concerned that using a number of different consenting processes could lead to fragmentary consideration of the impacts. The Councils have expressed concerns that pre commencement works are not managed by many of the management plans, for example, the CTMP. Experience has shown (EA1(N) and SZC) that pre-commencement works can generate traffic that has an impact on local roads and issues can arise such as delivery of safe accesses for these works including unforeseen vegetation removal or trimming.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.77 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.118	CTMP	Table 4.1 provides a response to comments raised on the DRAFT CTMP.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.78 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.119	CTMP	At Table 4.1, the Applicant considers it impractical and unnecessary to provide details on workers attending the site. However, the applicant does not consider it impractical and unnecessary to record details of the workers and visitors attending site on a daily basis. In the CTMP 7.3.5 the applicant states that staff will be required to sign in and out of each location and be issued permits to parking so such information will be available. The Councils note that other NSIP projects do provide the number of workers on a daily basis. Without attendance data it will be impossible to show that the workforce remains within that assessed in the EA and TA and that key embedded mitigation such as adherence to agreed shift times is realised.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.80 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.120	CTMP	CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ) - The Councils maintain that it should be discharging authority for the CTMP as per other recent DCOs.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.32 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.121	CTMP	Paragraph 5.4.7 makes reference to the booking system, including recording and timing of all HGVs and LGVs. It is reasonable to assume that these movements on this basis can be controlled and that there should be a requirement to report these movements.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.85 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.122	CTMP	Paragraph 7.2.2 identifies that it is “anticipated that the mobile gangs will travel together to and from their accommodation each working day in a minibus” and on this basis the minibus is an assumption rather than a commitment and so the assessment cannot be considered to be worst case	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.87 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.123	CTMP	Paragraph 7.2.4 makes reference to inspections and site visits; the Councils would query whether these movements between the site areas are included in the assessment.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.88 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.124	CTMP	Paragraph 7.3.1 sets out that “it is anticipated that the contractor will undertake a staff travel survey” and that it is “anticipated that the results of the staff travel survey will inform the setting of project specific requirements”. Clearly this does not form a commitment to undertake a travel survey, nor does it form a commitment to set targets. That being said, the Councils expect a commitment within the travel plan for the staff travel movements to achieve those car share proportions assessed in order for the project to reflect policy on sustainable travel patterns, and to limit impacts to those assessed within the Environmental Statement.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.89 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.125	CTMP	Paragraph 7.3.3 sets out that “it is anticipated that travel advice will be issued to visitors upon making appointments” and as such this does not contain a commitment. It is reasonable to expect the Applicant to commit to travel planning in the form of providing information to visitors.	The Applicant agrees that information provision to visitors can assist in compliance with travel plan but with small likely numbers it is not considered that this requires a formal commitment. Deliveries and staff travel are covered on secured route network and travel planning respectively, and these cover the overwhelming majority of travel.
D.126	CTMP	The commitment to promoting car sharing is welcome; however, the Councils expect vehicle car share figures to match those used in the assessment based on the high proportion of minibus users (i.e., 30% X 1no. person per vehicle and 70% x by 4no. persons per vehicle = 3.1 persons per vehicle). This should form a target with associated monitoring and controls rather than the 1.3 car share target, which includes little in the way of monitoring nor commitment towards remedial action.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.90 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.127	CTMP	The Councils welcome the commitment towards reviewing the travel survey for local pick-up and drop-off points to achieve higher proportions of car share and facilitate some good travel patterns.	The Applicant thanks the Councils for their support for this element.
D.128	CTMP	Paragraph 7.3.10 refers to an assumption that the main parking compound will hold 50 spaces. There is no assessment if these spaces will cater for the assessed demand nor any actual commitment to provide the spaces, nor any commitment to the permit scheme identified.	The assumption is based on comparable other projects and considered to cover likely required provision. A reasonable assumption has been made based on experience and engineering judgement that 30% of the workforce would travel to site by car. As detailed in Section 6 ‘Travel Plan’ of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6(B)</b> ), parking would be situated at site compounds for members of the workforce travelling to site in their own / a shared vehicle, including at the main compound located off the A134 at Leavenheath. A worst-case figure has been taken for car occupancy, which has been used to generate a worst-case traffic flow forecast and parking requirements.
D.129	CTMP	Paragraph 7.4.1 sets out that “it is anticipated that a baseline travel survey will be undertaken whilst paragraph 7.4.2 sets out that “it is anticipated that the contractor will undertake quarterly reviews following the three-month audit period”. There is no commitment to achieve sustainable travel patterns, nor any control over changes made to the Construction Traffic Management Plan to reflect new targets. The highway authorities should approve any changes made to targets. The Councils	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.91 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).



Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		require commitment to achieving the travel patterns assessed to reflect policy on sustainable travel patterns, and to limit impacts to those assessed within the Environmental Statement. At Paragraph 7.4.3 there should be a commitment to provide a copy of the report to the relevant highway authorities once it is available rather than on request.	
D.130	CTMP	Whilst recognising the need to make the project more sustainable by reducing single occupancy car journeys for workers. The preference of the Councils is that non-compliance or complaint such as HGVs diverting from agreed routes or exceedance of daily movements is report to the local highway authority and local planning authority as soon as practical.	In response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ). This is secured so that non-conformance with defined construction routes in CTMP would be a breach of the consented proposals.
D.131	CTMP	Paragraph 8.2.5 sets out that HGVs will be tracked for the construction routes using GPS data. It appears that those authorised construction routes would be agreed between the Applicant and the contractor. This is not considered to be acceptable. The routes should be agreed through any updates to the Construction Traffic Management Plan, which should be discharged by the relevant highway authorities. It is also worth noting that this mechanism would mean that the Applicant would know all HGV movements that travel to from the site, making monitoring and reporting of total movements and timing of movements possible. The paragraph also refers to changes to traffic level that are higher than the CTMP assumptions. Clarity should be provided on what these assumptions are.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.92 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.132	CTMP	The Councils' opinion is that the CTMP any subsequent changes should be approved by the local highway authority, in consultation with local planning authority.	Should be referenced against D.114 and paragraph 12.32 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.133	AIL	The application should prove that they have a feasible route from a port of origin and the relevant site access. This includes proving that highway structures are capable of bearing the anticipated loads. This may require surveys or investigation of structures where such information is dated or not available and, if necessary, repairs or temporary works to these structures. The applicant is expected to agree the scope of any such investigations or works and cover the LHA's reasonable costs in approving these. Contrary to the applicants comments the local highway authority is not under any obligation to maintain structures for loads greater	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.95 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		than those legally permitted (i.e., 44 tonnes). At the time of writing, SCC has placed temporary restrictions for STGO movements on a number of structures in the Bramford area. Pressure on funding has resulted in weight limits being implemented on highway structures at short notice (e.g., A1088 Stowlangtoft).	
D.134-136	Special Order Movements/AIL	Shunt reactors delivered to Bramford (access AB-AP1), Cable Drums – Dedham Vale East CSE Compound off Rands Road (access D-AP2), Dedham Vale West CSE compound off A134 Nayland Road, Leavenheath (access F-AP6), Stour Valley East CSE Compound off B1508 St Edmunds Hill (access G-AP4). The applicant has not provided a point of origin so it cannot demonstrate compliance with the 'nearest port'.	<p>The port(s) to be used for the project will only be defined once a main works contractor is appointed and material orders placed.</p> <p>The geographical boundaries used to define the TA [APP-061] includes all roads that have been identified as construction routes for the project between the Strategic Road Network and the construction access points which are illustrated on the Access, Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation Plans [APP-012].</p> <p>The assessment results are provided in Chapter 7 and Appendix E of the TA [APP-061]. This assessment concluded that project construction traffic would not have a substantial impact on the SRN, even with substantial contingency built into the forecast traffic numbers. As such, it is the Applicant's view that it is not necessary to define where the port is, rather it is the route from the SRN to the construction access point which is defined.</p>
D.137	Special Order Movements/AIL	The applicant has not identified the access locations for these loads, but as they are necessary for construction of the piles, CSE compounds, substations and temporary bridges it appears a significant number of accesses and routes to them will be involved. In addition, low loaders required for transporting construction equipment such as excavators or dumper trucks, including during the pre-commencement phase, may be classed as STGO.	In response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ).
D.138	Special Order Movements/AIL	The Councils are concerned that the lack of detail does not make it possible for the LHA to assess the potential impacts of the AIL movements.	In response to the feedback received from the Councils, the Applicant has added the proposed construction routes to Appendix A of the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ).
D.139	Special Order Movements/AIL	The Transport Assessment 2.2.4 states that D-AP2, F-AP6 and G-AP4 will be used as AIL accesses. The Councils seek clarification as whether in this statement the applicant is referring to AILs as defined as special order movements or all AILs including STGO.	These are all movements of vehicles larger than C&U extents.

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.140	Special Order Movements/AIL	The Councils maintain their structures on a risk-based approach dependent on the size, structural form and routes carried by assets. Future restrictions based on Special Order, Special Type General Order and Construction & Use categories are likely to be placed on local highway structures.	The Applicant requests the Councils to share details of all affected structures on the proposed construction routes.
D.141	Special Order Movements/AIL	In accordance with the asset management principles SCC undertakes detailed inspections, Structural Reviews and Assessments on a number of strategically important assets every year. The risk of structures being or becoming weaker applies to both the construction and operational phase of the project.	Noted, the Applicant requests the Councils to urgently share details of all such affected structures as soon as they become known to have such problems.
D.142	Special Order Movements/AIL	The Applicant has not demonstrated whether highway structures in the area adjacent to the substation at Bramford nor the Sealing End Compounds can carry appropriate heavy loads. Each individual load will be assessed immediately prior to its movements and there will be no strategic consideration of a resilient route to the site either during the construction phase nor the operational phase.	All structures have been assumed to have adequacy to carry C&U loading unless advised otherwise. The Councils are requested to urgently share any information indicating known constraints.
D.143	Special Order Movements/AIL	The Councils are aware that a number of structures, for example the rail bridge on the B1113 at Claydon have deteriorated and are now subject to weight limitations. Therefore, at this time uncertainty remains whether AILs can access the site.	All structures have been assumed to have adequacy to carry C&U loading unless advised otherwise. The Councils are requested to urgently share any information indicating known constraints.
D.144	Special Order Movements/AIL	There are several small bridges and culverts that are proposed to be crossed by vehicles during the construction works where it is unclear whether the structure has capacity to withstand the loading of vehicles proposed.	All structures have been assumed to have adequacy to carry C&U loading unless advised otherwise. The Councils are requested to urgently share any information indicating known constraints.
D.145	Special Order Movements/AIL	Section 5.3 includes reference to the Special Types General Orders that will be required for the project, and it is noted that the shunt reactors and Super Grid Transformers will require police escorts. The Councils would recommend reaching agreement with the constabulary on resourcing given that numerous local NSIPs that will require police escorts.	A response has already been provided in at paragraph 12.83 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.146	Special Order Movements/AIL	The applicant claims in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (5.2.1) that pre-construction surveys have been undertaken on routes that are anticipated to be used by AILs. Discussions are ongoing but the highlevel survey have indicated that some structures have restrictions that would limit or prevent AIL movements. The Councils consider that further structural	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.98 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
		investigations are necessary together with swept path analysis at junctions or pinch points to show that there are feasible routes to the site accesses.	
D.147	Special Order Movements/AIL	Section 5.3 includes reference to the Special Types General Orders that will be required for the project, and it is noted that the shunt reactors and Super Grid Transformers will require police escorts. The Councils would recommend reaching agreement with the constabulary on resourcing given that numerous local NSIPs that will require police escorts.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.83 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.148	Temporary accesses	The Councils' position is that the Applicant must provide sufficient unambiguous information to enable the ExA to judge if the proposals are feasible, safe and deliverable for the purpose of the examination and for the Councils to assess if they are acceptable within the local highway network. The Councils acknowledge that such information should be proportionate but also that the dDCO grants significant powers to the Applicant. Experience with other DCOs and planning applications has shown that not considering this matter in sufficient detail can result in significant problems with delivery.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.99 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.149	Temporary accesses	Specific Comments on Temporary Accesses – A common theme is the lack of detail to demonstrate that the accesses are feasible and deliverable.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.39 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.150	Temporary accesses	The applicant should not assume that because an access is in use that it will be suitable to the change or intensification of use during the construction phase. Many, particularly filed entrances and private accesses evolved and pre-date any formal design process.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.39 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.151	Temporary accesses	The Councils expect the applicant to enter into an agreement with the authority for any works within the highway. This is in part to ensure that it is clear what standard of inspection is required by the contractor (CTMP 5.5.7) and clarify who is liable for the site at any time. An agreement also provides a framework for approval of each access to satisfy Requirement 11, inspection of the materials and workmanship together with recovery of the authorities' reasonable costs.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.100 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.152	Permanent accesses	The Councils are concerned that the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan Appendix A -Vegetation and Retention Removal Plan [APP-183] does not clearly show vegetation that has to be permanently removed for these accesses. Nor has information been provided to the local highway authority regarding what, if any, areas of the accesses are intended to become highway maintainable at public expense. It is presumed that beyond the access points to the existing public highway the access roads will be privately maintained. No plans showing the general arrangement, drainage, kerbing or construction details have been shared with the authority.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.102 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.153	Permanent accesses	Specific Comments on Permanent Accesses	Should be referenced against D.149 and paragraph 12.39 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.154	Construction routes	Paragraph 5.4.3 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out that the construction routes will be agreed with the contractor. Whilst the Applicant can agree potential routes with contractors, the construction routes should be approved by the relevant highway authorities.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.84 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.155	Construction routes	Construction Routes – The Councils welcome the Applicant's proposals at Transport Assessment [APP-061] paragraph 2.4.3 that it will favour the SRN and A roads where practical, but not that this is only when it does not lead to excessive trip distance and journey time. There are several routes that are not practical for construction access as discussed. SCC is concerned that the Applicant intends to finalise the access routes post consent. All recent DCOs in Suffolk have identified access routes as part of the DCO application.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.74 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.156	Construction routes	The Councils note the applicant's view that the highway authority is responsible for maintaining the highway. However, that duty is only for the usual traffic that can be expected to use the network. Under section 59 of the Highway Act 1980 a Highway Authority can recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic. Rather than engage in wasteful legal processes, the Councils would prefer to enter into an agreement with the applicant to survey appropriate roads on a regular basis to determine if structural deterioration results from the projects construction traffic and if so, obtain appropriate mitigation. This methodology has been applied to recent NSIPs in Suffolk (EA1(N), EA2, Galloper, SZC).	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.103 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.157	Construction routes	The applicant's view is that signing for the project should be included in the permit system. The Councils would consider that the permits are issued for specific locations and a more holistic project wide signing strategy, perhaps secured through the CTMP is more appropriate. The Councils are concerned that the routes will be agreed with the contractor. There appears to no approval process for this with either the relevant local highway authority or local planning authority	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.104 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.158	Monitoring, reporting and enforcement	The complaints procedure referred to in paragraph 8.4.1 including reporting and actions taken should be reported to the local highway authorities.	The non-compliance and complaints procedures are set out in Sections 15.3 and 15.4, respectively. This states that where environmental incidents and non-conformance with the CEMP occurs that the appropriate enforcing authority will be contacted and informed.
D.159	Monitoring, reporting and enforcement	Specific Comments on Monitoring, Reporting and Enforcement – paragraph 8.6.6 should refer to changes to the Construction Traffic Management Plan being discharged by the relevant highway authorities.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.32 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.160	Monitoring, reporting and enforcement	Nowhere within the CTMP are any measures included to report or share compliance data with any organisation outside of National Grid and their contractors. In the Councils view, the CTMP should be expanded to include the process of monitoring, reporting and enforcement with the local planning authority and local highway authority engaged throughout.	A response has already been provided in D.158 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.161	Monitoring, reporting and enforcement	There do not appear to be any measures in the CTMP, CoCP or CEMP that include monitoring, reporting and enforcement of emission standards that are secured as GG 112 in the CoCP.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.4 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.162	Monitoring, reporting and enforcement	It is noted that in the CEMP at paragraph 15.3.1 the Environmental Clerk of Work responsibilities only appear to undertake site audits and does not include reviewing data collected to monitor the transport aspects of the project. The local highway authorities are not referred to as enforcing authorities so presumably would not be made aware of non-compliance with the Management Plans. Nor are the local planning authority or local highway authority notified of complaints or how they have been resolved (see paragraph 15.4).	The transport aspects are covered in the CTMP ( <b>document 7.6 (B)</b> ).

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
D.163	Monitoring, reporting and enforcement	The monitoring, reporting and enforcement measures across all Management Plans are considered by the Councils to be unacceptable.	The Applicant considers that the measures set out within the management plans are suitable to manage the likely significant effects on the project. The Applicant welcomes further feedback from the Councils in relation to any specific points that the councils consider need addressing.
D.164	Permit Scheme	The Councils welcome the applicant's intention to use the authority's street works permit scheme, particularly the commitment to co-ordinate such works with others. Recovery of costs for permits should be included in the protective provisions or highways side agreement.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.105 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.165	Traffic Regulation Orders	The Councils note that the applicant has included permanent and temporary traffic regulation orders within the dDCO. Comments on these are included. Experience as other NSIPs are delivered shows that additional or revised orders are required. Whilst the authority would work with the applicant to do so it would expect to recover any costs incurred.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.106 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.166	Traffic Regulation Orders	The applicant is requesting parking restrictions on many roads in Schedule 12 of the dDCO. The Councils question the need for these. If parking is obstructive the police already have powers to remove vehicles and the applicant would be reliant on the LHA or its agents to enforce the parking restrictions in any event. To implement the restrictions the applicant would need to either place significant lengths of road markings and signs on the network or place and remove no parking cones daily. The Transport Assessment [APP-061] states that there is no evidence of extensive or frequent on street parking except for a small number of locations including Bures	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.107 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.167	Traffic Regulation Orders	The Councils note that many of the streets are incorrectly referenced. The applicant should refer to the national street gazetteer which is a web-based resource which the applicant can access via its website "findmystreet.co.uk". Failure to use the correct street name can invalidate traffic regulation orders.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.108 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.168	Traffic Regulation Orders	The authority is mindful of the additional resources that the applicant may expect if widespread enforcement of the traffic regulations is necessary and the potential requirement for additional local authority or police officers for a short term commitment.	The Applicant intends for regulations to be minimised to those necessary and to be self-explaining to drivers and therefore minimising the need for enforcement. Once a main works contractor is in place, this will be included on matters to be

Reference	Matter	Point Raised	Applicant's Comments
			addressed through the ongoing Highways Thematic engagement with the relevant authorities.
D.169	Road Closures	The applicant states in CTMP 56.5.4 that smaller roads may need to be closed for up to two weeks during construction of accesses. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the need for careful programming of these closures so that they do not coincide and cause unnecessary delays or confusion to road users.	The Applicant recognises the important of works planning and co-ordination, both for the many elements of these works and for the other concurrent activities including planned and reactive maintenance including as well as works by other parties during the overall works period. Once a main works contractor is in place, this will be included on matters to be addressed through the ongoing Highways Thematic engagement with the relevant authorities.
D.170-172	Road Crossings	The Councils position is that it prefers no-cut crossings of the public highway wherever practical. The Councils have yet to review the closures proposed in the Access Rights of Way and Public Rights of Navigation Plans.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.109 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.173	Traffic Management	Although not stated the temporary access design appears to rely on temporary speed limits of 30mph to reduce visibility and other design criteria. It is unclear how these speed limits will be enforced and if not the likelihood that drivers will comply with the temporary limits. The Councils are concerned that to rely solely on a temporary speed limit to slow vehicles to provide safe working conditions could many locations be unsafe.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.110 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).
D.174	Traffic Management	The applicant has included parking restrictions on access roads (Schedule 12). The Councils question the need for these.	A response has already been provided in paragraph 12.107 of this document ( <b>document 8.5.3.1</b> ).



# Reference List

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) (2023) The Road Safety Engineering Manual (2023) (RoSPA, 2013)

Standard for Highways (2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, LA 112 Revision 1, Population and Human Health (January 2020) (Standard for Highways, 2020)

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2013) Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects' (April 2013) (DCLG, 2013)

Planning Inspectorate (2018) Advice Note 15: Drafting Development Consent Orders (July 2018) (Planning Inspectorate, 2018)

National Grid plc  
National Grid House,  
Warwick Technology Park,  
Gallows Hill, Warwick.  
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales  
No. 4031152  
[nationalgrid.com](http://nationalgrid.com)