



Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited Triton Knoll Electrical System

**Appendix 20: Statement of
Common Ground between Triton
Knoll Offshore Wind Farm
Limited and East Lindsey District
Council**

Date: 27 October 2015

**Appendix 20 of the Applicant's
Response to Deadline 2**

Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited

Triton Knoll Electrical System

Appendix 20: Statement of Common Ground
between Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm
Limited and East Lindsey District Council

Appendix 20 of the Applicant's Response to
Deadline 2

Date: 27 October 2015

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
4th Floor One Kingdom Street
Paddington Central
London
W2 6BD

T: 0845 026 0562
Email: info@tritonknoll.co.uk
www.rweinnogy.com/tritonknoll

Drafted By:	Chris Lloyd
Approved By:	Kim Gauld Clark
Date of Approval:	27/10/2015
Revision:	5.0

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
Copyright © 2015 RWE
Innogy UK Ltd
All pre-existing rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CONFIRMATION OF AGREEMENT	6
2. INTRODUCTION	7
3. CONSULTATION	9
4. MATTERS AGREED	13
5. Site Selection and Alternatives	15
6. Landscape and Visual	16
7. Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation	20
8. Terrestrial Ecology	23
9. Historic Environment (onshore)	26
10. Traffic and Access	30
11. Air Quality	31
12. Noise and Vibration	35
13. Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	39
14. MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION	42

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: Consultation undertaken with East Lindsey District Council pre-application

10

1. CONFIRMATION OF AGREEMENT

Confirmation of Agreement with East Lindsey District Council

Signed:



For: Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited

Name: KIM GAULD-CLARK,

Title: SENIOR CONSENTS MANAGER

Date: 27/10/15

Signed:

For: East Lindsey District Council

Name:  CHRIS PANTON

Title: Team Leader Planning

Date: 26/10/15

2. INTRODUCTION

Reason for this Statement of Common Ground

- 2.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Ltd's (TKOWFL or the Applicant) application for a development consent order (DCO) under the Planning Act 2008 (the Application).
- 2.2 This SoCG with East Lindsey District Council (ELDC) is a means of clearly recording any areas of agreement and disagreement between the two parties in relation to the Application. The SoCG has been structured to reflect topics of relevance to ELDC as a local planning authority in relation the Application.
- 2.3 The structure of the SoCG is as follows:
- Section 1: Introduction;
 - Section 2: Consultation;
 - Section 3: Matters agreed; and
 - Section 4: Matters under discussion.
- 2.4 Throughout this SoCG the phrase "It is agreed..." is used as a precursor to any point that has been specifically agreed between the Applicant and ELDC. The phrase "It is not agreed..." is used as a precursor to any point that the Applicant and ELDC wish to identify as not yet agreed. Points that are "still under discussion" or "not agreed" will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.
- 2.5 It is the intention that this document will facilitate further discussions between both parties and also give the Examining Authority (ExA) an understanding of the level of common ground between both parties from the outset of the examination process.

The proposed development

- 2.6 The proposed development comprises the project elements as described in Volume 2, Chapter 1, *Offshore Project Description* (document reference 6.2.2.1) and Volume 3, Chapter 1, *Onshore Project Description* (document reference 6.2.3.1) of the Environmental Statement (ES).

Application elements under the ELDC remit

- 2.7 ELDC is a prescribed consultee for the proposed development under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 9 (1)(a) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009.
- 2.8 ELDC is one of the two local planning authorities in whose area the project is located. In relation to the Triton Knoll Electrical System (TKES) its responsibilities include engagement in the pre-application process, production of a local impact report (LIR) during the Examination phase and the discharge of onshore requirements and monitoring consent compliance for the onshore area of the TKES works.
- 2.9 ELDC has joint responsibility for the foreshore (being the area between mean high water springs and mean low water) with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and will work together with them during the relevant phases of the project accordingly.
- 2.10 The assessment topics under ELDC's remit that have been agreed to include within this SoCG are:
- Volume 1, Chapter 4, Site Selection and Alternatives
 - Volume 3, Chapter 2, Landscape and Visual
 - Volume 3, Chapter 3, Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation
 - Volume 3, Chapter 4, Terrestrial Ecology
 - Volume 3, Chapter 8, Historic Environment
 - Volume 3, Chapter 9, Traffic and Access
 - Volume 3, Chapter 10, Air Quality
 - Volume 3, Chapter 11, Noise and Vibration
- 2.11 It has been agreed that in respect of the Lincolnshire Grazing Marsh, ELDC will defer to the views of Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.

3. CONSULTATION

Summary

- 3.1 The Applicant engaged with ELDC on the proposed development during the pre-application process, both in terms of informal non-statutory engagement and formal consultation, carried out pursuant to section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (the 2008 Act). A summary of consultation undertaken, specific to an environmental topic, is presented in each of the chapters of the ES, with detail on all the consultation undertaken by the Applicant during the pre-application process presented in the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1). The Consultation Report which demonstrates how the Applicant has complied with its duties under the relevant sections of the 2008 Act. Sections 2 and 8 of the Consultation Report detail the formal non-statutory consultation that was carried out and section 6 provide a summary of the formal statutory consultation under the 2008 Act.

EIA Evidence Plan

- 3.2 ELDC participated in the pre-application EIA Evidence Plan process which commenced in May 2014. The primary aim of the EIA Evidence Plan was to ensure that TKOWFL, by agreement with the key statutory and non-statutory bodies, provided sufficient and proportionate information and applied appropriate and proportionate methods in the assessment of the TKES works and the application documentation. The EIA Evidence Plan (document reference 8.16) was submitted with the application for development consent and provides detail of the discussions and agreements undertaken and made as part of that process.
- 3.3 As part of the process ELDC was represented in topic-specific Review Panels and was a member of the EIA Evidence Plan Steering Group. ELDC was principally involved in the Human Environment Review Panel which covered Landscape and Visual; Noise and Air Quality; and Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation. It was also indirectly represented on the Onshore Historic Environment Review Panel (represented by Lincolnshire County Council Archaeologists) and the Traffic and Access Review Panel (represented by Lincolnshire County Council Highways and Transportation Department).
- 3.4 Agreements reached during the EIA Evidence Plan process are set out in this SoCG in order to provide the ExA with a clear understanding of the status of these matters.

Pre-application Consultation

- 3.5 Consultation on the TKES commenced with discussions with ELDC in 2008. At that time the discussions related to the entire project, both the offshore array and the TKES.
- 3.6 In its response to the statutory consultation in November 2014 ELDC provided comments on the following topics of the preliminary environmental information (PEI) - landscape and visual, traffic and access, noise and vibration.
- 3.7 ELDC provided comments on the areas of the draft Environmental Statement (ES) relevant to their remit as the local planning authority.
- 3.8 The meetings detailed in Table 1 were held with ELDC and other relevant stakeholders to discuss outstanding issues.
- 3.9 It is agreed that Table 1 presents an accurate chronological overview of the key meetings in relation to the Application which were undertaken with ELDC prior to the submission of the Application.
- 3.10 It is agreed that the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1) submitted with the application provides accurate record of the statutory consultation which ELDC.
- 3.11 It is agreed that additional topic-specific consultation with ELDC, outside of the EIA Evidence Plan process, is captured within the consultation sections of each of the relevant ES chapters, listed in paragraph 2.10.

Table 1: Consultation undertaken with East Lindsey District Council pre-application

Date	Form of consultation	Activity/Summary	Application Reference for further details
14-May-13	Consultation Meeting	Site selection update meeting	Site selection and design report (doc ref 8.17)
24-Oct-13	Consultation Meeting	Site selection update meeting	Site selection and design report (doc ref 8.17)
22-Apr-14	Consultation Meeting	Discussions regarding the content of the draft SoCC	Consultation Report (doc ref 5.1)

15-May-14	Consultation Meeting	Discussions regarding the content of the draft SoCC	Consultation Report (doc ref 5.1)
15-May-14	Review Panel Meeting	Historic Environment Review Panel	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex C1
15-May-14	Review Panel Meeting	Human Environment (Landscape) Review Panel Kick-off	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex E1
15-May-14	Consultation meeting	Human Environment: Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation, Traffic and Access Consultation meeting	Volume 3 Chapter 3 of the ES. (doc ref 6.2.3.3)
15-May-14	Review Panel Meeting	Traffic & Access Review Panel	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex E4
21-Jul-14	Review Panel Meeting	Human Environment (Noise) Review Panel	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex E2
30-Jul-14	Review Panel Meeting	Human Environment (Landscape) Review Panel 1	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex E1
30-Jul-14	Review Panel Meeting	Human Environment: Socioeconomics, Tourism and Recreation Review Panel	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex E3
07-Aug-14	Review Panel Meeting	Historic Environment Review Panel	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex C1
10-Sep-14	Steering Group Meeting	EIA Evidence Plan – 1st Steering Group	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex F

11-Feb-15	Review Panel Meeting	Historic Environment Review Panel	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex C1
25-Feb-15	Steering Group Meeting	EIA Evidence Plan – 2nd Steering Group	EIA evidence plan (doc ref 8.6) Appendix I; Annex F

Post-application Consultation

- 3.12 The Applicant made initial contact with ELDC in relation to the preparation of a SoCG in late May 2015, following the Secretary of State's acceptance of the application. It was agreed that drafting a SoCG would be appropriate as a means of making a clear statement to the ExA appointed for the Application on the key issues during the early stages of the examination.
- 3.13 The Applicant met with ELDC on 16th July 2015 to discuss a first draft of the SoCG and the relevant representations submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. Further telephone discussion have been held in relation to agreeing this SoCG.

4. MATTERS AGREED

The Application

- 4.1 The following sections of this SoCG set out the areas of agreement by the parties in respect of the Application.
- 4.2 Where the agreements set out in the following sections refer to sections of the ES, it is agreed that those statements apply equally to the equivalent data, descriptions or analyses set out in any relevant technical reports, survey reports or any other application documents, unless otherwise stated.

Policy Context

- 4.3 It is agreed that the National Policy Statements (NPS) for Overarching Energy (EN-1), Renewable Energy (EN-3) and Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5), are the principal policy documents in relation to the Project.
- 4.4 It is agreed that NPS EN-1, EN-3 and EN-5 provide for flexibility in the project design at the point of consent.
- 4.5 It is agreed that NPS EN-1 and EN-3 advocate the use of the ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach to allow the assessment of effects in relation to the scope of the project design by reference to the maximum extents or dimensions, subject to the imposition of relevant controls in the draft DCO and DML (paragraphs 4.2.7 to 4.2.8 of EN-1 and paragraphs 2.6.42 to 2.6.43 of EN-3).
- 4.6 It is agreed that Policy Context sections of each of the relevant ES chapters listed in paragraph 2.9, have considered and referred to all relevant specific policy and guidance documents and all relevant national and international legislation in relation to the potential impacts identified.
- 4.7 It is agreed that each of the relevant ES chapters listed in paragraph 2.10 of this statement, contains a complete assessment of all the potential direct and indirect impacts that ought to be included for this type of development within the project area, and as defined by the relevant NPS(s) and other relevant policy and guidance.

Project Description

- 4.8 It is agreed that the project details described in Volume 3, Chapter 1, *Onshore Project Description* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.1) provide a clear and thorough description of the proposed development, which is suitable as a basis for detailed assessment of all onshore topics relating to the proposed development.
- 4.9 It is agreed that the project details of the proposed development are appropriately reflected in the parameters as set out in the draft DCO (document reference 3.1).
- 4.10 It is agreed that the staged approach to the construction of the authorised development, as set out in Schedule 1 (Authorised Project), Part 1 (Authorised Development) of the draft DCO is an appropriate mechanism to divide the authorised development for the purposes of the DCO and for the discharge of requirements.

Key Parameters for the Assessment

- 4.11 It is agreed that a maximum adverse scenario has been established according to the 'Rochdale Envelope', using project specification details given in Volume 3, Chapter 1 of the ES.

Approach to EIA

- 4.12 It is agreed that the EIA process, as set out in Volume 1, Chapter 3, *Approach to EIA* of the ES (document reference 6.2.1.3) is an appropriate approach for the identification and assessment of the potential impacts and effects of the proposed development.

Cumulative Assessment

- 4.13 It is agreed that the cumulative assessment appropriately considers all other projects with the potential to interact with the proposed development, with the exception of the National Grid Viking Link Ltd.'s Interconnector project.
- 4.14 It is agreed that there is currently insufficient information about the design, location or stage of development of the National Grid Viking Link Ltd.'s Interconnector project for it to be considered within any of the cumulative assessments.

5. Site Selection and Alternatives

- 5.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to the site selection and alternatives within ELDC's district.
- 5.2 It is agreed that paragraphs 4.25 – 4.79, Volume 1, Chapter 4, *Site Selection and Alternatives* of the ES (document reference 6.2.1.4) provide an accurate summary of the Interface Selection Assessment, including the update of the Interface Selection Assessment assumptions.
- 5.3 It is agreed that the process described in paragraphs 4.25 – 4.79, Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES is appropriate for the selection of the onshore interface point at Bicker Fen and took due consideration of the siting requirements of the substation, Intermediate Electrical Compound (IEC), landfall and cable route.
- 5.4 It is agreed that the paragraphs 4.80 – 4.248, Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES provide an accurate summary of the Site Selection Assessment and that the process undertaken was appropriate for the selection of the substation, IEC, landfall and cable route.
- 5.5 It is agreed that the site selection and alternatives process has resulted in an appropriate location for the substation
- 5.6 It is agreed that the site selection and alternatives process has resulted in the least harmful location for the landfall
- 5.7 It is agreed that the site selection and alternatives process has been undertaken in a satisfactory manner in relation to the cable route.

6. Landscape and Visual

- 6.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to Landscape and Visual within ELDC's district.

Scope and Methodology

- 6.2 It is agreed that the impact assessment approach presented in paragraphs 2.36 – 2.67, Volume 3, Chapter 2, *Landscape and Visual*, of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.2) is based on appropriate methodologies for the assessment of Landscape and Visual impacts and that it is fit for purpose for use in the assessment process.
- 6.3 It is agreed that the approach to assessment of effects on the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and additional information provided with regards to views from the AONB are appropriate.
- 6.4 It is agreed that the Photographic Surveys and Visualisations set out in paragraphs 2.68 – 2.86, Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES are an accurate and appropriate aid to the consideration of potential Landscape and Visual impacts.
- 6.5 It is agreed that relevant guidance has been used to inform the assessment of potential Landscape and Visual impacts.

Existing Environment

- 6.6 It is agreed that the Landscape and Visual study area defined in paragraphs 2.27 – 2.30, Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES is acceptable for the purposes of describing the baseline environment and understanding the potential Landscape and Visual impacts as a result of the proposed development.
- 6.7 It is agreed that the baseline field assessments undertaken to characterise the existing environment around the proposed development as set out in paragraphs 2.34 – 2.35, Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES are appropriate to identify and describe the baseline environment and inform the assessment.
- 6.8 It is agreed that the number and location of representative viewpoints are appropriate.
- 6.9 It is agreed that the descriptions given in paragraphs 2.87 – 2.99 and 2.120 – 2.127, Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES provide an accurate and appropriate characterisation of the landscape and visual baseline based on the existing data available from literature and site-specific surveys.

Key Parameters for Assessment

- 6.10 It is agreed that the maximum adverse scenarios as defined in Tables 2-10 and 2-13, Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES, are clearly described, sufficiently justified and appropriate for assessing the potential Landscape and Visual impacts during all phases of development.
- 6.11 It is agreed that the substation design envelope includes either an Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) or Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) layout and that the worst case considered in the assessment and shown in the photomontages is the AIS option.
- 6.12 It is agreed that the limited duration that lighting will be required during the construction and operational phases will not give rise to significant night-time visual effects at each of the substation, IEC, and existing National Grid Bicker Fen substation sites, landfall and cable route.
- 6.13 It is agreed that the photomontages are an accurate representation of the proposed development and are appropriate for the purposes of aiding the assessment.
- 6.14 It is agreed that there are no other scheme permutations, when considering the project details set out in Volume 3, Chapter 1, of the ES, which could lead to any greater landscape and visual effects than the maximum adverse scenarios set out in Tables 2-10 and 2-13.
- 6.15 It is agreed that Table 2-14, Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES describes the mitigation measures that have been embedded into the project design and demonstrate how the design has minimised harm to the environment.
- 6.16 It is agreed that the planting proposals set out in paragraphs 2.141 – 2.145 of Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES and detailed in Section 7 of the Outline Landscape Strategy and Ecological Management Plan (LSEMP) (document reference 8.8) are appropriate for the purposes of mitigating potential significant adverse landscape and visual effects during operation.
- 6.17 It is agreed that the cable route mitigation strategy detailed in paragraphs 7.14 of the Outline LSEMP (document reference 8.8) is appropriate for the purposes of mitigating potential significant adverse landscape and visual effects during construction.
- 6.18 It is agreed that the assessment of predicted residual landscape and visual impacts is appropriate in considering the embedded mitigation measures from the point that the proposed planting has reached maturity.
-

- 6.19 It is agreed that, as set out in paragraphs 7.6 and 7.11 of the Outline LSEMP, limited planting may be undertaken around the perimeter of the IEC site once the enabling works are complete to allow for some landscaping to become established whilst the construction work on the above ground infrastructure is underway within the compound.
- 6.20 It is agreed that the Outline LSEMP (document reference 8.8) provides a suitable indicative form of the Written Landscaping Scheme that is required to be submitted and signed off by the relevant authority.

Assessment of Impacts

- 6.21 It is agreed that paragraphs 2.151 – 2.745 of Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES present an assessment of the potential landscape and visual impacts arising from all stages of development, in accordance with the requirements of relevant policy and legislation.

IEC Construction

- 6.22 It is agreed that predicted landscape effects at the IEC during the construction phase as defined in Table 2-15 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES is Slight adverse, which is Not Significant.
- 6.23 It is agreed that predicted visual effects at the IEC during the construction phase as defined in Table 2-16 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES are Moderate adverse from Viewpoints 4 and 5, which is Significant.
- 6.24 It is agreed that all other predicted visual effects at the IEC during the construction phase as defined in Table 2-16 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 are Minor adverse or below, which is Not significant.

IEC Operation

- 6.25 It is agreed that predicted year 1 visual effects at the IEC during the operation phase as defined in Table 2-23 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES are Moderate adverse from Viewpoints 4 and 5, which is Significant.

IEC Decommissioning

- 6.26 It is agreed that there will be no predicted Significant visual effects during the decommissioning phase of the Intermediate Electrical Compound as set out in paragraph 2.739 in Volume 3, Chapter 2, of the ES.

Cable route and landfall

- 6.27 It is agreed that the predicted residual landscape and visual effects of the cable route and landfall, as set out Table 2-35 in Volume 3, Chapter 2, of the ES are Neutral during the construction phase, which is Not significant.
- 6.28 It is agreed that landscape and visual effects of the cable route and landfall during operation have been appropriately scoped out of the assessment as the cables will be below ground.
- 6.29 It is agreed that limited landscape and visual effects of the cable route and landfall during decommissioning have been identified, as set out Table 2-35 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES.

Mitigation and Monitoring

- 6.30 It is agreed that given the generally low level of effect likely to be experienced by Landscape and Visual receptors when including embedded mitigation during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project, no further specific applied mitigation or monitoring is required.

Cumulative Impacts

- 6.31 It is agreed that the projects scoped into the cumulative impact assessment, as detailed in Table 2-28, Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES are appropriate and reasonable in order to undertake the cumulative assessment for landscape and visual.
- 6.32 It is agreed that the design impact scenario considered within the assessment of potential cumulative landscape and visual impacts, as presented in Tables 2-29 to 2-31, Volume 3, Chapter 2, of the ES is appropriate for assessing the maximum likely cumulative effects on landscape and visual receptors.
- 6.33 It is agreed that the project has sufficiently considered all of the potential cumulative impacts. In addition, the outcome of the cumulative assessment presented in paragraph 2.763 to 2.778 of Volume 3, Chapter 2, of the ES which concludes that there are unlikely to be any significant effects, is accurate.

Inter-related Effects

- 6.34 It is agreed that the assessment undertaken and detailed in Table 12-6 of Volume 3, Chapter 12 Inter-related Effects (onshore) of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.12) is appropriate, accurate, and no significant effects on the landscape and visual context are predicted beyond those identified in Volume 3, Chapter 2, of the ES.
-

7. Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation

- 7.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to socio-economics, tourism and recreation within ELDC's district.

Scope and Methodology

- 7.2 It is agreed that the study area defined in paragraphs 3.25 – 3.30 of Volume 3, Chapter 3, *Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.3) is appropriate for the purposes of describing the baseline environment and understanding the potential impacts on socio-economics, tourism and recreation as a result of the proposed development.
- 7.3 It is agreed that the impact assessment methodology presented in Table 3-3 and paragraphs 3.36 – 3.54 of Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES is based on appropriate methodologies for the assessment of impacts on socio-economics, tourism and recreation, and that it is fit for purpose for use in the assessment process.

Existing Environment

- 7.4 It is agreed that the project specific data and reports provided in paragraphs 3.31 – 3.35 of Volume 3, Chapter 3, of the ES are up to date and appropriate for the purposes of establishing the existing environment.
- 7.5 It is agreed that the descriptions given in paragraphs 3.56 – 3.94 of Volume 3, Chapter 3, of the ES provide an accurate and appropriate characterisation of the socio-economic, tourism and recreation baseline based on the existing data available and site specific surveys.

Key Parameters for Assessment and Embedded Mitigation

- 7.6 It is agreed that the maximum adverse scenarios as defined in Table 3-7 of Volume 3, Chapter 3, of the ES, are clearly described, sufficiently justified and appropriate for assessing each of the potential impacts on socio-economics, tourism and recreation during all phases of development.
- 7.7 It is agreed that there are no other scheme permutations, when considering the project details, which could lead to any greater socio-economic, tourism and recreation effects than the maximum adverse scenarios set out in Table 3-7 of Volume 3, Chapter 3, of the ES.

-
- 7.8 It is agreed that paragraphs 3.99, 3.100 and Table 3-8 of Volume 3, Chapter 3, of the ES describe the mitigation measures that have been embedded into the project design and demonstrate how the design has minimised harm to the environment.
- 7.9 It is agreed that Section 3 of the Outline Construction Method Statement (document reference 8.7.1) appropriately sets out how public rights of way (PRoW) diversions will be managed, and the broad principles that will ensure the use of PRoWs during construction is managed safely and that any disruption caused to the general public is minimised.
- 7.10 It is agreed that Section 3 of the Outline Construction Method Statement (document reference 8.7.1) is a suitable form of the final Construction Method Statement that is required to be submitted and signed off pre-construction by the relevant authority.
- 7.11 It is agreed that Table 3-8 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES sets out a range of appropriate measures to minimise socio-economics, tourism and recreation effects including burial of cable under the sand dunes, minimising the use of artificial light and informing local tourism businesses of construction activities
- 7.12 It is agreed that Table 3-8 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES sets out a range of appropriate measures to maximise positive effects by informing local employers and suppliers of construction opportunities.

Assessment of Impacts

- 7.13 It is agreed that paragraphs 3.102 – 3.170 of Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES present an assessment of the potential impacts on socio-economics, tourism and recreation arising from the construction and operation of the development, in accordance with the requirements of relevant policy and legislation.
- 7.14 It is agreed that the decommissioning phase has been appropriately scoped out of the assessment.
- 7.15 It is agreed that the assessment of the proposed development on quality of life and specific health issues of identified receptors in paragraphs 3.111 – 3.116 of Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES is appropriate.
- 7.16 It is agreed that all potential impacts on socio-economics, tourism and recreation are predicted to be Minor adverse or below and are therefore Not Significant as summarised in Table 3-12 of Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES.

Mitigation

7.17 With respect to mitigation measures, it is agreed that given the generally low level of significance ascribed to the predicted changes to socio-economics, tourism and recreation receptors as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project, no specific mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

7.18 It is agreed that the projects scoped into the cumulative impact assessment, as detailed in Table 3-10 of Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES are appropriate and reasonable in order to undertake the cumulative assessment for socio-economics, tourism and recreation.

7.19 It is agreed that the design impact scenario considered within the assessment of potential cumulative impacts on socio-economics, tourism and recreation, as presented in Tables 3-11 of Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES, is appropriate for assessing the maximum likely cumulative effects on socio-economics, tourism and recreation.

7.20 It is agreed that the project has sufficiently considered all of the potential cumulative impacts to inform the assessment and that the outcome of the cumulative assessment presented in paragraphs 3.188 – 3.202 of Volume 3, Chapter 3 of the ES, which concludes that there are unlikely to be any significant impacts, is appropriate.

Inter-related Effects

7.21 It is agreed that the assessment undertaken and detailed in Table 12-7 of Volume 2, Chapter 12 of the ES is appropriate, accurate, and that no significant inter-related impacts relative to socio-economics, tourism and recreation are predicted.

8. Terrestrial Ecology

- 8.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to terrestrial ecology within ELDC's district.

Scope and Methodology

- 8.2 It is agreed that the study area defined in paragraphs 4.24 – 4.26 and Table 4-3 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 *Terrestrial Ecology* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.4) is acceptable for the purposes of describing the baseline environment and understanding the potential impacts on terrestrial ecology from the proposed development.
- 8.3 It is agreed that the impact assessment methodology presented in paragraphs 4.27 – 4.47 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES is based on appropriate methodologies for the assessment of impacts on terrestrial ecology, and that it is fit for purpose for use in the assessment process.
- 8.4 It is agreed that the use of aerial Phase 1 surveys for areas where survey access was not provided by landowners, as set out in paragraphs 4.46 – 4.48 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES, is an appropriate technique to identify the existing environment.
- 8.5 It is agreed that the project specific data sources and field surveys presented in Tables 4-7 – 4-8 and paragraphs 4.48 – 4.50 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES are appropriate for the purposes of establishing the existing terrestrial ecology environment.

Existing Environment

- 8.6 It is agreed that the descriptions given in paragraphs 4.51 – 4.98 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES provide an accurate characterisation of the terrestrial ecology baseline appropriate to inform the assessment.

Key Parameters for Assessment and Embedded Mitigation

- 8.7 It is agreed that the maximum adverse scenarios as defined in Table 4-16 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES, are clearly described, sufficiently justified and appropriate for assessing the potential impacts on terrestrial ecology during all phases of development.
- 8.8 It is agreed that there are no other scheme permutations, when considering the project details, which could lead to any greater terrestrial ecology effects than the maximum adverse scenarios set out in Table 4-16.

-
- 8.9 It is agreed that paragraphs 4.101 – 4.105 and Table 4-17 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES describe the mitigation measures that have been embedded into the project design and demonstrate how the design has minimised harm to the environment.
- 8.10 It is agreed that the Outline LSEMP (document reference. 8.8) provides a suitable indicative form of the Ecological Management Plan that is required to be submitted and signed off pre-construction by the relevant authority.
- 8.11 It is agreed that the ecological receptors set out in paragraphs 4.106 – 4.18 and Table 4-18 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES have been appropriately scoped out of the assessment.

Assessment of Impacts

- 8.12 It is agreed that paragraphs 4.109 – 4.162 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES present an assessment of the potential impacts on terrestrial ecology arising from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the development, in accordance with the requirements of relevant policy and legislation.
- 8.13 It is agreed that all potential impacts are predicted to be Minor Adverse or below and are therefore Not Significant as summarised in Table 4-33 of Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES.

Mitigation and Monitoring

- 8.14 With respect to mitigation measures, with the exception of the potential impact on the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marsh (LCGM) priority sites A to E, it is agreed that given the generally low level of significance ascribed to the predicted changes to terrestrial ecology as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project, no further specific applied mitigation is required.
- 8.15 In relation to LCGM Sites A to E, it is agreed that applied mitigation is being developed through consultation with Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.
- 8.16 It is agreed that the matters set out in the Outline LSEMP are appropriate for the management of potential terrestrial ecology impacts.
- 8.17 With respect to monitoring measures, it is agreed that given the generally low level of significance ascribed to the predicted changes to terrestrial ecology as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project, no specific monitoring is required.

Cumulative Impacts

- 8.18 It is agreed that the projects scoped into the cumulative impact assessment, as detailed in Table 4-31, Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES are appropriate and reasonable in order to undertake the cumulative assessment for terrestrial ecology.
- 8.19 It is agreed that the design impact scenario considered within the assessment of potential cumulative terrestrial ecology impacts on, as presented in Tables 4-32 of Volume 3, Chapter 4, of the ES, is appropriate for assessing the maximum likely cumulative effects on terrestrial ecology.
- 8.20 It is agreed that the project has sufficiently considered all of the potential cumulative impacts to inform the assessment and that the outcome of the cumulative assessment presented in paragraph 4.180 – 4.183 of Volume 3, Chapter 4, of the ES which concludes that there are unlikely to be any significant effects is appropriate.

Inter-related Effects

- 8.21 It is agreed that the assessment undertaken and detailed in Table 12-7 of Volume 2, Chapter 12, of the ES is appropriate, accurate, and that no significant inter-related effects relative to terrestrial ecology.

9. Historic Environment (onshore)

- 9.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to the Historic Environment (both archaeology and cultural heritage) within ELDC's district.

Scope and Methodology

- 9.2 It is agreed that the study area identified in paragraphs 1.2.3 – 1.2.5 and shown in Figure 1.1, Maps 1 – 11 of Volume 3 Annex 8.1 *Historic Environment Baseline* of the ES (document reference 6.2.5.8.1) is acceptable for the purposes of describing the baseline environment and understanding the potential impacts upon known and potential heritage assets as a result of the proposed development.
- 9.3 It is agreed that the impact assessment approach presented in paragraphs 8.32 – 8.39 of Volume 3, Chapter 8, *Historic Environment* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.8) is based on appropriate methodologies for the assessment of historic environment impacts and that it is fit for purpose for use in the assessment process.
- 9.4 It is agreed that the data sources used to inform the baseline study, listed in paragraph 1.2.6 of Volume 3, Annex 8.1, of the ES are adequate for the purposes of informing the existing historic environment.

Existing Environment

- 9.5 It is agreed that the methodology undertaken to characterise the existing environment around the proposed development with respect to the historic environment, as set out in of Volume 3, Annex 8.1 of the ES provides an appropriate approach to describing the baseline environment.
- 9.6 It is agreed that the descriptions given in paragraphs 8.49 – 8.90 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES provide an accurate and appropriate characterisation of the historic environment based on the existing data available from literature and site specific surveys.

Key Parameters for Assessment and Embedded Mitigation

- 9.7 It is agreed that the maximum adverse scenarios, as defined in Table 8-6 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES, are clearly described, sufficiently justified and appropriate for assessing the maximum likely impacts on the historic environment during all phases of the development.

-
- 9.8 It is agreed that there are no other scheme permutations, when considering the project details, which could lead to any greater effect on the historic environment than the maximum adverse scenarios set out in Table 8-6.
- 9.9 It is agreed that table 8.7 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES describes the mitigation measures that have been embedded into the project design and demonstrates how the design has minimised harm to the historic environment.
- 9.10 It is agreed that the Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) (document reference. 8.11) provides a suitable indicative form for the final onshore archaeological WSI that is required to be submitted and signed off pre-construction by the relevant authority.
- 9.11 It is agreed that the Outline Onshore WSI adequately secures appropriate measures for further archaeological investigation, in order to ensure appropriate mitigation during construction.

Assessment of Impacts

- 9.12 It is agreed that paragraphs 8.101 – 8.192 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES present an assessment of the potential impacts on historic environment arising from all stages of development, in accordance with the requirements of relevant policy and legislation.
- 9.13 It is agreed that all known archaeological and cultural heritage assets have been identified within the study area, as summarised in paragraph 8.28 – 8.31 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES.
- 9.14 It is agreed that there will be no direct physical impacts on the one designated heritage asset (RSK ID 699) identified in the onshore study area (which is located outside of the proposed development boundary) during construction.
- 9.15 It is agreed that, given the temporary nature of construction activities, indirect effects, such as visual impacts, on the setting of above ground designated heritage assets, are appropriately considered to be not significant, and have therefore not been considered further in the EIA.
- 9.16 It is agreed that the historic environment impacts arising from the construction of the proposed development have been appropriately assessed for all heritage assets within the project development boundary, as set out in Table 8-8 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES.

-
- 9.17 It is agreed that the onshore works will not have any direct or indirect impacts on built heritage during the operation of the proposed development, and that, as no further excavation of undisturbed ground will occur in the operational phase there are no significant effects anticipated on the historic environment during operation.
- 9.18 It is agreed that indirect effects on the setting of above ground designated heritage assets from the substation and IEC during operation have been appropriately considered, and that no significant adverse impacts were predicted, as described in paragraph 8.122 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES.
- 9.19 It is agreed that the assessment accurately identifies no significant adverse effects on the setting of Gunby Hall, or its associated features, as set out in paragraph 8.122 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES.
- 9.20 It is agreed that the application will not affect the significance of any heritage assets, as summarised in Table 8-11 of Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES.
- 9.21 It is agreed that further consideration of impacts during decommissioning have been appropriately scoped out as they are not expected to introduce any additional direct physical impacts to the historic environment.

Mitigation and Monitoring

- 9.22 With respect to mitigation measures, it is agreed that the embedded mitigation measures have minimised potential impacts to the historic environment as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project. In addition, it is agreed that the Onshore WSI is a robust approach to ensuring potential historic environment impacts are mitigated.
- 9.23 It is agreed that the clarification note at Appendix 11 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline I, sets out how the Sibsey Lancaster Memorial, and any impacts and mitigation associated with it have been considered by the Applicant. In addition it is agreed that the commitment to maintain access is sufficient for ensuring visitation to the Memorial is not impeded by the proposed development and that potential archaeological remains associated with the crash site can be appropriately managed through the production of a site specific written scheme of investigation, following post-consent geophysical surveys.

Cumulative Impacts

- 9.24 It is agreed that the specific projects scoped into the cumulative impact assessment, as detailed in Table 8.9 of Volume 3 Chapter 8 of the ES are appropriate and reasonable in order to undertake the cumulative assessment for impacts on the historic environment.
- 9.25 It is agreed that the design impact scenario considered within the assessment of potential cumulative impacts on the historic environment, as presented in Table 8.10 Volume 3, Chapter 8, is appropriate for assessing the maximum likely cumulative impacts on the historic environment.
- 9.26 It is agreed that the project has sufficiently considered all of the potential cumulative impacts to inform the assessment and that the outcome of the cumulative assessment presented in paragraph 8.151 of Volume 3 Chapter 8 of the ES, which concludes that there are unlikely to be any significant effects, is accurate.

Inter-related Effects

- 9.27 It is agreed that the assessment undertaken and detailed in Volume 3, Chapter 12 of the ES is appropriate, accurate, and that no significant effects on archaeological resources and cultural heritage are predicted from the project with respect to inter-related impacts

10. Traffic and Access

- 10.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to Traffic and Access within ELDC's district.
- 10.2 It is agreed that Table 9-16 of Volume 3, Chapter 9 *Traffic and Access* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.9) describes the mitigation measures that have been embedded into the project design and demonstrate how the design has sought to minimise the impacts on the transport environment.
- 10.3 It is agreed that the inclusion of a temporary haul road within the cable corridor and used during the construction of the onshore works, as described in paragraph 9.59 of Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, is robust embedded mitigation and will reduce the impacts of construction traffic on the local road networks.
- 10.4 It is agreed that the commitment to cross all classified roads using trenchless techniques, as set out in paragraph 9.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES, is an appropriate approach for minimising impacts and road closures in the local area.
- 10.5 It is agreed that the implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is adequate for securing appropriate routing of construction traffic, and that the approach set out in the Outline TMP (document reference 8.9) is adequate to manage the potential impacts of construction traffic.
- 10.6 It is agreed that the implementation of an Access Management Plan (AMP) is adequate for securing acceptable design and location of access to temporary working areas, and the that Outline AMP (document reference 8.13) sets out acceptable proposals for access to the site.
- 10.7 It is agreed that the implementation of a Contractor Travel Plan, which will form a part of the final TMP, is adequate for encouraging sustainable travel and minimising the impact on the road network.
- 10.8 With respect to mitigation measures it is agreed that in accordance with paragraph 9.189 of Volume 3 Chapter 9 of the ES, given there are no significant adverse effects predicted on traffic and access as a result of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project, no further specific mitigation is required beyond that which is already embedded into the project design and secured through the management plans that will be secured under the DCO.

11. Air Quality

11.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to Air Quality within ELDC's district.

Scope and Methodology

11.2 It is agreed that the Air Quality study area defined in section 2.2 of Volume 5 Annex 10.2 *Air Quality Assessment* of the ES (document reference 6.2.5.10.2) is acceptable for the purposes of describing the baseline environment and understanding the potential impacts upon Air Quality as a result of the proposed development.

11.3 Characterisation of the existing environment in the study area was informed by available project specific data and other publically available information. An overview of project specific data is provided in Volume 5, Annex 10.1 *Air Quality Baseline* (document reference 6.2.5.10.1) of the ES.

11.4 It is agreed that the impact assessment approach presented in paragraphs 10.32 – 10.41 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 *Air Quality* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.10) is based on appropriate methodologies for the assessment of Air Quality impacts and that it is fit for purpose for use in the assessment process.

11.5 It is agreed that relevant guidance has been used to inform the methodology for assessing impacts on Air Quality and the assessment has been undertaken in compliance with the relevant guidance, as detailed in Table 10.2 of Volume 3 Chapter 10 of the ES.

Existing Environment

11.6 It is agreed that the methodology undertaken to characterise the existing environment around the proposed development with respect to Air quality, as set out in Volume 5 Annex 10.1 of the ES provides an appropriate approach to describing the baseline environment.

11.7 It is agreed that the descriptions given in section 1.3 of Volume 5 Annex 10.1 of the ES provide an accurate and appropriate characterisation of existing Air Quality based on the data available.

Key Parameters for Assessment and Embedded Mitigation

- 11.8 It is agreed that the maximum adverse scenarios relating to each of the potential impacts on Air Quality during all phases of development, are clearly described and sufficiently justified in Table 10.4 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES, and are appropriate for assessing the maximum likely impacts.
- 11.9 It is agreed that there are no other scheme permutations, when considering the project details, which could lead to any greater effect on Air Quality than the maximum adverse scenarios set out in Table 10.4.
- 11.10 It is agreed that table 10.5 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES describes the mitigation measures that have been embedded into the project design and demonstrate how the design has sought to minimise harm as a result of Air Quality impacts.
- 11.11 It is agreed that the implementation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), is adequate for securing appropriate control measures of air quality during the construction phase.
- 11.12 It is agreed that the Outline AQMP (document reference 8.7.4) adequately sets out the approach which will be taken by TKOWFL to manage the potential impacts on Air Quality.

Assessment of Impacts

- 11.13 It is agreed that paragraphs 10.50 – 10.71 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES present a robust assessment of the potential impacts on Air Quality arising from all stages of development, in accordance with the requirements of relevant policy and legislation.
- 11.14 It is agreed that impacts on Air Quality during the construction phase arising from dust impacts have been appropriately assessed as not significant with negligible residual effects following the implementation of the recommended measures in the Outline AQMP, as detailed in paragraphs 10.50 – 10.59 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.10).
- 11.15 It is agreed that impacts on Air Quality during the construction phase arising from construction traffic have been appropriately assessed, as detailed in paragraphs 10.60 – 10.64 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.10), and that traffic movements associated with the TKES works are not likely to cause significant effects on Air Quality.

-
- 11.16 It is agreed that the impacts on Air Quality during the operational phase have been appropriately scoped out of the assessment in accordance with the Secretary of State's (SoS) scoping opinion.
- 11.17 It is agreed that impacts on Air Quality during the decommissioning phase arising from dust impacts have been appropriately assessed as not significant with negligible residual effects following the implementation of the recommended measures in the Outline AQMP, as detailed in paragraphs 10.66 – 10.71 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.10).

Mitigation

- 11.18 It is agreed that applied mitigation measures will be adopted to further minimise effects on Air Quality which are detailed in paragraphs 10.99 – 10.106 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES, and that the implementation of the proposed mitigation, together with best practice measures, ensure that the residual effects of the project on Air Quality are negligible which is not significant as described in Table 10.10 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES.

Cumulative Impacts

- 11.19 It is agreed that cumulative effects caused from dust emissions within the vicinity of the TKES works, which tend to be localised and temporary, have been appropriately scoped out of the cumulative impact assessment.
- 11.20 It is agreed that it is acceptable that only cumulative effects arising from road traffic emissions have been included in the cumulative impact assessment.
- 11.21 It is agreed that the projects scoped into the cumulative impact assessment, as detailed in Table 10.8 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES are appropriate and reasonable in order to undertake the cumulative assessment for Air Quality.
- 11.22 It is agreed that the design impact scenario considered within the assessment of potential cumulative impacts on Air Quality, as presented in Table 10-9 Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES, is appropriate for assessing the maximum likely cumulative air quality impacts.
- 11.23 It is agreed that the project has sufficiently considered all of the potential cumulative impacts and that the outcome of the cumulative assessment presented in paragraphs 10.92 – 10.96 of Volume 3, Chapter 10 of the ES, which concludes that there are unlikely to be any significant impacts, is accurate.
-

Inter-related Effects

11.24 It is agreed that the assessment undertaken and detailed in Volume 3, Chapter 12 of the ES is appropriate and that interrelated effects in relation to Air Quality have been correctly screened out of the assessment.

12. Noise and Vibration

12.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to Noise and Vibration within ELDC's district.

Scope and Methodology

12.2 It is agreed that the noise and vibration study area defined in paragraph 11.35 of Volume 3, Chapter 11, *Noise and Vibration* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.11) is acceptable for the purposes of describing the baseline environment and understanding the potential noise and vibration impacts resulting from the proposed development.

12.3 It is agreed that the impact assessment approach presented in paragraphs 11.36 – 11.55 of Volume 3, Chapter 11 the ES is based on appropriate methodologies for the assessment of Noise and Vibration impacts and that it is fit for purpose for use in the assessment process.

Existing Environment

12.4 It is agreed that the methodology and findings as set out in Volume 5, Annex 11.1 *Noise and Vibration Baseline Report* of the ES (document reference 6.2.5.11.1) are an appropriate approach to describing the baseline environment.

12.5 It is agreed that the descriptions given in paragraphs 11.56 – 11.60 of Volume 3 Chapter 11 of the ES provide an accurate and appropriate characterisation of noise and vibration based on the existing data available from literature and site specific surveys.

Key Parameters for Assessment and Embedded Mitigation

12.6 It is agreed that the maximum adverse scenarios relating to the potential impacts from Noise and Vibration during all phases of development, are clearly described and sufficiently justified in Table 11-6 of Volume 3 Chapter 11 of the ES, and are appropriate for assessing the maximum likely impacts on Noise and Vibration sensitive receptors.

12.7 It is agreed that all relevant receptors have been identified and considered appropriately in the assessment.

12.8 It is agreed that there are no other scheme permutations, when considering the project details, which could lead to any greater effect from Noise and Vibration than the maximum adverse scenarios set out in Table 11.6.

-
- 12.9 It is agreed that Table 11.7 of Volume 3 Chapter 11 of the ES describes the mitigation measures that have been embedded into the project design and demonstrate how the design has minimised harm to the environment.
- 12.10 It is agreed that the implementation of a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) is adequate for securing appropriate management measures for the control of noise and vibration during the construction phase, and that the approach set out in the Outline NVMP (document reference 8.7.3) is adequate to manage impacts of noise and vibration.

Assessment of Impacts

- 12.11 It is agreed that paragraphs 11.64 – 11.133 of Volume 3, Chapter 11, of the ES present an assessment of the potential impacts from noise and vibration arising from all stages of development, in accordance with the requirements of relevant policy and legislation.
- 12.12 It is agreed that the impacts of noise and vibration during the construction phase have been appropriately assessed as detailed in paragraphs 11.64 – 11.115 of Volume 3, Chapter 11 of the ES.
- 12.13 It is agreed that construction phase noise effects from HDD works, sheet piling at possible micro-bore or pipe jacking locations, cable route installation using the open-cut method, temporary construction compound construction works, IEC construction works, and construction access routes into the IEC are predicted to result in a short term, temporary minor adverse effect, which is Not Significant.
- 12.14 It is agreed that construction phase night time noise effects from HDD works, if unmitigated, would result in short term, temporary, major adverse noise effect, which is Significant.
- 12.15 It is agreed that construction phase vibration effects have been scoped out of the assessment and are not considered in further detail.
- 12.16 It is agreed that the impacts of noise and vibration during the operational phase have been appropriately assessed as detailed in paragraphs 11.116 – 11.132 of Volume 3, Chapter 11 of the ES.
- 12.17 It is agreed that operation phase noise and vibration effects at the IEC, landfall and cable route have been scoped out of the assessment and are not considered in further detail.

- 12.18 It is agreed the operation phase noise effects from the IEC are predicted to result in a minor adverse effect, which is Not Significant.
- 12.19 It is agreed that the impacts of noise and vibration during the decommissioning phase have been appropriately assessed as, at worst short term and temporary resulting in a minor adverse effect as detailed in paragraph 11.133 of Volume 3, Chapter 11 of the ES.

Mitigation and Monitoring

- 12.20 It is agreed that applied mitigation measures will be adopted to minimise effects of noise and vibration during the construction phase, as summarised in Table 11-21 of Volume 3, Chapter 11 of the ES.
- 12.21 It is agreed that the implementation of the proposed mitigation, together with best practice measures, will ensure that temporary residual effects from HDD works during construction are reduced from major adverse to moderate adverse, which is Significant.
- 12.22 With respect to monitoring measures, the draft DCO requires noise during the operational phase to be controlled and provides for the measurement of noise levels by an independent specialist consultant in the eventuality of any noise complaints. It is also agreed that no further specific monitoring is required for the impacts of noise and vibration during construction, operation and decommissioning.

Cumulative Impacts

- 12.23 It is agreed that the projects scoped into the cumulative impact assessment, as detailed in Table 11.19 of Volume 3, Chapter 11, of the ES are appropriate and reasonable in order to undertake the cumulative assessment for Noise and Vibration.
- 12.24 It is agreed that the design impact scenario considered within the assessment of potential cumulative impacts, as presented in Table 11-20 of Volume 3, Chapter 11, of the ES is appropriate for assessing the maximum likely cumulative impacts of noise and vibration.
- 12.25 It is agreed that the project has sufficiently considered all of the potential cumulative impacts during construction to inform the assessment and that the outcome of the cumulative assessment presented in paragraphs 11.154 – 11.155 of Volume 3, Chapter 11 of the ES, which concludes that cumulative noise impacts during construction are not likely to be of greater significance than impacts in isolation, is accurate.

Inter-related Effects

12.26 It is agreed that the assessment undertaken and detailed in Table 12.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 12 of the ES is appropriate, accurate, and that the assessment presented in Volume 3, Chapter 11 of the ES already provides for potential inter-related effects of noise and vibration on sensitive receptors, and therefore no further assessment of inter-related effects is necessary.

13. Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)

- 13.1 This section of the SoCG sets out those aspects of the Application that are agreed in relation to the draft DCO (document reference 3.1).
- 13.2 It is agreed that, in relation to the agreed scope of this SoCG, the articles of the draft DCO are appropriate and reasonable for the proposed development.
- 13.3 It is agreed that the approach taken in **Requirement 1** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) to separate the onshore works into stages, and of discharging the requirements in relation to those stages, is appropriate.
- 13.4 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 5** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures the submission and approval of the detailed design of the onshore works by the relevant planning authority and other statutory bodies where appropriate.
- 13.5 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 6** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures the provision of landscaping at the IEC and substation, and if necessary the unlicensed works at the National Grid Bicker Fen substation, for which Written Landscaping Schemes must be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority, and must accord with the principles set out in the Outline LSEMP (document reference 8.8).
- 13.6 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 7** of draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures the implementation and appropriate maintenance of the landscaping agreed under draft DCO Requirement 6.
- 13.7 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 8** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) ensures that any highways works are appropriately signed off and adequately secures an Access Management Plan (AMP), which accords with the principles set out in the Outline AMP (document reference 8.13).
- 13.8 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 9** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures submission and approval of written details of any permanent or temporary fences, walls or other means of enclosure.
- 13.9 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 10** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures a surface water drainage scheme which accords with the surface water drainage strategy submitted as part of the Flood Risk assessment.
-

-
- 13.10 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 11** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures a foul water drainage scheme that will include details of means of pollution control.
- 13.11 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 12** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures an archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which accords with the principles set Outline Onshore WSI (document reference 8.11).
- 13.12 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 13** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures an Ecological Management Plan (EMP), which accords with the principles set out in the Outline LSEMP (document reference 8.8).
- 13.13 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 14** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which accords with the Outline CoCP (document reference 8.7); a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which accords with the Outline CEMP (document reference 8.7.9); and the relevant specific plans listed in Requirement 14(2)(a) which accord with the suite of Outline plans submitted with the application (document references 8.7.1 – 8.7.10).
- 13.14 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 15** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures a written scheme for the management and mitigation of artificial light emissions during the operational phase of the project at the IEC and substation.
- 13.15 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 16** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures appropriate restrictions to the working hours permitted under the Order.
- 13.16 It is agreed that the approach taken in **Requirement 17** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures the control of noise during the operational phase of the project, during which noise levels at the IEC and substation shall not exceed 35 dB.
- 13.17 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 18** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures a construction phase Traffic Management Plan (TMP), which accords with the principles set out in the Outline TMP (document reference 8.9) and includes a Contractor Travel Plan (CTP).
- 13.18 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 19** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures adequate protection for European Protected Species (EPS) and the need for pre-construction survey work to confirm the presence or absence of EPS prior to the commencement of each stage of the onshore works.
-

13.19 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 20** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures the reinstatement of any land used temporarily for construction of the onshore works.

13.20 It is agreed that the wording of **Requirement 21** of the draft DCO (document reference 3.1) adequately secures a decommissioning plan to be submitted and approved within 6 months of the cessation of commercial operation of the onshore works.

14. MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION

14.1 The parties have not yet reached agreement on the following matters.

Policy Context

14.2 It is not yet agreed that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), where relevant, and the development plans may be material considerations in the overall determination. The Applicant's position is that NPPF 'may' be a material consideration. ELDC's position is that the NPPF 'will' be a material consideration.

Landscape and Visual

14.3 It is not yet agreed that the planting proposals set out in section 7 of the Outline LSEMP are appropriate mitigation in the landscape.

14.4 It is not yet agreed that the potential effects of any final layouts of the IEC will be of no greater significance than those assessed in the ES.

14.5 It is not yet agreed that predicted year 1 landscape effects at the IEC during the operation phase as defined in Table 2-22 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES are **Minor adverse**, which is **Not significant**.

14.6 It is not yet agreed that predicted year 15 landscape effects at the IEC during the operation phase as defined in Table 2-22 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the ES are **Neutral**, which is **Not significant**.

14.7 It is not yet agreed that all other predicted year 1 visual effects at the IEC during the operation phase as defined in Table 2-23 in Volume 3, Chapter 2 are **Minor adverse** or below, which is **Not significant**.

14.8 It is not yet agreed that the predicted year 15 **landscape** effects at the IEC as set out in Table 2-32 in Volume 3, Chapter 2, of the ES are **Neutral** and **Not significant** during the operational phase.