



Application by National Grid for the Richborough Connection Project The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information; responses to which are due on **Thursday, 8 September 2016 at 11.59pm– Deadline 4**.

Questions are set out using an issue-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as Annex B to the ExA's Rule 6 letter of 11 May 2016. There are additional topic headings which follow on sequentially.

Column 1 of the table below provides a **unique reference number** which starts with a 1, then combines a section number and a question number. **When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.** If you are answering a limited number of questions, responses in a letter format will suffice. If you are answering several questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on that used below. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available from the Planning Inspectorate. Please email your request to: Richborough@pins.gsi.gov.uk and include 'Editable ExAQ2 Table' in the subject line of your email.

Column 2 indicates **the party (or parties)** that is (are) required to answer each question. The ExA requests that all parties named answer all questions directed at them, providing either a clear and substantive response, or providing reasons as to why the question is not relevant to them.

The direction of questions in this way does not preclude an answer being provided by a party to whom it is not directed. Where questions can be fully addressed and answered within a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) or other submission, then a reference to the relevant section of a SoCG or submission, will be sufficient.

When referring to documents already submitted at previous deadlines, please use the document referencing system in the Examination Library, which can be accessed at the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020017/EN020017-000009-Examination%20Library.pdf>

| Ref No. | Respondent: | Question: |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | Air quality including dust | |
| No second round questions | | |
| 2 | Biodiversity and geological conservation | |
| | | <i>Habitat Regulations Assessment</i> |
| Q2.2.1 | Natural England | <p>Confirm agreement (or otherwise) in relation to whether the Applicant has identified all of the correct qualifying features/ interests for each of the eleven European sites screened into the assessment in the updated versions of Tables 3.1 and 3.2 [REP2-017, Appendix C].</p> <p>If not, please identify which European sites and qualifying features/ interests are not accurately reflected in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 and confirm the correct qualifying features/ interests for these European sites.</p> |
| Q2.2.2 | Applicant | <p>If Natural England (NE) does identify discrepancies with the qualifying features/ interests reflected in the updated versions of Tables 3.1 and 3.2 [REP2-017, Appendix C], the Applicant is to provide updated versions of Tables 3.1 and 3.2 at Deadline 5 which align with the information provided by NE.</p> <p>The Applicant should update the No Significant Effects Report (NSER) elsewhere to demonstrate how all of the correct qualifying features/ interests have been considered within the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant should update the screening matrices to ensure they are consistent with the qualifying features/ interests reflected in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 of the NSER.</p> <p>It is noted that the qualifying features of The Swale SPA are recorded differently in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 when compared with Screening Matrix 10 and in relation to Stodmarsh SPA; should Table 3.1 include "breeding bird assemblage"? These discrepancies will also need to be corrected by the Applicant.</p> |
| Q2.2.3 | Natural England | Please confirm in a Deadline 5 response that the Applicant has submitted the correct versions of the conservation objectives in [REP2-017] and in response to Q2.2.3; and if not provide the correct versions. |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------|---|
| | | |
| Q2.2.4 | Natural England | Do you agree with the Applicant's response to Q1.2.10 [REP2-016], that the placement of the pylons anywhere within the limits of deviation (LoD) would not affect the conclusions of the NSER? |
| Q2.2.5 | Natural England | Is there any change to NE's agreed position on there being no plans/ projects where in-combination effects may arise (response to Q1.2.6 [REP2-073]) in light of the following documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South East Water's Written Representation [REP2-099]; • Jacobs Alternatives Report (Appendix 11 [REP2-183]); • Broad Oak Reservoir Bird Study (Appendix 11, Appendix G [REP2-201], which is duplicated as Appendix 12, Appendix G [REP2-208]; • Jacobs Impact Report (Appendix 12 [REP2-205]); and • South East Water Document on Bird Collision Risk [REP3-031]? |
| Q2.2.6 | Natural England | Is there any change to NE's agreed position that the proposed development will not result in a likely significant effect on any European sites and that an appropriate assessment is not needed (response to Q1.2.13 [REP2-073] and SoCG [REP2-022]), in light of documents referred to in Q2.2.4? |
| | | <i>Assessment methods used in the Environmental Statement</i> |
| Q2.2.7 | Joint Councils | Does the Applicant's response to Q1.2.25 (REP2-016) provide the assurance that the Councils were looking for in terms of the review of the method and outcomes of the assessment with reference to the Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment, 2nd edition (2016), as set out in the Joint Councils' Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP2-061, para 7.4.1 and REP3-014, Table 4, ref 7.4.1, bullet 1]? |
| | | <i>Planning Statement</i> |
| Q2.2.8 | Applicant | Do you agree with Dover District Council's suggested amendment to the Planning Statement with regard to planning policy relating to Local Wildlife Sites (LWSS) and hedgerows in response to Q1.2.43 [REP2-065]? |
| | | <i>Consideration of Alternatives</i> |
| Q2.2.9 | Mr Bullen Interested Parties | Further to the Applicant's response to Q1.7.30 [REP2-016] on alternatives, do you have any further comments on alternatives relating to biodiversity, by reference to EN-1, section 4.4 and EN-5, section 2.7. |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | <i>Nationally designated sites: Sites of Special Scientific Interest</i> |
| Q2.2.10 | Joint Councils | Do the Councils agree with the Applicant's response regarding the West Blean and Thornden Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in connection with whether the works associated with the proposed development could provide greater (or lesser) opportunities for public access (official or unofficial), which cumulatively, with the residential development planned for the Sturry Broad Oak area, could be detrimental to the SSSI [REP3 –014, Table 4, ref 7.4.1, bullet 2]? If not, is there mitigation that the Councils consider should be included? |
| | | <i>Regionally and locally designated sites</i> |
| Q2.2.11 | Kent Wildlife Trust | Kent Wildlife Trust (KWT) to provide comments on points made by Kent County Council (KCC) [REP3-040, Appendix 1] regarding grassland reseeded mixes proposed for Local Wildlife Sites in its comments on the Concept Mitigation Planting Plans [REP2-014]? |
| | | <i>Ancient woodland and veteran trees</i> |
| Q2.2.12 | Applicant | Please provide an update on meeting(s) with the Woodland Trust. If no meeting has been arranged, why not? [REP2-016, response to Q1.2.35]. |
| Q2.2.13 | Applicant Joint Councils | What progress has been made on reaching an agreement on the need for and scope of enhancements or mitigation for ancient woodland (as referred to in response to Q1.2.31 [REP2-016])? |
| Q2.2.14 | Applicant Canterbury City Council | Further to the Applicant/ Joint Councils' SoCG ID 5.4.1 [REP2-024], report on the progress on agreement over a further contribution by the Applicant to " <i>the enhancement of the ancient woodland harmed by the route by contributing financially to support its future management and projects that seek to enhance its interpretation</i> ". The Applicant is also requested to discuss with and report views of the Woodland Trust on this matter. |
| Q2.2.15 | The Woodland Trust | Comments are sought on the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Applicant's assessment of the effects on West Blean and Thornden Woods SSSI including areas of ancient woodland (refer Q1.2.27 [PD-006]); • the Applicant's response to Q1.2.31 [REP2-016] regarding the Woodland Trust's concerns over removal of ancient woodland; |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any issues of which the Woodland Trust is aware of in relation to the management of the existing 132kV line where it passes through areas of ancient woodland (Q1.2.32 [PD-006]); • Wayleaves as set out in the Applicant's response to Q1.2.33 [REP2-016]; • the Applicant's assessment that the trees that would be removed from Little Hall and Kemberland Woods Pastures LWS are not ancient or veteran (Q1.2.34 [PD-006]); • Agreement or otherwise (with reasons) of the Applicant's response to Q1.2.35 [REP2-016] regarding areas of ancient woodland to be removed, affected and managed; • Q1.2.36 [PD-006]), which includes reference to the Applicant's updated Embedded Environmental Measures Schedule submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-006] and the updated Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy (BMS) [REP3-004] submitted at Deadline 3, noting the Kent Wildlife Trust's response [REP2-083]; • the Applicant's and Councils' responses to Q1.2.37 [REP2-016] regarding natural regeneration adjacent to ancient woodland and the ExA's further question in this regard; • management and maintenance periods of five years for mitigation planting as proposed by the Applicant (Q1.2.38 [PD-006]); • management operations within ancient woodland (Q1.2.39 [PD-006]); • the updated CEMP, submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-007] and updated BMS submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-004]; • the Concept Mitigation Planting Plans submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-014]; and • the Applicant's Response to issues raised at the Open Floor Hearings [REP3-022, Appendix 1]. |
| <p>Q2.2.16</p> | <p>Applicant Canterbury City Council Kent County Council Woodland Trust</p> | <p>Further to responses to Q1.2.37 [REP2-063 and REP2-069] regarding natural regeneration adjacent to ancient woodland, consider further whether areas for natural regeneration should be itemised on the concept mitigation plans. For example, should some or all of the proposed 3,927m² of Species Mix A on the Concept Mitigation Planting Plan [REP2-014, figure 11.1zd], which would plant an area adjacent to ancient woodland, previously a wayleave for the 132kV PX line, be left for natural regeneration? Likewise the proposed area of 2,818m² of Species Mix C on the Concept Mitigation Planting Plan [REP2-014, figure 11.1zf].</p> <p>Also see question under Requirement 8 of the DCO.</p> |
| <p>Q2.2.17</p> | <p>Mr Boylan</p> | <p>Further to points made in your Deadline 3 submission [REP3-045], the Applicant's Response to Q1.2.31 [REP2-016] and to issues raised at the Open Floor Hearings [REP3-022, Appendix 1, section 2.2], do you</p> |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | have any further concerns regarding the effect the proposed development would have on Kemberland Woods? |
| Q2.2.18 | Canterbury City Council | Do you agree with the Applicant's position that there would be no direct loss of ancient woodland, in response to the LIR ID7.1.1 [REP3-014, Table 1, ID 7.1.1]? |
| | | <i>Protection of habitats</i> |
| Q2.2.19 | Applicant | <p>As noted, the updated Figures [REP2- 009] requested in Q1.2.39 are the same as ES Figures 3.13 [APP-034]. The Applicant should ensure clarity is provided on status of these Environmental Statement (ES) figures in the ES erratum document and/ or the ES definition in the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant should confirm whether the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Limits of Deviation Potential, Figures 31.3a to 31.3v as requested in Q1.2.39 were submitted and if so where. If not, why not?</p> |
| Q2.2.20 | Applicant | <p>Responses to Q1.2.50 and Q1.7.11 [REP2-016] make reference to trees which may be removed. Where are the trees which may be removed identified within the application documents, other than the AIA Limits of Deviation Potential, Figures 31.3a to 31.3v [APP-070].</p> <p>Notwithstanding explanations in the AIA regarding the proposed development not being able to "fill" the Limits of Deviation (LoD) [APP-070, section 7.13], explain how the ExA can be satisfied that the full potential extent of the tree and hedgerow removal has been factored into the assessment presented in the ES.</p> |
| Q2.2.21 | Applicant | Can you explain the statement " <i>The total variability of effects on hedges is therefore similar to that of trees or groups.</i> "? This is stated in the context of Table 32.0, which shows the total number of trees affected could increase by ten, total area of tree groups affected could increase by 0.01 hectare and the length of hedges affected could increase by 4,747 m, compared with the total affected hedge length (2,482m) in the preferred alignment [APP-070, para 7.13.13]. |
| Q2.2.22 | Applicant | Are the trees and hedges shown on the AIA Limits of Deviation Potential, [APP-070, Figures 31.3a to 31.3v] as " <i>potentially affected by limits of deviation</i> " trees and hedges which might move from 'removal' or 'managed' to being 'unaffected' as well as ones which might move from 'unaffected' to 'managed' or |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>'removed'? If so, how has this been taken into account in the assessment presented in the ES?</p> <p>If not, explain how hedgerows such as H168 [App-070, Figure 31.3o and REP2-009, Figure 31.2o] can be shown for 'removal' and also as 'potentially affected by limits of deviation'.</p> <p>(Note there is a related question under Traffic and Transport relating to visibility splays).</p> |
| Q2.2.23 | Applicant | Please explain which drawings landowners should consult to establish if the proposed development would result in trees and/or hedges to be removed, managed or that may be affected on their land and if mitigation or enhancement is proposed. |
| Q2.2.24 | Applicant | <p>The response to Q1.2.47 [REP2.016] regarding removal of Tree Preservation Order (TPO) trees explains the need is based on the connected land required for reptile mitigation. However it also indicates that not all trees may need to be removed – a worst case is presented.</p> <p>The Applicant should review the trees to be removed in this location to establish if loss of TPO trees can be minimised further.</p> |
| | | <i>European and other protected species</i> |
| Q2.2.25 | Applicant The Environment Agency | <p>The response to Q1.2.55 is noted, which confirms that where full ecological surveys have not been possible to date for water vole and otter, they would be undertaken to support Flood Risk Activity Permitting (FRAP) applications.</p> <p>Could the results of the verification surveys affect the conclusions of the ES assessment?</p> <p>Is there a risk that any further mitigation measures which might be required through the FRAP process may not be compatible with the mitigation strategy secured in the DCO?</p> |
| Q2.2.26 | Applicant | Is there something missing from the end of response to Q1.2.57? |
| Q2.2.27 | Natural England | Please confirm that a letter of no impediment (LoNI) for water vole is not required. |
| Q2.2.28 | Joint Councils | Are the Joint Councils content with the responses given by the Applicant in its Comments on LIR and |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Councils WRs document [REP3-022, ref 7.4.1, bullet 3 and 7.4.2] regarding justification of short-term effects on water vole in the Ash Level and Richborough Pasture Local Wildlife Site and the request for further details about the works in the vicinity of ditches with potential water vole habitat? If not what information is required? |
| | | <i>Ornithology</i> |
| Q2.2.29 | Applicant | Comment on the difference in numbers and species of birds and the matters raised about dusk and dawn flights in the response to Q1.2.16 by John Craddick and Graham Chandler [REP2-081], including the reference to large numbers of cormorant. Comment also on the response of Mark Heath in the WR from Nethergong Camping [REP2-089] in its response to Q1.7.53 [REP2-090]. |
| Q2.2.30 | Applicant | Respond to the concern raised by St John's College regarding bird mortality collision risk and the positioning of the crossover " <i>located directly under a known Swan flightline where previous mass bird-strikes have occurred</i> " [REP2-092], the approximate location of which was pointed out on the Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) on 26 July 2016, where the ExA observed bird flight diverters on the 132kV line. |
| Q2.2.31 | Applicant Natural England | Respond to KWT's concerns regarding impacts on Golden plover within a site of conservation interest at a County level and its suggestion that mortality thresholds, monitoring and a mechanism for further mitigation are required [REP2-082, point 5b]. Is there any change to the Applicant's or NE's stated positions on bird mortality monitoring not being required; in light of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW's WR and Appendices [REP2-099, REP2-201 and REP3-031], • Dover District Council's response to Q1.12.33 [REP2-065], • NFU's Deadline 3 response [REP3-046] and • KWT's points regarding Golden plover [REP2-082, point 5b]? |
| Q2.2.32 | Applicant | Following on from the response to Q1.7.57 [REP2-016], do the different types of bird diverters that could be selected by the main contractor have different mitigating capabilities? Does this affect how the success of bird diverters has been assessed in the ES? |
| Q2.2.33 | Applicant | Provide a response to KWT position which considers that alternatives were not considered in any greater |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>detail before route selection was made with regards to ornithology, given that it had previously expressed concerns over the Northern Corridor having higher frequency of flocks of waders and small groups of wildfowl than the Southern Corridor. Also respond to KWT's position over the proximity of the Northern Corridor to the SPA and wetland habitats within the Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) of the Ash Levels and Chislet Marshes [REP2-082, point 5a].</p> <p>The Route Corridor Study [APP-131, para 11.25] states "<i>The winter bird survey results have shown flocks of waders and small groups of wildfowl are more frequently observed within the North Corridor compared to the South. The presence of the Seaton Gravel pits on the South Corridor make parts of the South Corridor potentially more important for wildfowl (SPA species) compared with the North Corridor (Scenario 2) of greater interest for raptor species such as marsh harrier (non SPA species). The on-going bird surveys will provide a clearer picture of bird patterns and movements.</i>"</p> <p>The Applicant should clarify what in fact the ongoing bird surveys did demonstrate in the response.</p> |
| Q2.2.34 | Kent Wildlife Trust | Expand the reasoning behind KWTs in principle objection [REP2-082, point 5a] to the chosen route corridor in the context of the policy position on alternatives contained in National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1, section 4.4 and EN-5, section 2.7. |
| <i>Mitigation and enhancement</i> | | |
| Q2.2.35 | Applicant Joint Councils KWT | In response to Q1.2.29, Kent Wildlife Trust expressed a desire to be kept apprised of future details of the Landscape and Habitat Enhancement Scheme (LHES) [REP2-083]. How should this happen? |
| Q2.2.36 | Applicant Kent County Council Canterbury City Council Dover District Council Thanet District Council | <p>KCC has provided comments on the Concept Mitigation Planting Plans [REP3-040, Appendix 1]. This sets out a number of technical matters to do with planting species and mixes and also suggestions for improving ease of use of the drawings.</p> <p>This raises a number of matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which Councils would be the post-consent discharging authorities for approvals to the mitigation planting scheme for the planting of trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows to be removed under Requirement 8? • Can agreement be reached on the species components and level of detail required in the Concept |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Mitigation Planting Plans between the Applicant and the Councils? Set out agreement and any remaining differences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the level of detail requested for the drawings in KCC's response necessary and proportionate, bearing in mind it was agreed at the first DCO hearing on 28 July 2016 that cross-referencing between mitigation and enhancement proposals would be undertaken by the Applicant? The ExA would find the suggested annotation of pylon numbers and street names useful. <p>The Applicant and Councils are requested to review the KCC comments and provide a joint response on the three points above.</p> |
| Q2.2.37 | Joint Councils | Are the Joint Councils satisfied with the Applicant's response in its Comments on LIR and Councils' WRs to their points on long-term methods of maintenance of safety clearance zones [REP3-014, ref 7.4.6]? |
| Q2.2.38 | Joint Councils The Environment Agency Natural England The Kent Wildlife Trust Other Interested Parties | Provide any further comments on the Applicant's updated BMS [REP3-004], and where relevant to biodiversity matters in the updated CEMP [REP2-007]. |
| Q2.2.39 | Applicant | <p>Should the commitment stated in your Comments on LIR and Councils' WRs to pass records to the Kent and Medway Biological Records Centre be secured, eg in the BMS [REP3-014, ref 7.4.7]? If so, provide drafting.</p> <p>Should the commitment stated in your Comments on LIR and Councils' WRs to provide ecological monitoring reports for European Protected Species licence requirements and for up to five years' replacement habitat planting to the County ecologist be secured eg in the BMS and/ or CEMP [REP3-014, ref 7.4.8]? If so provide drafting.</p> |
| Q2.2.40 | Applicant | Update discussions with Persons with Interest in the Land (PILs) over the potential for extension(s) to Higher Stewardship Schemes (HLS) in the Ash Levels. |

| | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| | | |
| 3 | Broad Oak | |
| | Respondents should note that if a question in this section is already answered in one of the post-hearing actions also to be submitted at Deadline 4, then a reference to that document with paragraph number(s) will suffice in response to the question(s) below. | |
| | | <i>Impacts of the proposed development on the proposed Broad Oak reservoir</i> |
| Q2.3.1 | Applicant South East Water | What was the outcome of the meeting on 9 August 2016 which sought to make progress on finding a design solution that would enable both developments to proceed? Including flexibility to allow for retrofitting of mitigation measures should such measures be considered necessary. |
| Q2.3.2 | The Environment Agency Natural England | Please provide comments on the Applicant's 'Response to South East Water's report Review of Alternative RCP Routes in Area of Interaction with Proposed Reservoir Scheme – July 2016' [REP3-019, Appendix 5] indicating any areas of concern and provide comments on the Applicant's views expressed on the potential for the two proposed developments to co-exist. |
| Q2.3.3 | The Environment Agency Natural England | Please provide comments on the Applicant's Deadline 2 submission (the Mott MacDonald Report) [REP2-017, Appendix F] and SEW's response to the Mott Macdonald Report [REP3-036, Appendix 4.1, Appendix 1]? Indicating any areas of concern and provide comments on the Applicant's views expressed on the potential for the two proposed developments to co-exist. |
| Q2.3.4 | Applicant South East Water | The Applicant and South East Water are requested to ensure that any ongoing differences between parties in terms of the application of visual (and/ or landscape) assessment methodology, such as those covered in SEW's responses to Q1.7.5, Q1.7.9, Q1.7.16 and Q1.7.29 [REP2-098], are included in the relevant topic-based SoCG for submission at Deadline 4. |
| Q2.3.5 | South East Water | Please provide any comments on the Concept Mitigation Planting Plans submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2 [REP2-014], with respect to the concept planting proposed and/ or on the Landscape and Habitat Enhancement Scheme (LHES) [APP-123] for land within SEW's ownership? (There are other questions on the Concept Mitigation Planting Plans under the biodiversity section.) |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|---|---|
| Q2.3.6 | Applicant Canterbury City Council The Environment Agency Natural England South East Water | <p>Whilst SEW's response to Q1.7.67 [REP2-098] is caveated with reference to the taking on board of the SEW Alternatives, there is a wider point regarding the necessary approvals for agreeing a planting scheme in the proposed reservoir area. Does the Applicant agree that planting (mitigation and enhancement) associated with all of SEW's land (or some of SEW's land associated with the reservoir) is an area where more certainty of design is desirable and should it also be subject to future approvals including NE and the EA as well as the relevant Local Authority?</p> <p>Do the Applicant and SEW consider securing a method of approval resolves the issues raised in the Jacobs response to the Mott MacDonald comment in SEW's response to the Applicant's Deadline 2 submissions [REP3-036, Appendix 4.1, ref 3.4.2.8]?</p> <p>If so, the Applicant is invited to propose suitable wording for the DCO and /or the LHES.</p> <p>The views of CCC, the EA and NE are sought.</p> |
| Q2.3.7 | Applicant | Please comment on SEW's response to Q1.7.70 and set out the implications for the DCO, including temporary possession, if the Secretary of State was to find that a ten year maintenance period was appropriate for the reservoir area for the reasons set out in SEW's response to Q1.7.70 [REP3-098]? |
| Q2.3.8 | Applicant | Please provide a plan to show the relative positions of the various elements of the reservoir and RCP, situated within the corridor said to be available, which are identified [REP3-019, para 4.10]. |
| Q2.3.9 | Applicant | If considering a generic situation where the Sarre Penn realignment, in cutting, would cross the proposed overhead line, how would the planting of each of the species in the potential mix be affected in terms of overhead line impact zones and their suitability for specific species [REP3-019, para 4.14]? The Applicant is requested to respond in a tabular or diagrammatic form. |
| Q2.3.10 | Applicant | What are the typical anticipated and potential heights of the species identified in Table 7.1 of the Jacobs Stage 1b Study Report [REP3-019, para 4.24]? |
| Q2.3.11 | South East Water | Provide evidence in support of its view that a continuous, and not semi-continuous, corridor of high canopy woodland is present along the Sarre Penn and why this habitat should be replaced along the |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | Sarre Penn realignment [REP3-019, para 4.25]? |
| Q2.3.12 | Applicant | Notwithstanding the stated uncertainty over flight paths, could the removal of the existing overhead line have any effect on bird collision risk in relation to the reservoir proposal [REP3-019, para 4.54]? If so, what? |
| Q2.3.13 | South East Water | How has the 260m key bird collision distance been determined [REP3-019, para 4.57]? |
| Q2.3.14 | South East Water | Provide details of the proposals to accommodate the RCP in relation to the Sarre Penn realignment, the fish pass and the access bridge which have been costed and confirm whether or not these proposals represent a potential physical solution to enable a 32.5m AOD top water level reservoir and the RCP to co-exist [REP3-019, para 9.16]. |
| Q2.3.15 | South East Water | Provide details of the proposals to accommodate the RCP in relation to the Sarre Penn realignment, the fish pass and the access bridge which have been costed and to confirm whether or not these proposals represent a potential physical solution to enable a 36m AOD top water level reservoir and the RCP to co-exist [REP3-019, para 9.24]. |
| Q2.3.16 | Applicant South East Water | The parties are requested to provide plans as set out in the agreed joint statement in relation to Action No 8 from the 29 July 2016 Broad Oak Issue Specific Hearing [REP3-024, secn 2 action 8]. The SEW understanding is correct on the scope of the plans, in that the requested plans should not include any of the parties' proposed alternatives. The opportunity is however available for any party to consider whether they wish to provide supplementary information in relation to this written question. For the avoidance of doubt, separate plans should be prepared for the 32.5 and 36m AOD reservoir proposals and the profile views, under item 9, should effectively be longitudinal sections along the line of the conductors. |
| Q2.3.17 | South East Water | What is the scope and cost of undergrounding the existing UK Power Networks overhead powerline where this has been included within the 2014 WRMP [REP3-036, section 2.2]? |
| Q2.3.18 | South East Water | Is the fish pass anticipated to be used in low flow periods? If so, when and why? What is anticipated to be the lowest flow and the shallowest gradient that would need to be accommodated for effective fish pass operation [REP3-036, section 3.2.4]? |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|
| | | |
| Q2.3.19 | South East Water | For reservoir top water levels above 32.5m AOD, is there anything that would prevent the Sarre Penn realignment route being positioned onto the route shown for a 36m AOD top water level [REP3-036, secn 8.1]? Would this minimise direct conflict with proposed Pylon PC9 at intermediate water levels between 32.5 and 36m AOD? Would there be any adverse effects from this transfer to a more southerly route before it was directly required by the reservoir proposal alone? Would a combination of the 36m AOD route and water levels between 32.5 and 36m AOD release additional land between the overhead line and the reservoir shoreline for biodiversity connectivity and landscape impact mitigation planting? |
| Q2.3.20 | The Environment Agency | The EA states that the riparian environment on the realigned Sarre Penn should be continuous with shading and that it is keen to see a connected environment [REP3-039, hearing comments summary]. Is the EA of the view that continuous shading is necessary to avoid deterioration in the Water Framework Directive status of the watercourse in the context of its existing characteristics? |
| Q2.3.21 | Applicant | In the context of the SEW proposals and the Mott MacDonald alternative solutions for the Sarre Penn realignment, for both the 32.5 and 36m AOD reservoir concept designs, how could a future design accommodate issues with the hydromorphological quality elements identified by the EA [REP3-039, Sarre Penn realignment design principles, Sarre Penn realignment]? In other words, how much flexibility would be likely to remain when the effect of the proposed overhead line is included in the consideration of issues relating to these matters? |
| Q2.3.22 | The Environment Agency | What times of year are the migratory trout and eels likely to be migrating [REP3-039, Sarre Penn realignment design principles, reservoir fish pass]? |
| Q2.3.23 | Applicant | In the context of the SEW proposals and the Mott MacDonald alternative solutions for the Sarre Penn realignment, for both the 32.5 and 36m AOD reservoir concept designs, how could a future design accommodate variation in the factors that could affect the design identified by the EA? Again, in other words, how much flexibility would be likely to remain when the effect of the proposed overhead line is included in the consideration of issues relating to these matters [REP3-039, Sarre Penn realignment design principles, reservoir fish pass]? |
| | | <i>Environmental Impact Assessment</i> |
| Q2.3.24 | The Environment | In responding to Q1.2.23 regarding the scope of the biodiversity receptors considered in the cumulative |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|------------------------|--|
| | Agency | <p>assessment EA stated <i>"The scope of impacts and receptors have been reviewed and it appears that all of those of interest to the Environment Agency have been included individually and in the cumulative assessment."</i> [REP2-060].</p> <p>EA also referred to ID 3.4.2 of their SoCG with the Applicant [REP2-020] (also in the updated version, [REP3-009]), which does not raise any further concerns regarding scoping out of receptors for cumulative assessment. The ExA notes that one matter is still outstanding in the earlier and updated SoCG with the Applicant [REP3-009] at ID 4.1.1 is the <i>"Cumulative effects of the Richborough development and the proposed Broad Oak Reservoir on WFD status of the Sarre Penn."</i></p> <p>In EAs Deadline 3 submission it states <i>"As previously indicated in meetings with National Grid, the Environment Agency considers that National Grid should have assessed the environmental effects of the proposed Broad Oak Reservoir cumulatively with those of the Richborough Connection Project... Specifically, this assessment would ensure that construction of the Richborough Connection Project is not pursued in such a way which may prevent the construction of the Broad Oak Reservoir by precluding necessary mitigation under the Water Framework Directive, Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975, Water Resources Act 1991 (as amended) and the Eels Regulations 2009."</i> [REP3-039].</p> <p>Can you clarify if the <i>"environmental effects"</i> to which EA refers in Deadline 3 submission [REP3-039] solely comprise the WFD status of the Sarre Penn as stated in the SoCG. If not, explain precisely which other potential effects (if any) and what other receptors (if any) EA consider the Applicant's cumulative assessment in its ES should have considered and why, relating this to the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 and any relevant guidance and/ or advice.</p> |
| Q2.3.25 | The Environment Agency | Has the environmental information submitted by both the Applicant and SEW during the course of the Examination assisted the EA in understanding the relationship between the two schemes in the proposed location of the Sarre Penn diversion? Is any further clarity required to be provided by either party to assist you in understanding the potential effects? If so what? |
| Q2.3.26 | South East Water | Does SEW have any comments on the Applicant's response to SEW's WR [REP3-019]? |
| Q2.3.27 | South East Water | Is SEW content that the information in the Appendices to the Applicant's response to SEW's WR that set out communication between the two parties is an accurate reflection of that communication [REP3-019, |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | Appendices 1 and 2]? If not set out your differences, and provide evidence of these. |
| Q2.3.28 | South East Water | Provide comments on the Applicant's approach to its cumulative assessment in the context of PINS Advice Note 17 (Cumulative Impact Assessment). |
| Q2.3.29 | South East Water | Further to your summary of oral submission at the 29 July 2016 ISH [REP3-034, para 127]; does the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the 2015 - 2040 WRMP cover the proposed Richborough Connection development in assessment of cumulative impacts? Did the SEA for the 2014 WRMP take the Richborough Connection development into account? If not explain why not? |
| Q2.3.30 | Applicant South East Water | Is there agreement that there are no likely significant effects of a cumulative nature arising for the construction stage because as currently proposed the construction stages of the two projects would not overlap? |
| Q2.3.31 | Natural England | As statutory nature conservation body (SNCB) is NE's agreed position still that the scope of impacts considered in the assessment set out in the ES Appendices and the scope of receptors considered in the cumulative assessment are adequate (response to Q1.2.23 [REP2-073] and SoCG [REP2-022, section 3.2]), in light of SEW's WR and related Appendices? If not, what is the basis for any changes and is any further clarity required to be provided by the Applicant or SEW to assist NE in understanding the potential effects? If so, what? |
| Q2.3.32 | Applicant | Following Deadline 2 submissions, agenda item 2 on the adequacy of the ES at the ISH on 29 July 2016 [EV-030], SEW's summary of oral submission at the 29 July ISH [REP3-034, para 124 to 136] and the EA's Deadline 3 submission [REP3-039], is the Applicant considering the submission of 'other information' as set out in Regulation 2 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 in relation to likely significant cumulative effects of the proposed development and the proposed reservoir to the Examination? If so what is the anticipated content and timescale? If 'other information' is to be provided; anything that can be submitted at Deadline 4 should be submitted then. Any information which has already been submitted to the Examination, which the Applicant considers would form the basis of 'other information' should be submitted in an appropriate |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | form, suitably identified as 'other information'. |
| Q2.3.33 | Applicant | With whom has it been agreed that effects on the water environment, in relation to the WFD status of the Sarre Penn, during the operational phase can be scoped out of the EIA cumulative assessment [REP3-009, section 4.1.1]? |
| Q2.3.34 | The Environment Agency | The signed SoCG appears to suggest that the EA had agreed that effects on the water environment, in relation to the WFD status of the Sarre Penn during the operational phase, could be scoped out of the EIA cumulative assessment [REP3-009, secn 4.1.1]. Is this correct? If so, when? |
| | | <i>Policy</i> |
| Q2.3.35 | Applicant | In respect of matters discussed at the ISH on 29 July 2016, can you provide any comments on SEW's note on policy addressing the relationship between the Planning Act 2008 and the Water Industry Act 1991 [REP3-037] and how this relates to the WRMP? |
| Q2.3.36 | The Environment Agency | The EA has set out the reasons why the proposed Broad Oak reservoir is an important strategic supply option identified within SEW's WRMP 2014 [REP3-009]. In this context are there any exemptions to meeting the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which might apply? |
| Q2.3.37 | Canterbury City Council | SEW argues that the status of WRMPs for the purposes of the PA 2008 is not materially different from local planning authority development plans [REP3-037, para 3]. Notwithstanding the point the EA makes that the post hearing action is for the Applicant and SEW, it states "... we understand that there is no direct relationship between the Water Industry Act 1991 and the Planning Act 2008 and that Water Resources Management Plans are not part of the development plan framework." [REP3-039]. Canterbury City Council is requested to comment on these two stated opinions. |
| Q2.3.38 | Canterbury City Council | The SoCG with the Joint Councils includes Section 4.34.2 which sets out the policy position in respect of South East Water proposals for a new reservoir at Broad Oak. Policy CC13- Water resources refers to Broad Oak as a 'major supply option' in supporting text but the policy itself does not include it as a site specific allocation and land is not safeguarded for its future position [REP2-024]. Would Canterbury City Council explain why the land required for the reservoir has not been allocated |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | /safeguarded in the adopted/emerging local plan? |
| | | <i>SEW Alternatives</i> |
| Q2.3.39 | Applicant | Further to the photograph of a relevant cable sealing end (CSE) compound [REP3-019, Appendix 5, Inset 4.7], can you submit a photograph of such a structure from further away so the entire compound is illustrated. Also, please submit a photograph each of a terminal pylon one with and one without auxiliary cross arms. |
| Q2.3.40 | South East Water | Is the SEW " <i>Option 2 – an alternative overhead line route to the north of the RCP proposal</i> ", which was not pursued further, the same or different from the Applicant's Option D [REP3-019, Appendix 5]? If it is different how is it different? |
| | | <i>General</i> |
| Q2.3.42 | South East Water | The purpose of the request for a list of Appendices was to ease navigation of the documents submitted at Deadline 2 by name of the pdf documents as submitted, (which are the document names given in the Examination library). SEW is requested to resubmit the list of Appendices to achieve that purpose and to include in the list only documents which have been submitted to the Examination. |
| 4 | Compulsory Acquisition | |
| | | <i>Written Representations</i> |
| Q2.4.1 | Finn's LLP | Finn's LLP is requested to provide the example plan offered [REP2-047, para 1.1.3]. |
| Q2.4.2 | Finn's LLP | What is the large discrepancy that is identified [REP2-047, para 1.2.2]? Is this suggested discrepancy within the draft DCO and its related documents? |
| Q2.4.3 | Applicant | The Applicant is requested to respond to para 1 [REP2-050]. |
| Q2.4.4 | Applicant | The Applicant is requested to respond to paras 2 and 3 [REP2-052]. |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|------------|---|
| Q2.4.5 | Finn's LLP | What are the alternatives for access which are said to have not been sufficiently explored by the Applicant [REP2-053, para 2]? |
| Q2.4.6 | Applicant | The Applicant is requested to respond to para 2 [REP2-053]. |
| Q2.4.7 | Applicant | The Applicant is requested to respond to para 2 [REP2-054]. |
| Q2.4.8 | Applicant | The Applicant is requested to respond to para 2 [REP2-055]. |
| Q2.4.9 | Applicant | The Applicant is requested to respond to para 1 [REP2-057]. |
| Q2.4.10 | Finn's LLP | Which of the proposed permanent accesses are of particular concern [REP2-058, para 1]? |
| | | <i>Deadline 3 Submissions</i> |
| Q2.4.11 | Applicant | What detailed arrangements for land subject to temporary possession for access purposes, where this land is used by others for access purposes to enable the land to be used by others during the period of temporary possession, be put in place? And how would this use by others be secured [REP3-013, para 2.3.50]? |
| Q2.4.12 | Applicant | How would any arrangements intended for access to land severed by land subject to temporary possession or other rights, be secured [REP3-013, para 2.3.49]? |
| Q2.4.13 | Applicant | How has the Applicant taken into account the draft DCO, Article 18, notice clarity request from the NFU [REP3-016, para 2.35]? If not, why not? If so, how? |
| Q2.4.14 | Applicant | Are there other powers outside of the PA 2008 which could be used for access to land subject to escheat [REP3-016, para 2.38]? The Applicant is also requested to provide the more substantive update on this matter offered in the first DCO issue specific hearing. |
| Q2.4.15 | Applicant | Is Article 29 necessary in the draft DCO [REP3-016, para 2.40]? If so, why? |
| Q2.4.16 | Applicant | What is the latest position regarding negotiations with statutory undertakers [REP3-016, para 2.54]? |

| | | |
|---------|---|---|
| Q2.4.17 | Applicant | The Applicant is requested to provide a detailed response to the Explanatory Note from PB Headley concerning Land and Access at Hersden, including whether any changes to the access routes identified are under consideration [REP3-044]. |
| 5 | Draft Development Consent Order | |
| | Respondents should note that if a question in this section is already answered in one of the post-hearing actions also to be submitted at Deadline 4, then a reference to that document with paragraph number(s) will suffice in response to the question(s) below. | |
| | <i>Articles</i> | |
| Q2.5.1 | Applicant NFU Land Agents Interested Parties | <p>Article 5 - Limits of Deviation</p> <p>At the DCO hearing, the ExA requested a Post Hearing Note setting out the mechanism for discussions with land owners and National Grid Land Team in relation to micro siting and limits of deviation. Doc 8.23; 10 [REP3-023] describes in broad terms a process by which the Applicant would consult with Persons with an Interested in Land (PILs)/Agents in relation to use of LoD but does not provide details.</p> <p>Should a more prescriptive mechanism be considered in relation to consultation with PILs/ Agents in relation to the micro-siting of the pylons to ensure that impacts on arable practices are considered alongside construction related issues?</p> <p>If so, what should that mechanism entail and how would this be secured in the draft DCO?</p> |
| Q2.5.2 | Applicant Kent County Council NFU Land Agents Interested Parties | <p>Article 41 - Felling or Lopping of Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the wording of this Article be amended to meet the concerns expressed by KCC in their D3 response to Action Point 41? If so, what would the alternative wording be? If not, why not? • Can the Applicant respond to the proposal raised by NFU that landowners / and or occupiers should be notified of any proposal to fell or lop trees. Furthermore, that the notification should explain to the landowner/occupier how that tree will obstruct or interfere with the construction maintenance of operation of the authorised development as set out in their response to D3 [REP3-047]. • Does the NF / land agents / landowners or PILs wish to comment on applicants response to Action Point 24 and Appendix B [REP3-023] |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could compliance with the Energy Networks Association Engineering Technical Report: 136 – Vegetation Management Near Electricity Equipment – Principles of Good Practice be [REP3-023, point 24 and Appendix B] be secured in the DCO? • What is the status of the bullet points in relation to the Land Officer's role in communicating with affected parties about tree felling or lopping [REP3-, point 24]. Should these points be added to a Land Officer role description in the CEMP? |
| | | <i>Schedule 3 - Requirements</i> |
| Q2.5.3 | Applicant | <p>Requirement 1- Commence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Applicant content with the proposed wording put forward by the Joint Councils in response to Action 29 at Deadline 3[REP3-42]? If not, why not? • Should requirement 3 be replaced with a substantive provision as per the A14 decision and if not, why not? |
| Q2.5.4 | Applicant | <p>Requirement 3 - General Accordance with Design Drawings</p> <p>Suggest a form of wording for Requirement 3 which would enable it to read "in accordance with the Design Drawings" but would be subject to Article5(b) - Limits of Deviation.</p> |
| Q2.5.5 | Joint Councils | <p>Requirement 4- Stages of Authorised Development</p> <p>Is the Applicant's response to Action Point 33[REP3-023] sufficiently precise to enable local authorities to discharge this requirement?</p> |
| Q2.5.6 | Canterbury City Council Dover District Council Kent County Council | <p>Requirement 5 - CEMP</p> <p>Further to comments on Q1.2.57 are you satisfied with Requirement 5(4) of the draft DCO [REP2-003], which now includes provision for NE to be consulted and the Method Statement A in the Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy, which states that if pre-works verification surveys identify new badger setts adjacent to working areas that a licence may be required from Natural England (NE) and species method statements would be required to accompany licence applications [APP-066, para 10.4.1]?</p> |
| Q2.5.7 | Applicant Kent County Council | <p>Requirement 5 -CEMP</p> <p>5(2) refers to various plans schemes and strategies "which specifies the measures to be used to minimise the impacts of construction". 5(3) states "any works carried out pursuant to the plans, scheme and strategy referred to in sub-paragraph (2) must be carried out in accordance with the approved plan,</p> |

| | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>scheme or strategy unless otherwise agreed with the relevant planning authority.”</p> <p>Section 5.19 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) refers to a Travel Plan “to be produced by the contractor at detailed design stage and will form aprt of the evolution of this CTMP.” Given that the CTMP is a certified document under Requirement 5, explain the reference to ‘evolution of this CTMP.</p> <p>Should the Outline Travel Plan be a separate requirement, the outline of which would be certified by the SoS as per the precedent set in a number of other made DCOs. If not, why not?</p> <p>The ExA has not come to a view as to whether there should be a separate requirement for travel planning. However, it would assist the ExA if an agreed draft form of wording was provided, for further consideration.</p> |
| Q2.5.8 | Applicant Natural England | <p>Requirement 6</p> <p>Should Natural England be added to Requirement 6(1) in the same way as the Environment Agency is included? This would be with regards consultation on the proposed lighting scheme.</p> |
| Q2.5.9 | Applicant | <p>Requirement 6 - Construction Mitigation Plans</p> <p>The current drafting of the tail piece appears to allow non-compliance with plans/schemes. Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 15 - Drafting DCOs makes the following comment:</p> <p>Para 19.4 “On the other hand, a requirement might make the development consent conditional on the LPA approving detailed aspects of the development in advance (for example, the details of a landscaping scheme). Where the LPA (or other discharging body) is given power to approve such details it will be acceptable to allow that body to approve a change to details that they had already approved. However, the tailpiece (or other wording) should not allow the LPA to approve details which stray outside the parameters set for the development as part of the examination process and subsequent approval of the Secretary of State.”</p> <p>Please comment on the suggested form of alternative wording below to overcome this concern. <i>(2) The construction works for each stage must be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and scheme referred to in sub-paragraph(1) or with any amended plans or scheme that may subsequently be approved in writing by the relevant planning authority.</i></p> |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| <p>Q2.5.10</p> | <p>Applicant Canterbury City Council Dover District Council Thanet District Council</p> | <p>Requirement 8 - Mitigation Planting Can all parties provide an agreed update on the outcome of the meeting held on 15 August 2016 between the Applicant and Joint Councils in respect of Requirement 8 - locations that would benefit from advance planting?</p> <p>Should there be a reference to 'areas left for natural regeneration' in Requirement 8(2)(a)?</p> <p>Do the Joint Councils, discharging post-consent approvals have any further comments on the need to specify what would be contained in the scheme for planting trees, groups of trees, woodlands and hedgerows?</p> |
| <p>Q2.5.11</p> | <p>Applicant</p> | <p>Requirement 10 - Retention and Protection of Existing Trees and Hedgerows Please update the document reference in Requirement 10(1) to include the Deadline 3 addendum and any Deadline 4 addendum.</p> <p>Should reference also be made in 10(1) to the drawings 'Trees or Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed' plans [APP-025] as these are more detailed, particularly where a hedgerow coincides with the Order limits.</p> <p>Should there be a reference to minimum stand-off distances, in the Tree and Hedgerow Protection Strategy (THPS), even if they are aspirational, in Requirement 10(2)?</p> |
| <p>Q2.5.12</p> | <p>Applicant The Environment Agency IDB</p> | <p>Requirement 12 - Reinstatement Schemes Notwithstanding the fact the Environment Agency (EA) has indicated enhancement measures would be agreed outside the DCO as part of the Land Drainage Consent Process; and mindful of NPS EN-1, paras 5.3.4 and 5.3.18, do parties consider there is a case for the specific reinstatement proposals for removal of temporary culverts that benefit elvers?</p> <p>The EA has suggested these as enhancement measures (response to Q1.2.64 [REP2-009]) secured in Requirement 12, or included in the CEMP or the BMS. If they are not secured in the DCO, should these be included in the Landscape and Habitat Enhancement Scheme (LHES)?</p> |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | The EA is requested to provide an update on its discussions with the River Stour (Kent) IDB regarding the afore-mentioned reinstatement proposals. |
| Q2.5.13 | Applicant MMO | Requirement 17 - Clearance over the Tidal Stour What is the outcome of discussions with MMO in relation to Action Points 46; 50 and 51 (REP3-023) |
| | | <i>Additional Provisions</i> |
| Q2.5.14 | Applicant | Please provide a form of wording for a draft additional requirement in relation to the handling of complaints, so that this can be considered further (REP3-023 Action 47, Appendix D). |
| Q2.5.15 | Applicant | In response to concerns expressed by Nethergong Camping at the Open Floor Hearing (EV-019), please explain the effect on the proposed development of an additional requirement included in the DCO that would prevent all works from being carried out in connection with the construction of pylons PC26 and PC27 between the months of May to September inclusive? |
| | | <i>Schedule 14 – Protective Provisions</i> |
| Q2.5.16 | Applicant | What is the Applicant's position on the protective provisions provided to the Applicant by SEW on 27 July 2016 [REP3-019, para 8.2]? |
| Q2.5.17 | Network Rail | Why would protective provisions, as in previous Orders, not prevent the identified detrimental impact, and suggested serious detriment, on the operation of the railway [REP3-041, para 2.2]? |
| 6 | Historic environment | |
| | | <i>Heritage assets</i> |
| Q2.6.1 | Canterbury City Council | Is the Council content with the Applicant's response to Q1.6.12 [REP2-016] regarding the heritage assessment of the Church of St Mary the Virgin in Chislet? If not, why not? |
| Q2.6.2 | Broad Oak Preservation Society | Please provide any further comments you may have following the Applicant's response to the BOPS' response to Q1.6.7 in connection with listed buildings in Broad Oak. |

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 7 | Landscape and visual | |
| | | <i>Applicant's landscape assessment</i> |
| Q2.7.1 | Kent County Council | Provide any further comments on first round questions Q1.7.7, Q1.7.9, Q1.7.14, Q1.7.15, Q1.7.16, Q1.7.29, Q1.7.38, Q1.7.39 and Q1.7.67, as the Council advised would be the case [REP2-069], other than those contained in response to first round questions [REP3-040]: |
| Q2.7.2 | Kent County Council | In places KCC's response to first written questions refers the ExA to specific parts of the Joint Councils' SoCG; which, whilst topically relevant, do not answer the specific questions [REP2-069]. Please can the council respond to: Q1.7.34 – reference to SoCG section 4.1; Q1.7.40 – reference to SoCG section 4.23; and Q1.7.44 – reference to SoCG section 4.23. |
| Q2.7.3 | Applicant | Further to Kent County Council's (KCC's) response to Q1.7.1 [REP2-069] and its comments on responses to Q1.7.4 [REP3-040], please explain the apparent discrepancy in response to Q1.7.2 and Q1.7.4 regarding 'regional' value. Are there areas which don not trigger assessment characteristics for 'regional' or 'national' value where the assessment remains as 'local', but have some special characteristics? If so should those areas be identified in some way in the landscape assessment? Please respond to this in the context of KCC's comments regarding the soundness of the Connection Options Report (COR) methodology and KCC's ongoing disagreement over the way the methodology in the ES has been applied in arriving at landscape sensitivity [REP3-040]. |
| Q2.7.4 | Applicant | SEW's comments in its WR [REP2-099, para 74 to 75], to which its response to Q1.7.7 refer, relate to the COR rather than the ES assessment, but the Applicants response relates to the ES [REP3-015]. Are there any points you wish to add in reference to the SEW points made on the COR? |
| Q2.7.5 | South East Water | SEWs response to Q1.7.7 refers to its WR [REP2-099, para 74 to 75], which firstly questions the logic of the COR landscape effects in relation to undergrounding then calls for a review of the SEW Alternatives |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | taking into account sensitivity values of landscape and visual receptors. Q1.7.7 specifically asked about the ES assessment and whether IPs agree that significant predicted effects would amount to no greater than moderate adverse effects [APP-029, Table 6.14]. Further explanation is required in order to explain the point being made. |
| Q2.7.6 | Kent County Council | <p>KCC made comments about the "<i>accumulative effect of a very large number of less significant adverse effects over a very extensive geographical area..</i>" [REP2-069 and REP2-068].</p> <p>Does the Applicant's response to KCC's response to Q1.7.7 [REP3-015] referring to the cumulative effects assessments in the technical chapters of the ES, satisfy KCC?</p> <p>If not set out in detail where KCC's opinion differs; and confirm how this relates to the agreement reached on the approach to presenting inter-related effects as set out in the SoCG [REP2-024, ID4.31.1].</p> |
| | | <i>Applicant's visual assessment</i> |
| Q2.7.7 | Applicant | <p>Set out a concise tabulated list of the documents Interested Parties, such as Broad Oak Preservation Society (BOPS) [REP3-048], should view to understand the visual assessment methodology and its application.</p> <p>Also indicate where the following can be found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanation of the relationship between landscape and visual assessments; and • assessments which are outward looking from Broad Oak. |
| Q2.7.8 | Applicant | <p>Where in the documentation is the '<i>panorama photo</i>' from the north of Broad Oak Valley which it is stated as having been submitted and referred to in the Response to the SEW WR [REP3-019, para 4.38].</p> <p>It should be submitted if not already.</p> <p>Is this the information to which SEW's WR refers [REP2-099, para below 224]?</p> |
| Q2.7.9 | Applicant South East Water | Is there still disagreement between parties on the need for further photomontages? If so, SEW is requested to describe what it considers is still required. The Applicant is asked to set out its position. |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|---|---|
| | | |
| Q2.7.10 | Applicant | The Applicant is invited to reconsider the assessment of <i>"visual receptor with no view of proposed development"</i> for the location immediately to the north of A1.H51 in Calcott [REP2-017, Appendix L, page 2 of 7] following inspection nearby on the Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) on 25 July 2016. |
| Q2.7.11 | Applicant | Please provide an update on progress on the possible photomontage from Sandwich Church Tower. |
| Q2.7.12 | Kent County Council | Is KCC satisfied with the explanation in the Applicant's response to Q1.7.27 that a clearly deterministic method to identifying views of regional value was not adopted in the ES, that site assessments were also considered, resulting in the judgements in the Visual Impact Assessment Tables [REP-2016]? |
| Q2.7.13 | Kent County Council Dover District Council | Are KCC and DDC satisfied with the way in which the sequential views from long distance trails (footpaths and cycleways) have been assessed in the ES [APP-029, Table 7.1]? |
| | | <i>Other feasible means of connection (alternative technologies)</i> |
| Q2.7.14 | Interested Parties | Are there any further comments (other than those already made) on the Applicant's response to Q1.7.30, setting out its position on alternative technologies and routeing [REP2-016]? |
| Q2.7.15 | Applicant | Please respond to the BOPS' comments regarding the undergrounding across the Wirral Peninsula [REP3-048]? |
| Q2.7.16 | Applicant | Further to the responses to the last part of Q1.7.30 and to Q1.7.45 [REP2-016 and REP2-017] which set out the reasons for not taking forward undergrounding in Section A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the reference for the summary of socio-economic effects from the COR correct, stated as COR, para 7.210? • Is it the case that the consideration of undergrounding at COR stage was undertaken on a section by section basis? This seems to be borne out by the Q1.7.30 (including Appendix N) response on consideration of undergrounding in areas of landscape and visual sensitivity <i>"With respect to high sensitivity landscape and visual areas and receptors in Section A the landscape and visual assessment concludes that an underground cable would give rise to beneficial effects on visual amenity with localised adverse effects on the landscape resource (ancient woodland and orchards) in Section A. Overall, it is not considered that an overhead alignment would result in such a</i> |

| | | |
|----------------|-----------|---|
| | | <p><i>substantial change to landscape and views that it would necessitate undergrounding.</i>" [REP2-017, Appendix N].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the suggestion by some IPs that a length of proposed overhead line which is contained within, but not extending for a full section length, should be undergrounded considered? • Could the approach at the COR stage have led to significant adverse effects in one length of a section being balanced with less significant effects in another part of that section, arriving at an overall section conclusion, which might differ from that of a part of the section? • Please respond to the BOP points regarding undergrounding from the vicinity of PC13 to Canterbury substation, including the need for only one CSE compound, cabling taking circuitous routing, the benefits in terms of proximity to Broad Oak and therefore less interaction with eg Goose Farm and the proposed reservoir; and points made regarding the other benefits of underground lines [REP3-048] and costs. • Would there be any difference in the type of CSE compound for undergrounding all the way from PC13 to Canterbury from that which would be required to deliver the two underground SEW Alternatives? If so provide a photograph. • Explain the need for the size of CSE compound, in response to the photographs in the BOPS' submission [REP3-048]. |
| | | <i>Routeing, including Holford Rules and lines of deviation</i> |
| Q2.7.17 | CPRE Kent | A response was not provided to Q1.7.47. Does CPRE Kent wish to respond? |
| Q2.7.18 | Applicant | <p>KCC is of the opinion in its WR [REP2-068] that Holford Rule 6 (in flat and sparsely planted countryside high voltage lines should be kept, as far as possible, independent of smaller lines and converging routes, so as to avoid a concentration or 'wirescape') has not been taken into account in the design of the diamond crossover, as illustrated with photomontage VPD1 [APP-044].</p> <p>The Applicants response to Q1.7.43, which includes a summary table outlining how the Holford Rules have been applied to each section of the final route alignment [REP2-017, Appendix O] makes no mention of the diamond crossover, which straddles the boundary of Sections C and D.</p> <p>As the crossover was not part of earlier options, provide an explanation of how this part of the overhead lines (the crossover) meets Holford Rule 6 and clarify what alternatives were considered in this location to aim for compliance with Holford Rule 6.</p> |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|
| | | |
| Q2.7.19 | Applicant | BOPS questions the application of Holford Rule 6 because of the existence of two existing lines in the Broad Oak area [REP2-077]. The Applicant's response in the summary table outlining how the Holford Rule 6 has been applied in Section A addresses landscape susceptibility and selection of pylon type [REP2-017, Appendix O]. Please explain how in the Broad Oak area Rule 6 has been applied. |
| Q2.7.20 | Applicant | SEW considers Holford Rule 7 has been overlooked as set out in its WR [REP2-099, para 194]. This is not specifically addressed in the Applicant's responses on Holford Rules and responses on SEW's WR [REP2-016, REP2-017 and REP3-019]. The BOP also makes reference to this Holford Rule in its response to Q1.7.43 [REP2-077]. The Applicant is requested to set out a more specific response to the points made by SEW and the BOP in connection with how it considers Holford Rule 7 has been applied in Section A of the proposed development. |
| Q2.7.21 | Kent County Council | In your opinion are there opportunities that the Applicant should seek to explore to ensure that the final design of the proposed development would offer a greater degree of compliance with the Holford Rules? |
| | | <i>Pylon design</i> |
| Q2.7.22 | Applicant | Please provide a photograph each taken from a similar distance of a standard 132kV lattice pylon, a standard 400kV lattice pylon and a low height lattice pylon. Using the photographs, please explain what is meant by " <i>consistent appearance</i> " between the low height 400kV pylons and the 132kV pylons in the justification of Holford Rule 6 compliance in Section D [REP2-017, Appendix O]. |
| Q2.7.23 | Applicant | Further to the response to Q1.7.56 [REP2-016] please resubmit Sheet 1 of the Design Drawings [APP-026] revised, so it illustrates pylon heights associated with this proposed development, rather than standard pylon heights. |
| Q2.7.24 | Applicant Kent County Council | Is the agreement on mitigation for landscape and visual effects set out in the SoCG [REP2-024, ID4.3.6 and ID4.4.6] included in the event the Secretary of State permits an overhead line? It appears to conflict with the statement in KCC's WR " <i>As the adverse landscape and visual effects have been under-reported and cannot be effectively mitigated, it is recommended that further consideration is given to the</i> |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | <p><i>undergrounding of the connection.</i>" [REP2-068].</p> <p>Clarification is requested from KCC.</p> <p>The Applicant may wish to elaborate on its understanding of the SoCG statement.</p> <p>Parties to review and advise whether a revised SoCG is necessary.</p> |
| Q2.7.25 | Applicant | <p>Please provide an update in relation to advance planting and potential locations including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad Oak in the vicinity of the proposed reservoir; • Foxhill Farm; • Nethergong Campsite; and • Tile Lodge Farm. <p>The response should cover advance mitigation planting, which could be secured through the DCO. It should also cover the potential to build agreements to deliver advance enhancement planting through the LHES, such as ex-situ planting at Foxhill Farm as mentioned in response to Q1.7.48 [REP2-016].</p> |
| Q2.7.26 | Applicant | <p>The Applicant is requested to explain where the fixed detail design is set out and where the areas open to further agreement within fixed parameters as relied on in the ES are set out.</p> |
| Q2.7.27 | Canterbury City Council | <p>Is Canterbury City Council content with the Applicant's response to Q1.7.49 setting out why it does not consider it would be possible to increase the lines of deviation (LoD) in the areas mentioned [REP2-016]?</p> |
| Q2.7.28 | Broad Oak Preservation Society | <p>Further to BOPS comments regarding screening, are there any further comments on the proposed line of native tree planting along the rear of the properties on Mayton Lane and along the northern boundary of Nook Farm shown as ID: MA12 [APP-123, Figure 5.8.2 and Appendix A, page 6], summarised in Applicant's response to Q1.7.66 [REP2-016]. This is proposed as enhancement planting (not mitigation) by the Applicant and subject to landowner agreement, and therefore the location is not guaranteed.</p> |
| Q2.7.29 | Mrs Christine Jenkins | <p>Provide any comments you have on the proposed line of native tree planting along part of the northern boundary of Nethergong campsite, south of Nethergong Penn at the base of the embankment, shown as</p> |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|--|---|
| | | ID: MB1.2 [APP-123, Figure 5.8.4 and Appendix A, page 13], summarised in Applicant's response to Q1.7.66 [REP2-016]. This is proposed as enhancement planting (not mitigation) by the Applicant and subject to landowner agreement. |
| Q2.7.30 | Mr Richard Jones and Ms Lindsay Halpin | Provide any comments you have on the proposed line of native tree planting along part of the track south west of Lower Chitty Farm shown as part of ID: MB1.6 [APP-123, Figure 5.8.4 and Appendix A, page 15], summarised in Applicant's response to Q1.7.66 [REP2-016]. This is proposed as enhancement planting (not mitigation) by the Applicant and subject to landowner agreement, therefore the location is not guaranteed. |
| Q2.7.31 | Mr Headley Mark Chandler for Finns | Do you have any comments on the mitigation planting which is shown on the Concept Mitigation Planting Plans [REP2-014, Figure 11.1zi, page 35 of 94 and other drawings eastwards]? Provide any comments you have on the proposed line of native tree and hedgerow planting in the vicinity of Tile Lodge Farm, shown as parts of ID: MB1.1 [APP-123, Figure 5.8.3 and Appendix A, page 12]. This is proposed as enhancement planting (not mitigation) by the Applicant and subject to landowner agreement. Both are summarised in the Applicant's response to Q1.7.66 [REP2-016]. |
| Q2.7.32 | Canterbury City Council, Dover District Council, Thanet District Council Kent County Council | Further to the Applicant's response to Q1.7.69 [REP2-016], please confirm if there are any other opportunities for enhancement which you consider the Applicant should explore? In the case of Dover District Council, if you consider the remit of the enhancements are beyond the planning remit (response to Q1.7.63 [REP2-065]), who do you consider is best placed to represent the interests of the Countryside Stewardship scheme? |
| | | <i>Good Design</i> |
| Q2.7.33 | Applicant | The response to Q1.7.52 [REP2-016] and responses to comments from the NFU and Richborough Agents [REP3-013, para 2.3.26 to 2.3.28] explains that comments were received during consultation which led to a decision to move the proposed overhead line alignment at the eastern end. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the design of the proposed development in the location of the crossover compliant with the |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| | | <p>policy requirements of NPS EN-1, section 4.5 and NPS EN-5, para 2.7.1 to 2.7.5?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set out a summary of the reasoning behind this decision and the consequential evolution of the design. • How were the effects (biodiversity including ornithology, socio-economic including farming, drainage and soils, landscape and visual) of the change assessed? • Was undergrounding of the existing 132KV line (that will remain) and / or the proposed 400KV line or other alternatives for the diamond crossover design and location considered? If not why not? • If the location of cable sealing end (CSE) compounds or CSE pylons in sensitive locations would be significant, were alternative locations for CSE compounds or CSE pylons considered? • What would be the cost, socio-economic and environmental implications of undergrounding the overhead line at the crossover? |
| 8 Noise and vibration, electro-magnetic fields | | |
| Q2.8.1 | Applicant Joint Councils | A draft Noise and Vibration Management Plan was subject to discussion with the Joint Councils prior to the submission of an NVMP [REP2-044] to the Examination. Does the submitted document adequately address the concerns raised by the Joint Councils about noise and vibration? What, if any, are the outstanding issues? |
| Q2.8.2 | Joint Councils | Are the Joint Councils content with the noise and vibration monitoring proposals contained in Section 1.10 of the NVMP? Do random monthly noise surveys adequately deal with short term activities such as bellmouth and access track construction? What alternative measures, if any, would they propose? |
| Q2.8.3 | Applicant Joint Councils | The Joint Councils in their LIR [REP2-061 Para 7.7.4] suggest that the inclusion in the DCO of more specific restrictions on hours of work at the defined locations set out in the NVMP [REP2-044 Para 1.5.6 Table 1.3] would go some way to address their concerns over the impacts of construction noise and vibration. What are the Applicant's views on such a change? |
| Q2.8.4 | Applicant | In Table 7 of the draft NVMP [REP2-044], why have no mitigation options been provided in respect of 1 Shalloak Road where a 60dB noise threshold is exceeded? |

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | |
| Q2.8.5 | Applicant | In assessing the effects of overhead line noise at the Nethergong Camp Site, what account has been taken of the fact that human receptors in this area will typically be under canvas at night? |
| Q2.8.6 | Applicant | What steps have been taken to ensure that the appropriate sized conductor arrangement would be selected in order to minimise potential noise from overhead lines? |
| 9 | Socio-economic | |
| Q2.9.1 | Applicant | <p>In a first written question [PD-006 Q1.7.33] the Applicant was asked how farming was taken into account in the local economic impact of the socio-economic appraisal at SOR stage and whether consideration was given to specialist cropping and irrigation needs.</p> <p>In response [REP2-016 Q1.7.33] the Applicant states that <i>'...the SOR is a high level appraisal of the options and does not consider at that stage the localised impacts such as those mentioned in the question and referenced in relevant representations. The appraisal at strategic options stage focusses on the identification of potential effects to major areas of economic activity, or tourism assets of regional or national importance which may differentiate one strategic option from another. Farming impact is not something that is considered to be significant enough to differentiate between options at that stage. Specialist cropping and irrigation needs were therefore not considered at SOR stage...'</i></p> <p>Is this approach consistent with the requirements of NPS EN-1, in particular Para 5.10.8?</p> |
| Q2.9.2 | Applicant | <p>In a first written question [PD-006 Q1.7.37] the Applicant was asked to provide a response to the point made which argued that the additional cost of undergrounding would add little to the annual bill of an average electricity consumer.</p> <p>It is unclear from the Applicant's response, what the economic cost of undergrounding would be and the likely impact on an average domestic consumer's bill of an underground option compared with an overhead. Can the Applicant explain matters further?</p> |
| Q2.9.3 | Applicant | In first written question [PD-006 Q1.7.52] the Applicant was asked to set out the reasons for the |

| | | |
|-----------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>change in the alignment of the 400kV line across Ash Level in Section D from south of the remaining 132kV line to the north. The Applicant replied [REP2-016 Q1.7.52] that the decision was made following the statutory consultation and a review of all feedback as detailed in the Consultation Report [APP-124].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the factors taken into account and the reasoning that led to this decision? • What account was taken of the impact on farming operations during construction and subsequently? • What account was taken of the need for additional pylons on Monkton marshes to facilitate the passage of the 400kV line over the remaining 132kV PY line necessitated by the change of alignment? |
| Q2.9.4 | Applicant | <p>What steps has the Applicant taken in the design of the proposed development to ensure that existing agricultural operations are able to continue in areas through which the 400 kV overhead line passes? What account has been taken of the potential loss of production area where agricultural machinery and spray irrigation equipment can no longer operate owing to field width or height restrictions? How does the approach adopted comply with the approach detailed in to the Route Corridor Study [APP-131 Appendix 2 Para 1.14] which notes that “..National Grid would work closely with any landowners on whose land its equipment is sited to negotiate the terms to install and maintain its equipment including compensation if this is appropriate....the residual economic impact is expected to be small...”?</p> |
| 10 | Traffic and Transport | |
| Q2.10.1 | Applicant Kent County Council | <p>The SoCG between the Applicant and KCC [REP3-011 SoCG 3.4.3] notes that <i>‘construction traffic would avoid travelling past local schools where possible. Construction traffic will not travel past schools during the morning and afternoon periods when pupils arrive and leave school.’</i> The sections of the CTMP [APP-068] referred to in the SoCG in this connection (3.4 and 5.3) make no mention of local schools or preventing construction traffic passing them at specified times.</p> <p>What schools would be affected and how would construction traffic be controlled so as to deliver this agreement? How would this be secured in the DCO?</p> |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Q2.10.2 | Applicant Kent County Council | <p>The SoCG between the Applicant and KCC [REP3-011 SoCG ID3.3.2] notes that there is agreement on <i>'..the scope of traffic surveys undertaken to inform the TA...'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What analysis has been carried out to ensure that the capacity of road junctions is not adversely affected by construction traffic from the proposed development? • How have impacts on junction capacities been assessed? • How have likely queue lengths and delays been calculated or otherwise assessed at, for instance, the roundabout at the junction of the A28 and Vauxhall Road and the junction of the A28 and the A291 at Sturry Station? |
| Q2.10.3 | Applicant Joint Councils | <p>The SoCG between the Applicant and KCC [REP3-011 SoCG ID3.2.1] notes that <i>'Advance warning signs will be provided where a PRoW is subject to closure or diversion. Where applicable maps showing temporary diversions and alternative rights of way will be provided at sites affected by the works as detailed in Section 3.2 of the PRoW Management Plan (Document 5.4.3H APP-069). National Grid will also work with KCC to include information on proposed mitigation on the 'Explore Kent' website.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would this be secured in the DCO? • Are the Joint Councils content with this approach, particularly in respect of proposed closures of the Saxon Shore Way? • Should a specific mechanism be identified which ensures timely communications to PRoW users to mitigate adverse impacts on PRoW users and address the concerns expressed in the DCC Written Representation [REP2-064 Para 1.8]? |
| Q2.10.4 | Applicant | <p>How do the topics to be included in the travel plan, set out in REP3-023 Appendix C Section 2.7, meet the requirement set out in EN-1 Para 5.13.4 that the Applicant should prepare a travel plan? How does the Embedded Environmental Measures Schedule [REP2-006]) define the measures which would be secured by the travel plan?</p> |
| Q2.10.5 | Applicant | <p>A revision to the Transport Assessment [REP3-007] was submitted for Deadline 3. The Summary of Changes sheet referred to in the document control sheet is not included in the published document and should be submitted.</p> |
| Q2.10.6 | Applicant | <p>The degree of protection afforded to trees and hedges in visibility splays is uncertain and the rationale</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>for the extent of some of the land required for visibility splays is unclear. For example, plot 394 is shown on the Land Plans [APP-015 Sheet 3B] as adjacent to the A291 Herne Bay Road. In an answer to a question [REP2-016 Q1.4.12] the Applicant produced a document [REP2-017] detailing the use to which each plot would be put, this indicates that Plot 394 would be used as a visibility splay. The Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed Plans [APP-025 Sheet 3] do not indicate that trees or hedges that are to be removed or managed in this area, but the tree constraints drawing in the AIA [APP-070, Figure 31.1d] shows a hedge H81 along the line of the Order Limits. What steps will be taken to ensure that hedges and trees will not be unnecessarily removed or damaged in providing suitable visibility for traffic using BM19?</p> <p>There is no hedge shown on the opposite side (west) of Herne Bay Road, (plot 396) so it is unclear why the Order Limit is required for the visibility splay for BM20. What works will be undertaken in such plots identified for visibility splays if there is no vegetation to be managed or removed? Likewise in plots 405 and 406 [APP-015 Sheet 3B], what work is to be undertaken other than the management of Tree T216 at the tip of the Order Limits?</p> <p>How can the ExA be satisfied that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effects on trees and hedges in visibility splays not shown for management or removal, has been adequately covered in the ES? and • The land shown in the Order Limits for visibility splays is required for class 5 access? |
| 11 Water Issues | | |
| 11 | Water Issues | |
| | <i>Environmental Statement – Chapter 13 (Water environment) [APP-030]</i> | |
| Q2.11.1 | The Environment Agency | When is new data published for Cycle 2 of the WFD assessments of the SE River Basin District likely to be available [APP-030, para 13.5.52]? |
| Q2.11.2 | Applicant | Is it possible to incorporate new data published for Cycle 2 of the WFD assessments of the SE River Basin District in the ES baseline water quality data during the course of the examination or is it necessary for there to be a commitment in the DCO for the Applicant to undertake this assessment before finalising its mitigation strategy [APP-030, para 13.5.52]? |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|----------------|----------------------|--|
| | | <i>Environmental Statement – Chapter 13A (Flood risk assessment) [APP-111]</i> |
| Q2.11.3 | Kent County Council | Is KCC satisfied that Requirement 5 in the draft DCO [REP2-003] and the CEMP [APP-064] adequately secure all measures required to mitigate flood risk in terms of its statutory responsibilities as Lead Local Flood Authority [APP-111, para 7.1.2]? If not, why not? |
| | | <i>Deadline 3 Submissions</i> |
| Q2.11.4 | Applicant | Is agreement anticipated on these points during the course of the Examination [REP3-010, table 4.1 item 4.1.1]? If agreement is not achieved, how does the Applicant intend that the draft DCO will comply with s150 PA 2008 in this regard? |
| 12 | Other matters | |
| | | <i>Construction effects</i> |
| Q2.12.1 | Applicant | Although the ES Figures [APP-034 Figs 3a-h] indicate the areas required for the removal of 11kV and 33kV overhead line (conductors and poles) and the installation of underground cable and associated works, it is not clear in all cases why such extensive areas are required. For example on Fig 3.1a between pylons PC2 and PC3; south of PC6; north of PC7, and on Fig 3.1e at PC33. Please explain by means of more detailed drawings or otherwise the purposes for which these areas of land are required. |
| Q2.12.2 | Applicant | In designing the layout of construction routes over agricultural land what consideration has been given to the detailed views of land owners and tenants? How and in what instances have these been taken into account in producing the submitted scheme? What consideration has been given to the maintenance of existing drainage? In what way will the construction details for temporary accesses been amended to suit the varying ground conditions likely to be encountered in order to reduce long term impacts and minimise the need for remediation? |
| Q2.12.3 | Applicant | In its answer to written question [PD-006 Q1.7.52] the Applicant listed topics included in discussions with PILs. A more detailed explanation of the topics discussed with precise references to how agreements are to be secured, together with evidence that agreement has been reached with the relevant landowners in respect to the matters listed, or an indication of the stage which discussions have |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| | | reached, should be provided. |
| Q2.12.4 | Applicant | The Proposed Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015] show a number of routes that appear to be required for access to sites of environmental mitigation measures. It would be helpful if routes intended entirely for this purpose could be indicated on updated drawings. |
| Q2.12.5 | Applicant | Why is the clearance of vegetation required on land accessed from Vauxhall Road via Bellmouth 40? |
| Q2.12.6 | Applicant | What is the purpose of the scaffold access running north from the location of pylon PC5 as shown on the Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015 Sheet 2]? |
| Q2.12.7 | Applicant | What is the purpose of the two scaffold accesses immediately west of the location of pylon PC13, and that running east of pylon PX21, as shown on the Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015 Sheet 4]? |
| Q2.12.8 | Applicant | What is the purpose of the scaffold access running east of pylon PX25, as shown on the Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015 Sheet 5]? |
| Q2.12.9 | Applicant | What is the purpose of the scaffold access running north from BM25 then east towards pylon PX28 as shown on the Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015 Sheet 7]? |
| Q2.12.10 | Applicant | What is the purpose of the duplicated construction accesses running between the locations of pylons PC26 and PC27 as shown on the Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015 Sheet 8]? |
| Q2.12.11 | Applicant | What is the purpose of the scaffold access between pylons PX42 and 43 lead south from the indicated dismantling access as shown on the Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015 Sheet 10]? |
| Q2.12.12 | Applicant | What is the purpose of the construction access running from BM33 to BM37 as shown on the Construction, Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015 Sheet 11]? |
| Q.12. | Interested Parties | Do any interested parties have comments on any of the accesses shown on the Construction, |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| | | Dismantling and Maintenance Access Plans [REP2-015]? |
| Q2.12.13 | Applicant | Can you provide a detailed account of the steps taken to minimise the impact on agricultural operations of the 400kV route by locating pylons either on field edges or sufficiently far from margins to allow unhindered access for irrigation and other agricultural machinery? |
| Q2.12.14 | Applicant | In response to written question [REP2-016 Q1.12.8] the Applicant notes that in constructing access roads a contractor may choose to use trackway instead of stone construction depending on ground conditions. How would the views of PILs be sought in the design of the access roads? |
| Q2.12.15 | Applicant | <p>The outline of a Soil and Aftercare Management Plan (SAMP) [REP3-023 Appendix C Sec. 2.2] makes no mention of inputs from PILs. What is the mechanism for including the views of PILs in the SAMP and in the day to day operation of the plan?</p> <p>In response to points raised in the ISH on the DCO held on 28 July [REP3-023 Action No. 48] the Applicant proposed the appointment of an agricultural liaison officer. This role is not yet described in the SAMP, should it be?</p> <p>What assurance will there be that the person appointed to this role has sufficient seniority within the Applicant's organisation and the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding of the agricultural issues involved, both to gain the confidence of PILS involved and to represent them effectively to the Applicant and its contractor?</p> |
| Q2.12.16 | Applicant | What are the terms of reference of the land drainage consultant (REP3-013 para 2.3.33)? |
| Q2.12.17 | The Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Board, Kent County Council NFU | <p>You are requested to provide any comments on the plans and strategies referred to in Appendix C Plan [REP3-23] including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil and Aftercare Plan • Drainage Management Plan • Pollution Incident Control Plan • Lighting Scheme • Site Waste Management Plan |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel Plan |
| Q2.12.18 | Applicant | The degree of protection afforded to trees and hedges in visibility splays is unclear. For example, plot 394 is shown the land plans [APP-015 Sheet 3] as adjacent to the A291 Herne Bay Road. In an answer to a question [REP2-016 Q1.4.12] the Applicant produced a document [REP2-017] detailing the use to which each plot would be put: this indicates that Plot 394 would be used as a visibility splay. Site inspections show the plot area to be wooded but the Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed or Managed plans [APP-025 Sheet 3] do not indicate that trees or hedges are to be removed or managed in this area. What steps will be taken to ensure that hedges and trees will not be unnecessarily removed or damaged in providing suitable visibility for traffic using BM19? What other visibility splay areas are similarly affected? |
| Q2.12.29 | Applicant | Can you explain REP3-013, para 2.3.53, further? |
| | | <i>Contaminated land</i> |
| Q2.12.20 | Applicant | In answer to a written question [REP2-016 Q1.12.14] the Applicant states that the proposed Westbere compound would be used, among other things, for a site office and welfare cabins for staff use. How would services and sewage connections be made to these facilities and fuel storage facilities be installed given the Applicant's answer to written question Q1.12.23 [REP2-016] about the possible harmful effects of the former use of this site? |
| | | <i>Environmental Statement</i> |
| Q2.12.21 | Applicant | Your response to Q1.12.26 considers resilience of the proposed development to flooding. How have the impacts of climate change, and in particular resilience of the proposals to effects of wind and storms on overhead lines; higher average temperatures leading to increased transmission losses and the effects of flooding or drought, on those locations where the proposals include undergrounding? |
| Q2.12.22 | The Environment Agency, Kent County Council, Canterbury City Council, Dover District Council, | Are parties content that the Applicant has provided appropriate evidence to demonstrate where intra-project effects have been considered in its response to Q1.12.17 [REP2-016]? |

EN020017: Richborough Connection. Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---|
| | Thanet District Council | |
| | | <i>Planning policy</i> |
| Q2.12.23 | Applicant | Can you respond to the note by SEW on the relationship between the Water Industry Act 1991 and the PA 2008 [REP3-037]. |
| Q2.12.24 | Applicant | Please respond to SEWs further comments on Q1.12.40. |
| Q2.12.25 | Applicant | Do you agree with DDC's suggested word change to the Planning Statement given in its response to Q1.2.43 [REP2-065]? |
| | | <i>General matters</i> |
| Q2.12.26 | Applicant | Please provide an update to REP3-008 at Deadline 5. |
| Q2.12.27 | Applicant | SEW refers to the judgement given on the second application for permission to appeal the Thames Blue Green Economy [REP3-036]. Does the Applicant wish to make any further comments in relation to this judgement and SEW's submission? |