

# **Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing Order 202[\*]**

---

## **Document NCC/GY3RC/EX/022: Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions**

---

**Planning Act 2008**

**Infrastructure Planning**

**The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: TR010043

Author: Norfolk County Council

Document Reference: NCC/GY3RC/EX/022

Date: 22 October 2019

*This page is intentionally left blank*

---

---

## Foreword

The Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions document relates to an application ('the Application') submitted by Norfolk County Council ('the Council' / 'the Applicant') to the Secretary of State for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') under the Planning Act 2008.

If made by the Secretary of State, the DCO would grant development consent for construction, operation and maintenance of a new bascule bridge highway crossing of the River Yare in Great Yarmouth, and which is referred to in the Application as the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing (or 'the Scheme').

<b>CONTENTS</b>		<b>PAGE No.</b>
Foreword.....		iii
Glossary of Abbreviations and Defined Terms .....		v
1 General and Cross-topic Questions.....		1
2 Air Quality and Emissions.....		14
3 Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment.....		19
4 Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Consideration .....		37
5 Draft Development Consent Order .....		47
6 Transportation and Traffic/Highways .....		67
7 Water Environment / Flood Risk .....		71
8 Climate Change.....		73
9 Effect on Port Operations .....		75
Annex A Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule at Deadline 2.....		87

## Glossary of Abbreviations and Defined Terms

ALARP	As low as reasonably possible
Alicat	Alicat Workboats Limited
CPA	County Planning Authority
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environment Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
FCTMP	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan
GYPA	Great Yarmouth Port Authority
GYPC	Great Yarmouth Port Company
GYPUA	Great Yarmouth Port Users Association
HRA	Habitat Regulation Assessment
IAQM	Institute of Air Quality Management
IDB	Internal Drainage Board
MA&D	Major Accidents and Disasters
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
NCC	Norfolk County Council
NRA	Navigation Risk Assessment
NRMM	Non-Road Mobile Machinery
NRR	National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies
NRSWA	New Roads and Street Works Act 1991
Outline CoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
OSPAR	Oslo/Paris Convention for the protection of the marine environment of the North-East Atlantic
PEA	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
pNRA	preliminary Navigation Risk Assessment

---

Scheme	The Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing project for which the Applicant seeks development consent.
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SPA	Special Protection Area
The Applicant	Norfolk County Council (in its capacity as Highway Authority and promoter of the Scheme).
The Council	Norfolk County Council
UKCP18	UK Climate Projections November 2018

## 1 General and Cross-topic Questions

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.0.1	The Applicant	The Applicant's OCoCP requires the contractor to prepare a number of plans including a flood management plan, site waste management plan and materials management plan. Can the Applicant explain what function these plans perform to address significant effects and whether the minimum measures necessary should be included to the OCoCP to provide confidence to the findings of the assessment?	<p>Mitigation and monitoring measures, including the preparation of a number of plans, are included in the Outline Code of Construction Practice ('Outline CoCP') (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187). The mitigation and monitoring measures, presented in the Outline CoCP will ensure that likely significant environmental effects, as identified in the Environment Statement ('ES') (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096) are avoided, minimised or offset. Compliance with the measures included in the Outline CoCP, and hence the plans, is secured through Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020). The plans include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invasive Non-Native Species Management Plan – as per paragraphs 5.5.1 and 5.5.2 of the Outline CoCP the Plan will include measures to reduce the risks associated with material being moved offsite and therefore manage the</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>potential for the spread of invasive non-native species;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency Response Plan(s) – as per paragraphs 2.10.1 to 2.10.3 and 6.2.1 of the Outline CoCP the Plan(s) will include details of the emergency procedures and processes to be followed in the event of a particular hazard. Such procedures and processes, will include as a minimum, emergency service notification procedures, emergency measures in the event of flooding and fires, and spill response procedures;</li> <li>• Flood Management Plan – as per paragraph 7.2.1 of the Outline CoCP the Plan will include mitigation measures to minimise damage in the event of a flood. Such mitigation measures will expand upon those included in the Emergency Response Plan(s) and will include as a minimum, important contact details (e.g. buildings, services etc.), a description or map showing locations of key property, protective materials and service shut-off points, basic strategies for protecting property, minimising business disruption and assisting recovery, and procedural</li> </ul>



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>checklists that can be quickly accessed by staff during a flood;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Waste Management Plan – as per paragraph 8.1.2 of the Outline CoCP the Plan will include measures to ensure that demolition and construction wastes are dealt with in an appropriate manner and in accordance with the 'waste hierarchy'.</li> <li>• Such measures will be inclusive of, but not limited to, outline responsibilities for resource management, observing the legal process for ensuring waste is correctly recycled or disposed of and providing a mechanism for recording the types and volumes of waste generated (compared to projections);</li> <li>• Materials Management Plan – as per paragraph 8.4.1 of the Outline CoCP the Plan will include measures to enable the reuse of natural soils and arisings including made-ground (contaminated or otherwise). Such measures will be inclusive of, but not limited to, suitability for use criteria, contingency arrangements, tracking and document control mechanisms and a verification plan;</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction Traffic Management Plan ('CTMP') – as per paragraph 11.1.1 of the Outline CoCP a framework plan has been developed and submitted as Appendix A. The framework plan sets out high level principles for a management and control strategy related to non-motorised users and vehicular movements. The objectives of the Plan are to reduce vehicular movements and to minimise the impact of road construction traffic; and</li> <li>• Workforce Travel Plan – as per paragraph 11.1.1 of the Outline CoCP a framework plan has been developed and submitted as Appendix B. The Plan will contain measures to minimise single occupancy trips by promotion of other sustainable modes and control of car parking. Such measures will be inclusive of, but not limited to, details of how to access live travel information, the provision of discount schemes available for public transport, the provision of cycling initiatives and the provision of a mechanism for liftshare schemes.</li> </ul> <p>In all instances the paragraphs referenced above include a list of information which will be included</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>in each plan or refer to the Framework Plan(s) submitted with the application. Further details will be added to the plans when sufficient information becomes available following detailed design. This provides the necessary control pursuant to Requirement 5 (Schedule 2, Draft DCO, Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020) to ensure that when the relevant part of the CoCP is prepared by the Contractor (prior to the relevant part of the Scheme commencing) all the measures identified will be appropriately included. Requirement 5 of the draft DCO also ensures that no part of the authorised construction activities will begin until the relevant part of the CoCP, which must be written in accordance with the Outline CoCP, following consultation with Great Yarmouth Borough Council, the lead local flood authority, the Internal Drainage Board ('IDB') and the Environment Agency, has been approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The detail of the measures will therefore be able to be considered by the relevant authorities to ensure that they are appropriate. On this basis the Applicant considers the minimum measures for inclusion in the Plan(s) are sufficiently defined, provide confidence in the findings of the</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			assessment and ensure the avoidance, minimisation, or offsetting of applicable likely significant environmental effects.
1.0.2	The Applicant	The ES explains that monitoring may be required to ensure that measures intended to avoid or reduce effects are effective in their purpose. Can the Applicant please explain if/how any such monitoring will be secured and what action will be taken in the event that the intended purpose of any such measures lacks efficacy? Will the Applicant commit to the implementation of remedial measures in this instance and what is the proposed mechanism for delivery?	<p>The Applicant has identified monitoring measures, where appropriate following the assessment undertaken, throughout the following technical chapters of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Chapter 6: Air Quality;</li> <li>● Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration;</li> <li>● Chapter 11: Road Drainage and the Water Environment;</li> <li>● Chapter 12: Flood Risk;</li> <li>● Chapter 15: Materials;</li> <li>● Chapter 16: Geology and Soils; and</li> <li>● Chapter 17: Traffic and Transport.</li> </ul> <p>Monitoring measures for the construction phase of the Scheme are included in the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187). Compliance with the monitoring measures included in the Outline CoCP are secured through Requirement</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>5 in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020).</p> <p>In all instances within the Outline CoCP a process methodology and / or references to specific guidance documents have been included to increase the efficacy of the monitoring measures. Should the monitoring measures identify that remedial measures are required the Applicant will undertake them.</p> <p>No monitoring measures for the operational phase of the Scheme have been identified to be necessary within the ES.</p>
1.0.3	The Applicant	How has the number of waiting pontoons been determined and is the applicant confident that these will be sufficient in the event of unforeseen delays or difficulties in opening the bridge?	<p>The length of waiting pontoons provided (50m both north and south of the bridge) has been calculated based on sufficient provision to accommodate 3 maximum unrestricted "broads" vessels that being 14m total length (Broads Authority Vessel Dimension Byelaws 1995 Article 7). This is considered to provide sufficient waiting provision to minimise the need for recreational vessel openings during peak road traffic hours when balanced with the cost and consequential loss of existing berth incurred by their provision. Should more than 3 recreational vessels request transit at the same time or if a further vessel</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>requests opening when the pontoon is fully occupied then the bridge would be raised to allow all vessels to pass.</p> <p>In connection with this procedure, paragraph 70 of the protective provisions for the protection of Great Yarmouth Port Authority ('GYPA') (in Schedule 14 to the Draft DCO) sets out that the Applicant must, so far as practicable, keep the new bridge in the raised position from the occurrence of a failure until its resolution.</p>
1.0.4	The Applicant	Has consideration been given to an 'emergency lay-by' facility?	<p>Yes, consideration has been given to the provision of emergency lay-by facilities at various locations within the river.</p> <p>However, through the Navigation Risk Assessment ('NRA') process it has been determined that an emergency lay-by facility is not required, as alternative operational processes would provide an adequate substitute. The latest update of the preliminary Navigational Risk Assessment ('pNRA') (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/029 considers this issue).</p>
1.0.5	The Applicant	What is the rationale for locating the waiting pontoons on the western side of the river as opposed to the east which is claimed to have greater safety benefits?	<p>The potential for vessel contact with the waiting facilities has been considered in the pNRA (Document Reference 6.14, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-185) and also the latest update of the pNRA (Document Reference</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>NCC/GY3RC/EX/029) which highlights that operational procedures (recreational craft would be released from the waiting pontoons and permitted to pass the bridge to continue their passage sufficiently in advance of a large vessel transit so as to avoid increased risk) would be implemented to lower this risk to as low as reasonably possible ('ALARP').</p> <p>From the Vessel Simulations and through the subsequent NRA process (as reported in the application pNRA (Document Reference 6.14, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-185) it has not been shown that waiting pontoons on the east bank would be safer than on the west bank. During the vessel simulations more vessel passages occurred favouring the inside of the bend (i.e the east side) rather than the outside (i.e the west side), therefore it follows that pontoons on the east bank would put any occupant closer to passing vessels than pontoons on the west side would. Additional operational mitigations have been recommended in the update to the pNRA being submitted at deadline 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/029) which would require any vessels on the waiting pontoons to undertake their transit in advance of a large vessel passage.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>The provision of pontoons on the east bank would create a significantly greater impact on existing port operations when compared to the west bank. Bollard Quay on the west bank has limited available quay margin (usable land behind the quay) for commercial operations and has not been in commercial operation for 3 years whereas Atlas Quay on the east bank is one of the main general cargo quays handling on average 5 vessels per month to the location of the vessel waiting facilities.</p>
1.0.6	The Applicant	<p>Diversion of utilities infrastructure will be required in order to facilitate the proposed development. i. Can the Applicant confirm that all connections to utilities are located within the Order limits? ii. Have the impacts of such diversions and replacement connecting infrastructure been considered in all the relevant ES assessments?</p>	<p>Yes, the Applicant confirms that all connections to utilities are located within the Order Limits. The Applicant undertook C2 Enquiries, C3 Budget Estimates and C4 Detailed Estimates during the design and pre-application process to identify the existing utilities infrastructure and to ascertain the potential need for diversions and replacements. The C2 Enquiries, C3 Budget Estimates and C4 Detailed Estimates were undertaken in accordance with the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 - Diversionary Works process. This information was used to inform the Order Limits for the Scheme, as shown on the Land Plans (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/004, Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-007) and the Works Plans</p>



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>(Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/005, Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-008).</p> <p>Yes, the Applicant can confirm that diversions and replacement connecting infrastructure has been considered in all relevant environmental impact assessments as they are included within the Scheme description in chapter 2 of the ES (see paragraph 2.4.3) (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096). For example, the full Flood Risk Assessment which is presented as an appendix to the ES (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-135) has considered the utilities infrastructure as part of the flood risk vulnerability assessment (Table 4.2) and the receptor sensitivity classification (Table 6.2).</p>
1.0.7	The Applicant	How and who will measure the height of yacht masts before allowing them through without the bridge being raised?	<p>As the clearance beneath the bridge in its lowered position is between 4.5 and 5.5m (depending on tidal state) and allowing a reasonable safety margin to account for unexpected vessel heave (vertical motion) it is unlikely that many masted vessels would be able to pass under the bridge without an opening, as typically a vessel would have a mast height of between 60% and 150% of its length. For any vessel that may be able to pass beneath the bridge, air draft displays (visual indications of the</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			bridge height above the water level) are required to be provided (see paragraph 7.3.6 within the pNRA (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/029)) (secured through Requirement 14 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020) to give a visual indication of the available clearance, enabling a vessel's Master to satisfy himself as to safety of passage.
1.0.8	GYPA	In principle do you have any concerns to the 50m clear span shown on the submitted plans?	The 50m span has been shown to be satisfactory for vessel movements through the vessel simulations (see pNRA Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/029), it is also similar in dimension to the state that exists should two wide beam vessels be moored on opposite quays elsewhere in the river, as considered in the simulations.
1.0.9	GYPA	What specific concerns do you have in relation to the preliminary Navigational Risk Assessment (pNRA) that has been carried on behalf of the applicant?	The Applicant has no comment.
1.0.10	GYPA	The General Arrangements plans show waiting areas either side of the proposed bridge adjacent to Bollard Quay. With that in mind can	The waiting pontoons are designed for recreational and potentially very small commercial vessels, they are not intended nor will be suitable for use by larger commercial river traffic.

---

---

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		you provide further details to support your concerns about 'lay-by berths'?	Please also see the response to item MP5 of the Applicant's response to Relevant Representations (Document Reference NCC/GYTRC/EX/008).

## 2 Air Quality and Emissions

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.1.1	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain how PM10 will be monitored during construction and what trigger point would be applied for the need for corrective action? Can the Applicant also explain what corrective action would be applied if the trigger point is breached?	<p>In accordance with Section 3.3 of the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187), and paragraph 6.8.14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096), during the construction phase the Contractor will undertake monitoring of dust and PM<sub>10</sub>, the full details of which (including triggers for corrective action), will be able to be agreed as part of the approval of the full CoCP by the County Planning Authority following consultation with Great Yarmouth Borough Council, pursuant to Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020).</p> <p>The Contractor will deploy specialist air quality monitoring equipment in accordance with the Institute of Air Quality Management ('IAQM') Guidance on 'Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites'. The monitoring equipment deployed will include an alert system with regard to increased emissions of dust and a trigger for the review of dust control measures during construction. The trigger point</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>applied for the need for corrective action will be 190 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>10</sub> averaged over a 1-hour period in accordance with Paragraph 4.40 of the aforementioned IAQM guidance.</p> <p>The mitigation measures to be applied during construction to manage dust and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are defined in Section 3.2 of the Outline CoCP. In the event of an exceedance of the trigger point, as notified by the real-time monitoring, the specified mitigation measures will be reviewed together with the site activities generating dust and PM<sub>10</sub> to ensure that the measures are being applied correctly and to identify any corrective actions that are required as per paragraph 6.8.10 of the ES. The specific corrective action required in relation to an exceedance will depend on the site conditions; for example, it may be appropriate to rearrange or suspend some dust generating activities according to the weather as high winds can increase the dispersal of construction dust. Paragraph 3.3.3 of the Outline CoCP states that site management will be applied to record in the log book any exceptional incidents that cause dust and/or air emissions, either on- or offsite, and the action taken to resolve the incident.</p>
1.1.2	The Applicant	The ES makes no commitment to monitoring PM <sub>2.5</sub> emissions. Can the Applicant explain	PM <sub>2.5</sub> (particles with a diameter less than 2.5 µm) are a smaller size fraction component of the

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>what measures are in place to address impacts associated with increased PM<sub>2.5</sub> from the Proposed Development during the construction and operational phases? Can the Applicant also explain what confidence it has in the implementation and efficacy of such measures?</p>	<p>pollutant PM<sub>10</sub> (particles with a diameter less than 10 µm). In accordance with Section 3.3 of the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187) and paragraph 6.8.14 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096), specialist monitoring equipment will be deployed to measure dust and PM<sub>10</sub> during the construction phase. In accordance with best practice, monitoring will be undertaken in accordance with the IAQM Guidance on 'Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites'. The IAQM Guidance advises the measurement of PM<sub>10</sub> and/or PM<sub>2.5</sub> with a trigger point based on 'primary metric' PM<sub>10</sub> for corrective action to reduce construction dust emission. PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are largely related to exhaust emissions from Non-Road Mobile Machinery ('NRMM') and all vehicles will be operated in accordance with the Regulation (EU) 2016/1628, as referenced in the IAQM Guidance on Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction, Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 which imposes gaseous and particulate emission limits on exhaust emissions. The proposed measures are consistent with best practice as defined by</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>current IAQM guidance and are therefore considered to be effective.</p> <p>An assessment of the predicted change in PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations during the operational phase of the Scheme Opening Year 2023 has been presented within Table 6.17 of Chapter 6: Air Quality of the ES. The assessment is based on atmospheric dispersal modelling which predicts the dispersal of pollutants from traffic emissions. The detailed modelling results of the ES demonstrate that the maximum predicted PM<sub>10</sub> concentration and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in 2023 will be 21.2 and 15.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> respectively with the Scheme in operation as shown in Figure 6.12 and Figure 6.13 (Document Reference 6.3, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-163). These concentrations are well below the Air Quality Standards Regulations national air quality objective values set for the protection of human health for PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Given the concentrations of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are predicted to remain well below the objective concentration of 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>10</sub> and 25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> PM<sub>2.5</sub>, scheme-specific monitoring for these pollutants is not proposed during the operational phase. Concentrations of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are measured in Great Yarmouth by the Local Authority, Great</p>

---

---

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			Yarmouth Borough Council, on an ongoing basis at a continuous air quality monitoring station situated in South Denes, as described in Paragraph 6.5.6 of the ES.



### 3 Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.2.1	The Applicant	APP-096 (in Section 10.9.5) describes the use of floating cranes and barges to construct the bridge piers and bridge deck and other features, although no reference is made to these in the HRA [APP-182] or dDCO [APP-020]. APP096 describes various construction techniques which may be necessary to construct the proposed development. Can the Applicant confirm if the impacts associated with construction activities (e.g effect on local air quality and noise) and techniques have been taken into account in the HRA e.g. disturbance associated with the proposed use of floating cranes and barges?	<p>It is acknowledged that Chapter 10: Townscape and Visual of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096) refers to floating cranes and barges. The use of cranes has been assessed in the noise and vibration chapter – see Appendix 7C (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-110). The barges referred to are ‘dumb’ flat top barges with no engines, which would be towed into position by a tug and would be used as a platform upon which the cranes will sit. The cranes would be used to lift the appropriate construction equipment into position.</p> <p>As noted in paragraph 10.9.5 of the ES, the tugs will be similar in type to the vessels currently traversing and docking in the River Yare and the number of movements of tugs a day to move the barges into required position will be less than the average 11 movements a day reported in the pNRA. Furthermore, in accordance with paragraph 3.2.2 of the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187) all engines, inclusive of those use by tugs, will be switched off when not in use to</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>ensure that they do not cause emissions once static and thus any adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>It was therefore considered that the use of the tugs and barges is not considered, on a qualitative basis, to cause significant effects relating to air quality or noise and vibration as they will be experienced as part of the wider baseline of the River Yare.</p> <p>As a result, the matter was not given further consideration in the environmental impact assessment or the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182) as there are not considered to be any potentially significant effects.</p>
1.2.2	The Applicant	The Applicant details the extent of the study area for the HRA in Paragraph 4.1.2 [APP-182] however, no explanation is provided on the basis on which it was determined. Can the Applicant provide evidence and justification for the chosen study area, particularly providing justification as to why 2km is a suitable distance relevant to the extent of the likely impacts from the Proposed Development?	The study area for European sites was extended from 2 km up to 30 km as a result of the potential for hydrological connections, as presented within paragraph 4.1.2 of the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182). Considering the likely effects of the Scheme and potential impacts on potential receptors this area is considered to capture all sites of relevance for HRA. The study area was consulted upon with various bodies, inclusive of

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			Natural England and as noted in the Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') with Natural England (Document Reference NCC/GYTRC/EX/010, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-004), submitted at Deadline 1, was considered to be appropriate.
1.2.3	The Applicant	Para 4.3.2 of the APP-182 identifies the potential impacts that were considered in relation to all the European sites included in the assessment. These are: habitat loss; fragmentation; disturbance; air quality; and water quality (pollution and sediment loading). Please can the Applicant explain the extent to which there is agreement with Natural England that these are the relevant impacts to be considered in the assessment?	The Applicant has agreed with Natural England that the relevant impacts have been considered in the assessment. The Applicant has undertaken consultation with Natural England prior to and throughout the Application process. This is summarised in Table 8.4 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096), Table 3.1 of the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182) and in the SoCG with Natural England (Document Reference NCC/GYTRC/EX/010, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-004) submitted at Deadline 1. All of these references confirm that the methodology and conclusions presented in Chapter 8: Nature Conservation of the ES and in the HRA are appropriate and consistent with the recommendations made by Natural England.
1.2.4	Natural England	It should be noted that Figures 1 & 2 of the HRA list some additional designated sites namely,	The Applicant has presented within the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>'Greater Wash', 'Benacre to Baven's' and 'Minsmere Walberwick'. These designated sites, which are a combination of SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites, do not appear to be included in HRA. No matrices have been provided to date or rationale for their absence in the assessment. The Applicant provides justification regarding the chosen study area for the HRA. The reasoning seems to be robust however the ExA requests clarification regarding the above to ensure all relevant designated sites have been considered in the assessment. Please can NE confirm whether they are satisfied that the correct sites, features and impacts have been identified in the Applicant's Habitats.</p>	<p>Inspectorate Reference APP-182) the study area and the identified sites considered for screening purposes. The Applicant considers that the sites considered are consistent with those that Natural England have advised require consideration for the Scheme. The Greater Wash Special Protection Area ('SPA'), Benacre to Easton Baven's SPA and Minsmere-Walberwick SPA are either not hydrologically linked and/or do not support any qualifying species considered likely to interact with the Scheme.</p>
1.2.5	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 3 of the APP-182 presents the detail of the consultation exercise with statutory and non-statutory bodies, specifically PINS, NE, EA, MMO and Norfolk County (in tabulated form, Table 3.1). The chapter also details the ecological surveys undertaken associated with the Proposed Development, in this table.</p> <p>No further details are provided about the nature and currency of the data obtained. Please can the Applicant identify the source of the data</p>	<p>The following appendices contain survey information which informed the assessments presented in both Chapter 8: Nature Conservation of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096) and the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 8B: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-115) which summarises a survey undertaken in September 2016;</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>relied upon for the assessment, including cross references as appropriate to survey information contained within the application documents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 8C: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Update (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-116) which updates Appendix 8A through a survey undertaken in July 2018;</li> <li>• Appendix 8D: Breeding Bird Survey Report (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-117) which presents results of a survey carried out from May – June 2018;</li> <li>• Appendix 8E: Protected Species Survey Report (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-118) which summarises surveys for water vole (August 2017) and bats (August 2017);</li> <li>• Appendix 8F: Water Vole Survey Report (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-119) providing an update to water survey work as carried out in July 2018;</li> <li>• Appendix 8G: Preliminary Bat Roost Report (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-120) presenting results of surveys of</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>buildings within the Order Limits in November 2018;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 8H: Detailed Arboriculture Report (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-121) presenting results of a desk study and a walkover survey undertaken in October 2018; and</li> <li>• Appendix 8I: Benthic Ecology and Fish Survey Report (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-122) presenting results of surveys undertaken in the River Yare in January 2019.</li> </ul> <p>The following documents have informed the HRA as the surveys summarised in these documents provided information on the likely effects on bird features and supporting habitats of the Outer Thames Estuary SPA:</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 8D: Breeding Bird Survey Report; and</li> <li>• Appendix 8I: Benthic Ecology and Fish Survey Report.</li> </ul> <p>Appendix 8I provides information on benthic ecology and fish features in the River Yare which forms the extension of the Outer Thames Estuary SPA and therefore provides information on indirect impacts on the SPA.</p>
1.2.6	The Applicant	<p>In APP-182, the ExA notes the reference to PINS Advice Note Ten (paragraph 7.12.1) and the explanation that this has been applied in relation to their incombination assessment. The detailed description of the methods applied are however lacking. Can the Applicant explain exactly what method was applied to identify relevant other development for the purposes of the assessment e.g. with reference to the 'long' and 'short' list? Can the Applicant also explain if the Local Planning Authority have been consulted to identify the other development?</p>	<p>The methodology for assessing in-combination effects, including the process for identifying the 'long' and 'short' lists, is presented in Chapter 19: Cumulative Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096) paragraphs 19.4.11 to 19.4.31. As Chapter 19 of the ES utilised the same Zone of Influence as described in the HRA in addition to considerations of timing of the projects considered (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182) it is the Applicant's view that the other committed developments identified are appropriate (as referenced in paragraph 7.12.2 of the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182)).</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Table 19.14 of the ES summarises the consultation process undertaken with Norfolk County Council and Great Yarmouth Borough Council with regards to the approach to the cumulative effects assessment. In addition, both the 'long' and 'short' lists identified for the in-combination effects assessment formed part of that consultation and Great Yarmouth Borough Council provided information for two additional sites for consideration in the assessment, as reflected in the signed SoCG (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/010, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-004) submitted at Deadline 1. Furthermore, the signed SoCG for Natural England (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/010, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-004), submitted at Deadline 1, includes the agreement of the in-combination effects methodology and assessment process for the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182).</p>
1.2.7	The Applicant	In APP-182, there is limited explanation to support the conclusion that the proposed Development is unlikely to have any significant effects on any European site in combination with the identified developments and references are made to cumulative rather than in-combination	The HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182) applies the methodology for identifying European sites to be considered for in-combination effects in accordance with Chapter 19: Cumulative Effects of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>effects. Please can the Applicant provide a justification of this conclusion, that addresses the incombination effects of each development for all phases of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>Inspectorate Reference APP-096). As Chapter 19 utilised the same Zone of Influence as described in the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182) it is considered that the other developments identified are appropriate.</p> <p>Table 19.16 of the ES outlines the cumulative effects of each committed development for construction and operational phases of the Scheme (as appropriate). It is considered that these conclusions are equally valid in an HRA context of in-combination considerations, given the conclusions made in respect of timing and distance of the developments considered.</p> <p>The reference to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 10 and 'cumulative' effects in paragraph 7.12.1 of the HRA in the context of in-combination effects is an erratum. The reference should refer to Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 17.</p>
1.2.8	Natural England	<p>Paragraph 6.9.6 of APP-182 indicates information on the conservation objectives is not readily available for the Broadland Ramsar site and that therefore the conservation objectives for the Broadland SPA have been used for the</p>	<p>The Applicant has no comment.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		purposes of the Ramsar site assessment. Please could NE confirm whether they agree that this is an appropriate approach.	
1.2.9	The Applicant	Please can the Applicant provide Word versions (.doc) of the screening and integrity matrices from APP-182	Word versions of the screening and integrity matrices, as included within the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182), are included as part of the document suite submitted at Deadline 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/031).
1.2.10	The Applicant	In accordance with the Inspectorate's Advice Note 10, the Applicant is asked to provide specific cross references, including paragraph/section numbers in the ENs to the documents supporting the assertions within the ENs, for both the Screening and Integrity Matrices.	These references have been updated in the Word versions of the matrices submitted at Deadline 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/031) pursuant to question 1.2.9.
1.2.11	The Applicant	Where no likely significant effect in relation to sediment re-suspension and deposition has been determined in APP-182; the Evidence Notes of the matrices state that 'Specific control measures would be incorporated within the Scheme in accordance with good practice regardless of the presence of any European site, with the principal function of seeking to avoid the contamination of the River Yare'.	It is not considered that the Scheme will result in a requirement for construction dredging and the references to dredging in paragraphs 5.1.4, 5.4.2, 6.2.4 and the definition of Vessel Waiting Facilities on page vii, are included in the HRA (Document Reference 6.11, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-182) in error.

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>There are statements relating to silt traps, fences, filters etc. to treat sediment laden water however, the potential for dredging of the channel is not discussed. Please can the Applicant elaborate on the above aspect commenting on the likelihood of any dredging being undertaken (as discussed in Paragraph 5.1.4, 5.4.2 and 6.2.4. Furthermore, if identified as a possibility, specify the maximum volume of sediment that would require disposal from dredging and detail the testing regime to ensure appropriate disposal. Consideration to the noise disturbance from such activities should also be documented.</p>	<p>Construction activities associated with the bridge sub-structures will be undertaken within the River Yare, the Contractor has confirmed that there will be no dredging works associated with the construction phase of the Scheme. Construction activities for the bridge sub-structures will be carried out within two cofferdams, one on the eastern side and one of the western side of the River Yare. The only additional in-waterway activities planned outside the two cofferdams are associated with the vessel waiting facilities.</p> <p>Once installed the cofferdams will be dewatered using dewatering wells to draw down the water level. The cofferdam wall level will be above the high tide level which will ensure that the material is not saturated. This will enable the excavation of the material from within the cofferdams to be done when the material is dry. Therefore, the material being excavated is not considered to constitute dredged material.</p> <p>Once excavated the material will be placed into temporary stockpiles on adjacent working areas prior to being transported off site. All material will be disposed of on land in compliance with all applicable legislation. No materials are proposed to be disposed of at sea during the construction phase; this is secured through condition 5 of the</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>deemed marine licence (see Part 2 of Schedule 13 to the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020).</p> <p>With regards to noise disturbance the construction of the Scheme is considered to have minor impacts relative to the conditions already present in the River Yare. River works will be fully controlled in accordance with the Deemed Marine Licence in Schedule 13 to the draft DCO and are considered, for the purposes of the assessment, to involve a limited temporal extent (less than 32 days for individual aspects of the construction programme; as assumed in Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration of the ES). All impacts are considered to be of limited extent (as compared to background levels), allowing recoverability of fish populations. Such findings are discussed in sections 7 and 9 of the HRA.</p>
1.2.12	Natural England	Can NE confirm that they are content with the Applicant's approach to assessing impacts on amphibians and reptiles and their decision to scope out the need for specific surveys in this regard?	<p>The signed SoCG for Natural England (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/010, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-004), submitted at Deadline 1, explains that the scoping out of great-crested newt and reptile surveys is under discussion with Natural England. The Applicant has detailed its informed approach to scoping of required surveys through its Preliminary Ecological Appraisal ('PEA'): Appendix 8B:</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-115) which summarises a survey undertaken in September 2016; and Appendix 8C: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Update (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-116) which updates Appendix 8A through a survey undertaken in July 2018.</p>
1.2.13	The Applicant	<p>Can the Applicant explain what the specific measures are that will be implemented to control impacts during construction in relation to works within the riverbed and at other water crossing points? Can the Applicant also explain how such measures are secured and the confidence it has in the effectiveness of such measures?</p>	<p>The Applicant has proposed the following measures with respect to construction at the riverbed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of soft start piling techniques to minimise the disturbance and subsequent mobilisation of contaminated sediment within the River Yare during construction of the bridge substructures (included within Section 6.2 of the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187) and secured through Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020); and</li> <li>• The use of cofferdams to exclude work areas from the main River Yare waterbody,</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>thus reducing the risk of increased sediment loads or hazardous substances entering the main water flow (included within Section 6.2 of the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187) and secured through Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020).</p> <p>In respect of works at other crossings of watercourses, section 6.2 of the Outline CoCP includes the following measures (among others):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A temporary surface water drainage strategy to be prepared for the construction stage to ensure that surface run-off would not directly enter existing watercourses and temporary drainage arrangements to be constructed ahead of the construction works commencing to ensure that surface runoff will not directly enter existing water courses;</li> <li>• Temporary cut-off drains would be used uphill and downhill of the working areas to prevent clean runoff entering and dirty water leaving the working area without appropriate treatment;</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All drains within the Principal Application Site would be identified and labelled and measures implemented to prevent polluting substances from entering them;</li> <li>• Areas with a greater risk of spillage (e.g. vehicle maintenance and storage areas for hazardous materials) would be carefully sited (e.g. away from drains or areas where surface waters may pond);</li> <li>• Measures to be put in place to prevent pollution from construction plant, vehicles and machinery including refuelling and lubricating in designated areas, on an impermeable surface, with appropriate cut-off drainage located away from watercourses; plant to be maintained in a good condition with wheel washing in place, all refuelling would be supervised and carried out in a designated area. In the event of plant breakdown drip trays would be used during any emergency maintenance and spill kits would be available on site;</li> <li>• Oil absorbent booms would be made available on site and deployed in the event of a significant spillage;</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface water run-off and excavation dewatering would be captured and settled out prior to disposal to sewer as appropriate. Any contaminants to be removed prior to disposal.</li> </ul> <p>The effectiveness of this mitigation has been summarised in Chapter 7: Noise and Vibration, for example with paragraphs 7.8.36 to 7.8.41 and assessed in paragraph 7.8.42. Chapter 11: Road Drainage and Water Environment of the ES summarises the scenario for assessment in paragraph 11.7.1, which is then assessed in section 11.8 (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096). These findings have subsequently informed Chapter 8: Nature Conservation of the ES where section 8.7 establishes the scenario for assessment.</p> <p>The measures in the Outline CoCP referred to above are secured by requirement 5 in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020). Requirement 5(1) and (2)(h) require, before the authorised development commences, the approval of the County Planning Authority (following consultation with Great Yarmouth Borough Council, the lead local flood authority,</p>



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>the IDB and the Environment Agency) of provisions to control pollution of water land. Requirement 5(3) requires those details to accord with the Outline CoCP.</p>
1.2.14	The Applicant	When will the detailed design be made available, and will this include details of a preferred planting mix and habitat for Black Redstart?	<p>The detailed design will be available post DCO consent. Delivery of these matters is however secured through requirement 4(1)(b) of the Draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020) which requires the detailed design to be undertaken in general accordance with the Approach to Detailed Design (Document Reference 7.4a, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-196) (which discusses at section 6.3 the need for habitat which would support black redstart habitat); and requirement 6(2)(e) which requires the landscaping scheme for each part of the development to be approved by the county planning authority following consultation with Great Yarmouth Borough Council - as set out by that paragraph, such a scheme must include details of ecological mitigation areas as well as the location, species, size and planting density of any proposed planting.</p> <p>As such, the relevant details will be able to be brought forward and considered by the</p>

---

---

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			appropriate authorities as part of the detailed design process.

## 4 Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Consideration

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.3.1	The Applicant	Would the Applicant please complete the attached Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule at annex A and add or delete any entries that it believes would be appropriate, giving reasons for any additions or deletions?	<p>The Applicant has completed the ExA's Compulsory Acquisition Objection Schedule (see entries in red text) and this is included as Annex A to this document.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that the ten entries included within the ExA's version of Annex A are correctly included.</p> <p>The Applicant has also added entries for Hope (Borough of Great Yarmouth) (Planning Inspectorate Reference RR-032), Regaland Ltd (Planning Inspectorate References RR-013 and REP1-025) and Alan Forder (Planning Inspectorate Reference RR-009) who are also people or organisations who have an interest included in Parts 1, 2 or 3 of the Book of Reference - Rev 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/017). The Applicant does not have the necessary information to complete the entries for these additional parties in column 4 of Annex A – IP/AP Ref Nos – but will add these</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>references in due course, if the information can be provided by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>In updating Annex A, the Applicant has also make amendments to clarify which plots of land are proposed to be subject to which powers to use or acquire land (e.g. compulsory acquisition, acquisition of rights, or temporary possession powers).</p>
1.3.2	The Applicant	Can the applicant confirm that it is working proactively with port tenants to address those concerns that have been raised in the various Relevant Representations?	<p>The Applicant can confirm that it is working proactively with port tenants to address their concerns.</p> <p><u>Great Yarmouth Port Users Association</u>          The Applicant has attended regular user association meetings and working group meetings with the Great Yarmouth Port Users Association ('GYPUA') (Note: these meetings were held on 29/06/2017, 16/11/2017, 22/03/2018, 21/06/2018, 11/07/2018, 10/08/2018, 07/09/2018, 05/10/2018, 02/11/2018, 05/12/2018 and 20/06/2019) and is happy to attend future meetings. The Applicant will continue to work with the GYPUA to address its concerns and is</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>developing a Statement of Common Ground with this party.</p> <p><u>Great Yarmouth Port Company</u>            The Great Yarmouth Port Company ('GYPC') leases land from both Great Yarmouth Port Authority and Great Yarmouth Borough Council and operates from that land itself as well as subleasing areas to other parties.</p> <p>The Applicant and GYPC have entered into an Agreement covering inter-alia, land acquisition provisions and compensation terms. The Agreement is conditional on the DCO being granted, funding being secured and notices for the acquisition of land required for the Scheme being served.</p> <p>Primacy of vessel navigation is acknowledged by the Applicant, as is set out in the Scheme of Operation (Schedule 10 to the draft DCO and also article 43(6) of the draft DCO) prepared for the regulation of bridge openings following implementation of the Scheme.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p><u>ASCO UK Limited</u>            Details of the Applicant's engagement with ASCO UK Limited ('ASCO') are set out in pages 116 to 125 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/008, Planning Inspectorate reference REP1-002) and the Negotiations Tracker (Rev.1) - updated for Deadline 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/020).</p> <p>Detailed discussions have been ongoing with ASCO and Perenco Limited ('Perenco') since November 2017, with the Applicant's objective being to understand those parties' operational requirements and to explore all possible options to mitigate the impact of the Scheme on both parties' businesses.</p> <p>The Applicant is working with both Perenco and ASCO to address operational concerns raised. This work is still ongoing with the aim of finding the right solution so that Perenco continues to be located within Great Yarmouth, Perenco's operations will not be interrupted as a result of the</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Scheme and the current working relationship between ASCO and Perenco is maintained.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken hydrodynamic, sediment transport and vessel simulation modelling and assessments to the extent considered necessary for the production of the Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096). These works indicate that there would be minimal effect on the hydrodynamics in the River in the areas of ASCO's operations and any effects would not impact upon the ability to operate the berths.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, refinements to the hydrodynamic modelling works are being undertaken to further address the concerns raised by ASCO and other parties on the potential long-term effects the Scheme could have on the sediment regime in the River.</p> <p><u>Perenco</u>          Details of the Applicant's engagement with Perenco are set out in pages 126 to 129 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Representations (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/008, Planning Inspectorate reference REP1-002) and the Negotiations Tracker (Rev.1) - updated for Deadline 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/020).</p> <p>Detailed discussions have been ongoing with ASCO and Perenco since November 2017 to understand their operational requirements and explore all possible options to mitigate the impact of the Scheme on both businesses. Since early September 2019, these discussions have intensified significantly. The Applicant is working with both Perenco and ASCO to address operational concerns raised. This work is still ongoing with the aim of finding the right solution before the end of the DCO Examination, so that Perenco continues to be located within Great Yarmouth and Perenco's operations will not be interrupted as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p><u>Alicat Workboats Limited / Richards Dry Dock and Eng Ltd</u></p> <p>In addition to attendance at the meetings with the GYPUA, at which a representative of Alicat Workboats Limited ('Alicat') has been present, the</p>



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Applicant has also met separately with Alicat on 9 August 2019 to discuss works within the river. In addition separate engagement has taken place with regard to the development of a SoCG. The Applicant has submitted this SoCG at Deadline 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/021).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Alicat during the examination and subsequent construction phase (should consent be granted).</p> <p><u>Goodchild Marine Services Limited</u></p> <p>Engagement with Goodchild Marine Services Limited ('Goodchild Marine') has been via email correspondence. The Applicant can confirm that it will continue to engage with Goodchild Marine during the examination and subsequent construction phase (should consent be granted).</p> <p>In its Written Representation (Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-019) the Applicant notes Goodchild Marine's suggestion that a SoCG be developed between the two parties. The Applicant will contact Goodchild Marine in order to develop a SoCG.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.3.3	ASCO	What appropriate safeguards, protective provisions and mitigation measures are ASCO seeking in relation to its land?	<p>Whilst the Applicant is generally open to discussing such matters with ASCO it does not intend to enter into negotiations with ASCO regarding protective provisions. This is on the basis that ASCO is a commercial entity and there is no statutory undertaking that would be protected by the protective provisions.</p> <p>Please also see the Applicant's response to ExQ1 1.8.14.</p>
1.3.4	GYPA	<p>i. What evidence is there that the acquisition of land within the port estate will act to the serious detriment of the port undertaking? ii. What proportion of the existing berth space to be acquired is in current active or proposed use? iii. What specific detriment do you identify to the existing port operations from the severance of land? iv. In what ways will the bisecting of the inner harbour damage your ability to secure further business from the off-shore wind sector? v. What specific evidence do you have that the effects identified above will result in the deflection of future business to competitor ports? vi. What other mitigation measures have you proposed in respect of the above matters?</p>	<p>The Applicant and GYPC entered into an Agreement dated 29 March 2019 covering inter-alia, land acquisition proposals and compensation terms. The Agreement is conditional on the DCO being granted, funding being secured and notices for the acquisition of land required for the Scheme being served.</p> <p>The Agreement contained provision for Great Yarmouth Port Authority to become a signatory to that Agreement. The Applicant is awaiting confirmation from the Port Company and Port Authority that this has occurred.</p> <p>i. The Applicant does not consider that the acquisition of land within the port estate will have impacts on the port's statutory</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>undertaking which amount to serious detriment. Primacy of vessel navigation is acknowledged by the Applicant as is set out in the Scheme of Operation (DCO Schedule 10) prepared for the regulation of bridge openings following implementation of the Scheme. The Agreement dated 29 March 2019 between the Applicant, GYPC and GYPA covers the financial compensation payable by the Applicant for the acquisition of the land required for the Scheme.</p> <p>ii. The Applicant understands that there are currently 97 distinct berth locations in the Port although not all are within the operational control of GYPC. Of these, five berths would be permanently lost due to the Scheme and a further two berths would be temporarily affected during construction.</p> <p>iii. As noted in response to (i) above, the Applicant has entered into an agreement with GYPC and GYPA addressing matters of compensation and land acquisition and</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>does not consider that the Scheme will have impacts on the port's statutory undertaking which amount to serious detriment. In terms of addressing severance of land arising from the Scheme, the Scheme includes provision of an underpass which will provide connectivity between the GYPA and GYPC land either side of the Scheme.</p> <p>iv. The Applicant considers that the improved connectivity to the Strategic Road Network afforded by the Scheme will enhance the ability to secure additional business to the port from both the off-shore wind sector and businesses generally.</p> <p>v. The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme will result in future business being deflected to other ports.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that all raised concerns have been considered and are addressed in the Commercial Agreement.</p>

## 5 Draft Development Consent Order

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.1	The Applicant	Article 2 Interpretation: "undertaker". Please explain the separation of functions/ powers within Norfolk County Council i.e. as undertaker, highway authority, county planning authority, street authority, traffic authority etc and explain any controls put in place to ensure scrutiny and accountability?	<p>The Applicant for the DCO is Norfolk County Council ('NCC') in its role as local highway authority. The Scheme is managed by the Infrastructure Delivery Team ("the Applicant Team"), which is situated within NCC's Directorate of Community and Environmental Services.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.1.1 to 3.1.20 of the Introduction to the Applicant and the Application (Document Reference 1.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-002) describes the roles of NCC as highway authority (including traffic authority), County Planning Authority and street authority. It also describes the control measures that are in place to ensure that the decision-making functions of these roles, and the Applicant Team for the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing, remain separate. This is also summarised below.</p> <p><u>Role as County Planning Authority</u></p> <p>The Applicant team and the County Planning Authority ('CPA') team are each answerable to a different Assistant Director as follows:</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Assistant Director for Culture and Heritage supported by the Head of Planning discharges the CPA's functions;</li> <li>• The Assistant Director for Highways and Waste oversees the Applicant's functions.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst both Assistant Directors ordinarily report to the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services, it has been agreed that any reports by the Assistant Director for Culture and Heritage in relation to the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing shall be treated as if it were a non-executive function and dealt with either by the CPA under delegated powers or reported to the Planning (Regulatory) Committee as required. In addition, any officer providing specialist advice to the planning team will not have assisted the Applicant in preparing the application.</p> <p>As a result of these arrangements the separate functions and responsibilities of the CPA and the Applicant in relation to the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing will be kept distinct and independent from each other.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>If contact between the CPA and the Applicant is necessary, this will be through a named individual. The named person is currently Angelina Lambert.</p> <p><u>Role as Highway Authority (including Traffic Authority)</u></p> <p>The Growth and Infrastructure Team is the statutory highway authority consultee and this team is answerable to the Assistant Director for Growth and Development within NCC. This provides a clear line of communication and separation of functions.</p> <p>If contact with the Growth and Infrastructure Team is necessary by the Applicant, this has been agreed to be through a named individual. The named person is currently Liz Poole.</p> <p><u>Role as Street Authority</u></p> <p>The Area based street works teams undertake NCC's function as street authority, including the co-ordination of street works &amp; network activities together with the granting of permit applications. Although these teams and the Applicant Team fall under the same Assistant Director for Highways</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>and Waste, they have different senior management team(s). Both teams therefore have clear lines of reporting, which are kept separate to ensure there is separation of functions.</p> <p>In addition to the lines of reporting described above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant will maintain secure electronic filing systems which can only be accessed by the Applicant's Team;</li> <li>• The CPA will maintain a secure electronic and paper filing system which can only be accessed by the CPA;</li> </ul> <p>The above procedures will apply to the application, examination, and the discharge of any requirements of the Development Consent Order for the Scheme.</p> <p>It should be noted that there is nothing unusual in a local government body with planning and related functions determining its own applications and NCC is accustomed to putting in place appropriate measures to ensure such decisions</p>



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>are made transparently. In the DCO context there are numerous precedents for local authority applicants to also determine applications under requirements or other consents relating to their functions; see for example the Cornwall Council (A30 Temple to Higher Carblake Improvement) Order 2015, the Northumberland County Council (A1 – South East Northumberland Link Road (Morpeth Northern Bypass)) Development Consent Order 2015 and the Norfolk County Council (Norwich Northern Distributor Road (A1067 to A47(T))) Order 2015.</p>
1.4.2	The Applicant	<p>Article 3 disapplication of legislation etc. Can the applicant provide an explanation as to the effect of disapplication and cross-reference to the relevant part of the protective provision which would prevent any adverse impact as a result of removing byelaw control or the necessity for consent?</p>	<p>The effect of article 3 is that the provisions listed in article 3(1)(a) to (g) will not apply to the construction of any work or the carrying out of any operation required for the purposes of the construction, operation or maintenance of any part of the authorised development. The Applicant's approach to consents is explained in its Consents and Agreements Position Statement (Document Reference 7.3; Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-194), in particular paragraph 3.2.6. This approach is consistent with standard practice for development consent orders where certain consent regimes are to be disapplied and replaced with protective provisions.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Sub-paragraphs (1)(a) and (c) of article 3 relate to the functions of the Waveney, Lower Yare and Lothingland IDB under the Land Drainage Act 1991. The provisions to be disappplied, including the byelaws, relate to the requirements for consents for works on, in, over, under or in the vicinity of the IDB's watercourses, which in the language of the 1991 Act, are termed "ordinary watercourses". The IDB's protective provisions are contained in Part 5 of Schedule 14 to the draft Order. It is important to note the definition of "specified work" which is defined in terms that would cover any part of the authorised development that would affect the IDB's assets. Paragraph 41 of Schedule 14 requires notice of the intended start of any specified works; paragraph 43 makes specific provision in relation to the construction and operation of an outfall pipe; and paragraphs 44 and 45 deal with temporary diversions and culverting respectively.</p> <p>Sub-paragraphs (1)(d) and (f) relate to the flood risk management functions of the Environment Agency in relation to "main rivers", in this case the River Yare. They would disapply the requirement to obtain a flood risk activity environmental permit</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>or any consent required under the corresponding byelaws in relation to works to or in the vicinity of flood defences. The Environment Agency's protective provisions are contained in Part 4 of Schedule 14. Again, it is important to note the definition of "specified work" in Part 4 of Schedule 14 which covers permanent and temporary works within 8 metres of a drainage work or which is likely to have the effects listed in paragraph 29(a) to (e). Paragraph 30 requires the detailed plans of specified works to be approved by the Environment Agency which can be granted subject to reasonable conditions and requires the specified works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Paragraph 31 requires notice to be given of the commencement of specified works, paragraph 32 makes provision for additional "protective works" where reasonably required. Paragraphs 33 and 34 make provision for the maintenance of specified works. Other provisions deal with access, the parties' liabilities and disputes.</p> <p>Article 3(1)(e) disapplies byelaws 20, 48 and 56 of the Great Yarmouth Port Authority Navigation (Haven) Byelaws 1997. Protective provisions for the benefit of GYPA are contained in Part 6 of</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Schedule 14. Again, it is important to note the scope of the definition of “specified work” which covers so much of the authorised development as may materially affect, is situated upon, across, under or over or within 15 metres of the River Yare. Broadly paragraphs 53 to 60 are concerned with the carrying out of the specified works. It is relevant to note that paragraph 57 requires compliance with the reasonable directions of the harbour master. Paragraphs 61 and 62 make provision for addressing any changes to the dredging regime for the River Yare as a result of the Scheme. Paragraphs 63 to 71 deal with a range of matters including the access for inspections, vessel signals, the installation and subsequent removal of temporary works, maintenance, the provisions of “as built” drawings, co-ordination of traffic signals and provision for GYPA’s expenses.</p>
1.4.3	The Applicant	<p>Article 4 – development consent etc. granted by the Order. Can the applicant explain further the effect of and necessity for Article 4(2). How much land (and how far from the DCO boundary) might be affected by the provision? What enactments are likely to be engaged?</p>	<p>As is noted in paragraph 5.2 of the Explanatory Memorandum (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/006; Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-009), article 4(2) applies to enactments “<i>applying to land</i>” and requires those enactments to take effect “<i>subject to the provisions of this Order.</i>” It applies to local enactments, which is to say, enactments that are</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>of local effect within a specified geographical area, and not of general effect. Enactments of this type are commonly used to grant consent to particular projects and schemes which historically, before the advent of the Transport and Works Act 1992 and latterly the Planning Act 2008, were consented using local legislation. The Applicant has carefully reviewed the available local legislation, but historic enactments are not drawn with the same degree of precision as is the modern practice.</p> <p>Article 4(2) is, therefore, an important safeguard to ensure that historic local enactments could not be employed to frustrate the carrying out of this nationally significant infrastructure project. This rationale is reflected in the drafting which refers to local enactments “within, adjoining, or sharing a common boundary” with the Order limits. It is not uncommon for local enactments to make provision for certain activities or operations beyond their own Order limits which is why article 4(2) extends to enactments “adjoining or sharing a common boundary” in order to protect the authorised development from such provisions. In this context the term “adjoining” would be given</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>its normal everyday meaning "<i>lying close, being contiguous</i>".</p> <p>As is noted in the Explanatory Memorandum, article 4(2) has precedent in the following made development consent orders: the Silvertown Tunnel Order 2018, the A19/A184 Testo's Junction Alteration Development Consent Order 2018 and the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme Development Consent Order 2016.</p>
1.4.4	The Applicant	<p>Article 9 - Power to alter layout, etc., of streets. Can the applicant provide justification for the wide power to alter layout etc of any street and explain in what circumstances the undertaker would not be the relevant street authority and who the street authority would be. Other than the A47 are there any cases where NCC would not be the street authority?</p>	<p>Article 9 (power to alter layout etc., of streets) includes a specific power, set out in paragraph (1), which relates to the works in the streets specified in Schedule 3 to the draft Order as well as a general power in paragraph (2).</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider the general power in article 9(1) to be unduly widely drawn. Its scope is in keeping with the Applicant's existing powers and duties under the Highways Act 1980, see for example; sections 65 (cycle tracks), 72 (widening of highways), 75 (variation of widths of carriageways and footways), 76 (levelling of highways), 77 (alteration of levels), in addition to its general improvement power in</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>section 62. It is desirable for the matters included within article 9 to be included in the draft Order for clarity.</p> <p>The term “street authority” is defined in article 2(1) by reference to Part 3 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (“the 1991 Act’). The 1991 Act defines “street” in terms that are broader than the traditional definition of a “highway” and it includes land laid out as a way, whether it is for the time being formed as a way or not (see section 48 of the 1991 Act). Section 49 of the 1991 Act defines the “street authority” as either the highway authority, where the street is a maintainable highway, or, in the case of other streets, the “street manager”. In turn “street managers” is defined as the authority, body or person liable to the public to maintain the street, or if there is none, any person having the management or control of the street.</p> <p>In practice, in the majority of circumstances, the street authority will be the Applicant in its capacity as the local highway authority. In relation to those parts of the A47 that are within the Order limits and are maintainable at the public expense by</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Highways England, Highways England would be the street authority.</p> <p>The only other circumstance where a person other than the Applicant or Highways England would be the street authority would be in respect of any streets that are not maintainable by the Applicant or Highways England.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that within the Order limits the only street in respect of which the street authority is neither the Applicant nor Highways England is Cromwell Court, which is a private street, in respect of which the street authority would be the owners of the street. It is understood that the majority of the land comprising the courtyard area known as Cromwell Court is owned by Mr Baker, who also owns No. 5 Cromwell Court, with the owners of Nos 1-4 Cromwell Court each owning the freehold title to a parking space within the courtyard area.</p> <p>The works that are proposed to be carried out within Cromwell Court (referenced as D3 in Part 1 of Schedule 4 to the draft DCO) would be authorised as part of Work No.5D of the Order, and under article 9(2), and so the consent of the street authority under article 9(4) for these works would be required.</p>



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.5	The Applicant	Article 10 - street works. Can the applicant explain why the wide power is necessary in this particular case. Also how do the works within streets identified in Schedule 1 (and authorised through article 5 (1)) relate to the works authorised through articles 10 and 11?	<p>As is noted in paragraph 6.3 of the Explanatory Memorandum (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/006; Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-009), article 10 is based on the Model Provisions, which in turn were based on sections 50 (street works licenses) and 51 (prohibition of unauthorised street works) the 1991 Act. These sections make provision for the regulation of the installation, alteration and maintenance of apparatus in streets. As is noted in the answer to question 1.4.4, in the majority of circumstances envisaged by the Order, the street authority will be the Applicant which, in its capacity as the local highway authority, is not required to obtain street work licences for works in its streets. Consequently, the Applicant does not consider article 10 to be widely drawn, it is in accordance with the background legislation and merely puts the Applicant in the same position as other undertakers that have statutory authority to carry out street works in relation to streets where it is not the street authority.</p> <p>In the specific circumstances of this Scheme the provision is required for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.3 of the Explanatory Memorandum, namely the provision and alteration of services</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>and other apparatus, for example to supply power to the bridge and the variable message signs. It is desirable to include this provision so that the Applicant is empowered to undertake those works, rather than relying upon the powers of statutory undertakers.</p> <p>In terms of the relationship between the works described in Schedule 1 and street works authorised under article 10; the Applicant considers that such street works would be included within the ancillary works at paragraphs (c) and (l), of Schedule 1, which provide for:</p> <p><i>“works to place, alter, remove or maintain street furniture or apparatus (including statutory undertakers’ apparatus) in, under or above a street, including mains, sewers, drains, pipes, cables...”</i> (paragraph (c)); and works</p> <p><i>“to place, alter, divert, relocate, protect, remove or maintain services, plant and other apparatus and equipment belonging to statutory undertakers, utility companies and others in, under or above land, including mains, sewers, drains, pipes, cables....”</i> (paragraph (l)).</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.4.6	The Applicant	Article 15 - Temporary stopping up and restriction of use of streets. At this stage has the applicant identified any street that would be used as a temporary working site?	<p>The Applicant has not, at this stage, identified any relevant streets that would be employed as temporary work sites. As is noted in the Explanatory Memorandum (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/006; Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-009 at paragraph 6.19) it is often the case that where streets are temporarily closed for works, there will be a need for plant, equipment and materials to be placed in the street. This article would provide the authority to do so, should the need arise, and it is based on the Model Provisions and has been included in various other made Orders, including the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme Development Consent Order 2016 and the A19/A184 Testo's Junction Alteration Development Consent Order 2018.</p>
1.4.7	The Applicant	Articles 21 & 22 – Notwithstanding drafting precedent in other DCOs, can the applicant explain why these powers are necessary in the circumstances of this particular scheme.	<p>Paragraph 7.3 of the Explanatory Memorandum (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/006; Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-009) explains the rationale behind the inclusion in the draft DCO of article 21 (protective works to buildings). The authorised development would be carried out in an urban environment. While the Applicant is confident that the authorised development can be carried out without giving rise to a need for protective works, the provision</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>is included such that if the need were to arise, the Applicant would be empowered to take action to prevent, or remedy, damage to buildings arising from the delivery of the Scheme.</p> <p>The inclusion of the power is in the wider public interest as it is clearly desirable to empower the Applicant to take action to prevent or remedy damage to buildings arising from the Scheme. This would benefit both building owners/occupiers and the public purse by limiting compensation claims for such damage. Article 21 contains the standard safeguards included in this article such as (i) a requirement to give 14 days' notice (except in emergencies) (ii) provision for the building owner or occupier to serve counter notice disputing the necessity or expediency of the protective works and (iii) providing for compensation. Additionally, the power is time limited and will expire 5 years after the part of the authorised development in the vicinity of the building has been opened for use.</p> <p>Article 22 (authority to survey and investigate land) is required to empower the Applicant to undertake the surveys and investigations</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>necessary to support the development of the Scheme, its detailed design and in support of applications to discharge requirements. As is noted in the Explanatory Memorandum (see paragraph 7.5 of Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/006, Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-006), the power is essential to implementation of the authorised development, for example, in verifying ground conditions or the presence of statutory undertakers' apparatus. It may also be required to undertake the ecological surveys envisaged by the Outline Code of Construction Practice ('Outline CoCP') (see paragraphs 5.3.1 in relation to water voles and 5.3.5 in relation to bats of the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16; Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187), compliance with which is secured through requirement 5 in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1; Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020).</p> <p>It should be noted that a survey conducted under article 22 would be a lesser imposition than the exercise of other powers that may be available, such as the acquisition of the land outright under article 25 (compulsory acquisition of land) or the</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>temporary possession of land under article 35 (temporary use of land for carrying out the authorised development). There is therefore clearly a benefit in including within the draft Order a free-standing survey power that would facilitate such surveys to give the Applicant the flexibility to use that power in preference to acquiring the land outright or to temporarily possessing it, sooner than it may be required for construction purposes.</p>
1.4.8	The Applicant	<p>Article 28 – compulsory acquisition of rights. Can the applicant provide details of those plots where such powers are likely to exercised?</p>	<p>Article 28 (compulsory acquisition of rights) includes a general power to acquire rights and impose restrictive covenants over land in respect of which the Order would otherwise authorise outright compulsory acquisition under article 25. It is the Applicant's view that since powers of compulsory acquisition would only be granted where the proposed compulsory acquisition of land (shown in pink on the land plans) had been shown to be justified, the lesser imposition of the acquisition of rights and imposition of restrictive covenants is, by extrapolation, also justified, in circumstances where the acquisition of rights or imposition of restrictive covenants ultimately turns out to be sufficient for the Applicant's purposes. This could arise, for example, where land shown pink (denoting acquisition) on the land plans, and</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>land shown in blue (denoting acquisition of rights) border one another (see for example sheet 4 of the Land Plans (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/004, Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-007), plots 4-05 and 4-11). It may be that, once detailed design is complete that parts of plots 4-05 and 4-11 could instead be subject to the compulsory acquisition of rights for the purposes of constructing, protecting, accessing and maintaining the Scheme, rather than outright acquisition. The Applicant should have the flexibility to "step down" its acquisition powers in this way where it would lead to a lesser imposition on landowners. This flexible use of compulsory acquisition powers is discussed in detail in section 3 of the Statement of Reasons (Document Reference 4.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-022).</p> <p>In addition to the general power to acquire rights and impose restrictive covenants in article 28(1), article 28(2) specifies that the land listed in Schedule 6 (land in which only new rights may be acquired) may not be acquired outright under article 25 (compulsory acquisition of land) and that only rights may be acquired, or restrictive covenants imposed, for the purposes specified in</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>relation to that land, in Schedule 6. The land listed in Schedule 6 is shown in blue on the land plans. Schedule 8 also includes land (including airspace) over which new rights (including restrictive covenants) would be required for the protection and maintenance of the new bridge.</p> <p>As is noted in paragraphs 8.8 and 8.10 of the Explanatory Memorandum (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/006, Planning Inspectorate Reference AS-009), the approach in article 28 is well precedented and is usually included in development consent and transport and works act orders and it is required for the Applicant's Scheme. This is particularly the case with the need to impose restrictive covenants, which is important for the protection of the bridge. In the absence of the ability to "step down" to the acquisition of rights and restrictive covenants the Applicant would instead have to acquire the land outright.</p>



## 6 Transportation and Traffic/Highways

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.5.1	The Applicant	<p>There are numerous representations commenting on the alteration of surrounding road networks, and the impact this would have on local businesses in terms of access and parking; this does not appear to have been discussed within the Traffic and Transport section; can the Applicant explain the extent to which impacts to nearby commercial premises from changes in traffic and transport during the construction of the proposed development have been taken into account in the ES? What measures (if any) are proposed to address these impacts?</p>	<p>An Environmental Impact Assessment ('EIA') has been undertaken and the findings reported in the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096).</p> <p>Chapter 17 (Traffic and Transport) of the ES describes the assessment which has been undertaken relating to traffic and transport for both the construction and operational phases. The assessment of effects during the construction phase has been based on information provided by the Contractor as detailed in Chapter 2 of the ES. As detailed in paragraphs 17.4.16 to 17.4.18 of the ES, worst case assumptions regarding additional private car and HGV trips have been considered to ensure a robust approach. The assessment concludes that the Scheme will result in temporary slight adverse effects during construction.</p> <p>A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan ('FCTMP') has been produced as Appendix A to the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187).</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>This sets out the high-level principles of the management and control strategy for vehicular traffic and non-motorised users, with the aim of minimising the impact of construction activities.</p> <p>The Contractor will produce a full CTMP to provide further details of the working methodology and mitigation measures, which will include more detailed consideration of construction phasing and design of traffic management measures. In accordance with Requirement 5 of the draft DCO the full CTMP will need to be approved by the County Planning Authority prior to works commencing.</p>
1.5.2	The Applicant	Please provide a specific justification for the extension of the no-waiting restrictions alongside the eastern side of Southgates Road north of the Barrack Road junction (Sheet 2 Reference 10) which is located some distance away from the proposed signalised junction.	<p>Detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken to forecast the future operation of the road network, including maximum queue lengths, taking into account bridge openings. This is described in the Transport Assessment (Document Reference 7.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-189).</p> <p>Whilst the length of the proposed no waiting restriction shown as reference 10 on sheet 2 of the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans (Document Reference 2.3, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-008) is not required to accommodate the</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>forecast maximum queue length at the opening year 2023, the additional no waiting restriction length reflects the forecast maximum queue length on this approach to the proposed signalised junction in the design year 2038.</p>
1.5.3	The Applicant	How will safe and convenient HGV access to Fish Wharf be maintained throughout the construction period?	<p>Access and egress to/from Fish Wharf (northern road adjacent to the current Dolphin Public House) will be maintained for traffic including HGVs during construction of the Scheme. There will be the need for some road closures and these will be advertised in advance and diversion routes will be provided. Chapter 9 and Chapter 11 of the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187) details the Applicant's commitments relating to traffic diversions and construction traffic.</p> <p>Any temporary traffic management or diversion routes will be designed in accordance with Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual to accommodate HGV traffic where this is anticipated. Consultation will be carried out with affected parties in accordance with measures in the Outline CoCP to minimise disruption during construction.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.5.4	The Applicant	What, if any, suicide prevention measures are to be incorporated into the bridge design?	<p>The current design envisages a 1.4m high pedestrian/cyclist guardrail parapet on the outer extremities of the north and south non-motorised user facilities across the bridge (see sheet 4 Engineering Plans, Drawings and Sections (Document Reference 2.10, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-015), which are included in the Scheme for safety purposes but will act as an impediment to suicide jump attempts. Traffic barriers are also proposed to mitigate the risk of a member of public stepping out in front of oncoming traffic.</p> <p>The control tower will be manned for operational procedures and the bridge site will be fitted with 24hr CCTV monitoring across the bridge including approaches. This provision of manned attendance/surveillance at the bridge would likely deter a possible suicide attempt at this site.</p> <p>Please refer to Applicant's response to item HW3 in the Response to Relevant Representations (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/008, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-002).</p>

## 7 Water Environment / Flood Risk

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.6.1	Environment Agency	Can you please provide an update to your letter 31 July 2019 and specifically when you anticipate providing final comments on the modelling work?	The Applicant has no comment.
1.6.2	The Applicant	Can you clarify what work is currently being undertaken to address the outstanding issues set out in the Environment Agency's letter of 31 July 2019	<p>The signed SoCG for the Environment Agency (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/010, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-004), submitted at Deadline 1, summarised the discussions undertaken to date.</p> <p>The Environment Agency's letter dated 31st July 2019 expressed concerns about the Flood Risk Assessment, Environmental Statement - Appendix 12B (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-135) and the associated modelling.</p> <p>Discussions have continued further to the Environment Agency's letter. To address the concerns the Applicant has undertaken further sensitivity modelling which was submitted to the Environment Agency for their review on 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> of October 2019. The further sensitivity modelling has concluded that the information</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			presented in the Flood Risk Assessment, along with its conclusions are robust.
1.6.3	GYPA	What specific evidence do you have to substantiate your concerns about the scheme's hydrological effects?	The Applicant has no comment.
1.6.4	The Applicant	What amount of material is removed from the inner harbour each year via dredging?	The Applicant considers this question would be better addressed by either the GYPC or the Marine Management Organisation ('MMO') as the party responsible for current dredging operations and that responsible for licensing and monitoring such activity respectively. However, the Applicant understands the current licence MLA/2016/00125, as detailed on MMO public register, permits the holder (GYPC) to dispose of a total of 33280 dry tonnes of material per annum, the amounts actually removed from the river are not detailed on the Oslo/Paris Convention for the protection of the marine environment of the North-East Atlantic ('OSPAR') returns currently shown on the MMO's web portal.

## 8 Climate Change

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.7.1	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain the extent to which the assessment of major accidents and disasters has accounted for more recent climate change projections?	<p>As described in Paragraphs 18.1.3 and 18.6.6 of Chapter 18: Major Accidents and Disasters ('MA&amp;D') of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096) the scope of the assessment is based on the applicable risks detailed in the Cabinet Office's 'National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies' (2017) ('NRR'). A number of the risks listed in Table 18.7, such as flooding and severe weather, may be influenced by climate change.</p> <p>Changes to risks as a result of climate change are one of the long-term trends considered in the NRR. The NRR is updated every five years and as such the 2017 version remains applicable to the MA&amp;D assessment presented in the ES. It is acknowledged that since the publication of the NRR an updated iteration of the UK Climate Projections was released in November 2018 ('UKCP18'). The UKCP18 projections were considered within all relevant assessments presented in the ES, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 11: Road Drainage and the Water Environment;</li> <li>• Chapter 12: Flood Risk; and</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 13: Climate Change.</li> </ul> <p>The assessment methodology for MA&amp;D, as described in Section 18.7 of the ES considered the assessment results and embedded mitigation measures from other assessments, inclusive of those listed above, relating to the application for a DCO. Therefore, the MA&amp;D assessment presented in Chapter 18 of the ES has inherently considered the UKCP18 climate change projections.</p>
1.7.2	The Applicant	Can the Applicant explain what if any design features apply to the Proposed Development to address its vulnerability to anticipated climate change?	As described in Section 13.6 of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096) the significance of effects has been assessed with regards to the vulnerability of the Scheme to climate change (climate change resilience and adaptation). The assessment takes into account planned adaptation measures for the Scheme. The planned adaptation measures include a large number of embedded design measures which are listed in Table 13.23 of the ES.



## 9 Effect on Port Operations

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.8.1	The Applicant	Approximately how long will the river be closed for during the construction phase, how much notice would be provided of those closures and what measures are to be implemented to minimise disruption on neighbouring businesses?	<p>During the construction phase, the river will be closed to navigation (i.e. Temporary suspension of navigation) on no more than 3 occasions, with the period of closure on each occasion being no longer than 72 hours (as secured through article 23(3) of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020)).</p> <p>The Applicant would provide at least 21 days' notice of these closures (as secured through article 23(9) and (12)).</p> <p>This can only occur following consultation with the GYPA (article 23(2)).</p> <p>The GYPA must also publish a notice to mariners following the consultation required under article 23(2).</p> <p>The consultation and notice requirements are intended to minimise disruption on neighbouring businesses and other river users.</p>
1.8.2	The Applicant	Has the applicant carried out a specific assessment on the impact of scheme on individual businesses which will be affected by the proposed development?	Table 14.13 from Chapter 14: People and Communities of the ES (Document Reference 6.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-096) identifies the economic receptors and businesses

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			that have the potential to be affected by the Scheme and which the chapter then goes on to assess the impacts of the Scheme upon. This assessment was undertaken in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 6. and includes an assessment of the effects on these receptors of the land required for the Scheme for construction and operational purposes and the effects arising from severance and disruption to businesses.
1.8.3	The Applicant	Given difficulties experienced by businesses upstream of the proposed bridge location, are there any proposals to synchronise the operation of the proposed bridge with that of Breydon and Haven bridges? If not, please explain why.	The draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020) contains, at Schedule 10, a Scheme of Operation that outlines how the scheme bridge is intended to function – and it is noted in particular that it requires 'on demand' openings for commercial vessels. The Applicant will work with GYPC, who operate Breydon and Haven Bridges (on behalf of Highways England and Norfolk County Council), to coordinate, where this is feasible, the opening regimes of the three bridges.
1.8.4	The Applicant	What measures are being put in place to ensure the safeguarding and continuity of access for all existing businesses during the construction phase?	A number of measures are included in the Outline CoCP (Document Reference 6.16, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-187) in respect of safeguarding and continuity of access for existing

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>businesses during the construction phase, these include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "...the Contractor should maintain the navigation channel at all times, except when possession of the entire channel or a restriction on navigation is required to facilitate construction" (Paragraph 2.7.1) (see response to EXQ 1.8.7);</li> <li>• "... Contractor should allow access from the public highway to Kingsgate Community Centre, MIND Centre and Grounds, Haven Veterinary Surgeons, affected residences and roads such as Suffolk Road during construction of the Scheme, except in exceptional circumstances where affected parties would be notified in advance of any need to limit access" (Paragraph 2.8.1); and</li> <li>• The provision of appropriate diversions which are established prior to construction and clear directions for any alternative routes and appropriate alternative diversions would be clearly publicised by the Contractor to maintain public access (see Paragraph 9.2.7).</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Compliance with the measures included in the Outline CoCP is secured through Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020).</p> <p>The Outline CoCP requires the development of a detailed construction traffic management plan to be agreed by NCC's Network Management Team and requires the delivery of the measures set out in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (appended to Outline CoCP). These include various commitments that will enable disruption to businesses to be minimised including:</p> <p>The role of the Streetworks Coordinator (within NCC's Network Management Team) is to ensure work is carried out in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 for highway authorities and external utility service providers to ensure all traffic management works are coordinated to minimise disruption to businesses and road users.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.8.5	The Applicant	How does the applicant respond to the suggestion that the proposed development will force some port tenants to leave Great Yarmouth?	<p>The Applicant has engaged with the Great Yarmouth Port Company and Port Users via the Great Yarmouth Port Users Association from an early stage in the development of the Scheme to understand port tenants' concerns. The two key concerns expressed were primacy of navigation and operational failure of the bridge.</p> <p>The need for primacy of navigation is acknowledged by the Applicant and both article 43(6) of the dDCO and the Scheme of Operation in Schedule 10 to the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020) have been drafted to provide for the bridge to be opened on demand for any commercial vessel (see paragraph 7 of the Scheme of Operation and article 43(6) of the draft DCO). Recreational vessels will be expected to wait for the next scheduled opening time.</p> <p>The Applicant has introduced backup measures and redundancy in the bridge design to mitigate potential failure of the proposed bridge operation. These measures were outlined in the Applicant's response referenced MP3 in the Response to Relevant Representations (Document Reference</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>NCC/GY3RC/EX/008, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-002).</p> <p>With regard to the direct impact on ASCO and Perenco the Applicant has to date;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modified the alignment of the Scheme which was adopted as a preferred route by Norfolk County Council in December 2009 by moving the alignment to the north as far as reasonably practicable which avoided a direct impact on the Perenco warehouse building.</li> <li>• Engaged with both Perenco and ASCO since November 2017 to identify and develop a mitigation package, including an underpass within the Scheme design, as per paragraph 14.8.48 of the ES.</li> <li>• Underwritten design costs to develop the proposed mitigation package.</li> <li>• Provided a letter of confirmation on key elements of the mitigation package to Perenco from both Norfolk County Council and Great Yarmouth Borough Council dated 3 October 2018.</li> <li>• Underwritten legal fees to develop a draft compensation and works agreement.</li> </ul>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			All of the above has been undertaken to understand and mitigate the impact of the Scheme on both businesses to enable them to stay in Great Yarmouth.
1.8.6	The Applicant	A Preliminary Navigation Risk Assessment is provided with the application [6.14] When will the final Navigation Risk Assessment be published?	The Navigation Risk Assessment is a "live" document and will be updated at intervals throughout the duration of the Scheme, after which it will be incorporated into the Port's working NRA and further updated as required, further to paragraph 7.3.8 of the pNRA (secured by requirement 14 of the draft DCO).
1.8.7	The Applicant	Will the 50m channel width be maintained throughout the construction phase?	<p>The 50m channel will not be maintained throughout the construction phase, however the effects of this will be minimised and controlled by the following measures in the draft DCO:</p> <p>Article 23 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020) sets out the requirements of the temporary suspension of navigation in connection with the authorised development. For example:</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article 23(3) states that the power to close that the entire width of the River Yare for the purpose of constructing the authorised development is to be exercised on no more than 3 occasions and the period of closure on each such occasion is not to exceed 72 hours.</li> <li>• Article 23(4) allows for a reduction in the width of the River Yare for the purposes of constructing the authorised development, but only with the consent of the GYPA (who must not unreasonably withhold or delay consent and where granted may apply reasonable conditions).</li> </ul> <p>These measures should also be seen in the context of paragraph 58 of Schedule 14 of the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020), the Protective Provisions for GYPA.</p> <p>This sets out that construction of the Scheme must be undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• without unnecessary delay</li> </ul>



ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in such a manner as to cause as little adverse effects as is reasonably practicable to the river;</li> <li>• in such a manner as to cause no material adverse effects to the integrity of the walls or banks of the river; and</li> </ul> <p>in such a manner as to cause as little inconvenience as is reasonably practicable to the GYPA.</p>
1.8.8	GYPA	How many commercial ships have passed through the site of the proposed bridge in the previous twelve months?	The Applicant has no comment.
1.8.9	GYPA	Will two-way working through the proposed new bridge be permitted for recreational vessels?	The Applicant has no specific objection to simultaneous two-way vessel movements through the bridge, as navigational safety is the jurisdiction of the Harbour Master this would be at their discretion.
1.8.10	GYPA	How much notice do you usually receive of a commercial vessel requiring a bridge lift on (a) the inward passage and (b) departure?	The Applicant has no comment.
1.8.11	Goodchild Marine	Approximately how many openings of the Breydon and Haven bridges does your business reply upon each week and on average how long to does it take for the bridges to be opened?	The Applicant has no comment.

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
1.8.12	Alicat Workboats Ltd/ Richards DryDock/Eng Ltd	The pNRA states that your business has on average 1 vessel movement per day. What proportion of these movements would require the proposed bridge to be opened?	The Applicant notes that all movements to Berth 29 (Alicat's berth) identified within the historic data (2008 to 2016) have been assumed as requiring a bridge opening.
1.8.13	Alicat Workboats Ltd/ Richards DryDock/Eng Ltd	Will the road/access improvements arising from the proposed development benefit your business?	The Applicant has no comment.
1.8.14	ASCO / Perenco	What appropriate safeguards, protective provisions and mitigation measures are ASCO seeking in relation to its landholdings?	<p>Detailed discussions have been ongoing with ASCO and Perenco since November 2017 to understand these parties' operational requirements and to explore all possible options to mitigate the impact of the Scheme on both parties' businesses. Since early September 2019, these discussions have intensified significantly.</p> <p>The Applicant is working with both Perenco and ASCO to address operational concerns raised. This work is still ongoing with the aim of finding the right solution before the end of the DCO Examination, so that Perenco continues to be located within Great Yarmouth and Perenco's operations will not be interrupted as a result of the Scheme.</p>

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>Whilst the Applicant is generally open to discussing such matters with ASCO, it does not, however, intend to enter into negotiations with ASCO regarding protective provisions. This is on the basis that ASCO is a commercial entity and there is no statutory undertaking that would be protected by the protective provisions.</p> <p>Please also see the Applicant's responses to ExQ1 1.3.3 and 1.8.5.</p>
1.8.15	ASCO / Perenco	You state that the southern part of your landholding will not be subject to any compulsory/temporary acquisition, on that basis can you explain your position that it will be adversely affected by the proposed development.	The Applicant has no comment.
1.8.16	ASCO / Perenco	Will the road/access improvements arising from the proposed development benefit ASCO?	The Applicant has no comment.
1.8.17	ASCO / Perenco	Approximately what percentage of ASCO's landholding will be permanently acquired by the proposed development?	Within the Order Limits an area of 941m <sup>2</sup> of ASCO's leased land holdings is identified for permanent acquisition, namely plots 4-30 and 4-36 within the Book of Reference - Rev 2 (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/017) and Update to Land Plans (Document Reference

ExQ	Question to	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>NCC/GY3RC/EX/004, Planning Inspectorate reference AS-007).</p> <p>The Applicant understands that ASCO has a number of landholdings within the Port area in a capacity of leaseholder, occupier or both. The Applicant has calculated that ASCO's total land holding in the port is approximately 86,892m<sup>2</sup> (21.47 acres). The total area of land which is proposed to be acquired permanently for the purposes of the Scheme (i.e. 941m<sup>2</sup>) therefore represents only 1.08% of ASCO's total land holding in the port area.</p>
1.8.18	ASCO / Perenco	Would it be practicably possible to reconfigure ASCO's residual land holding in a manner that would meet its operational requirements?	The Applicant considers that this is certainly possible in view of the small area of land (as referenced in the Applicant's response to ExQ1 1.8.17) being acquired for the Scheme.
1.8.19	ASCO / Perenco	What evidence or assessments have you done to support the view that the vessels waiting south of the bridge would undermine access to/from ASCO's quays?	Please see the Applicant's responses to questions 1.8.2 and 1.8.5.
1.8.20	Perenco	Please provide evidence to support your view that Perenco would be forced to relocate to another site?	The Applicant has no comment.

## Annex A: Compulsory Acquisition Objections Schedule at Deadline 2

*This page is intentionally left blank*

**1.1 List of all objections to the grant of compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers  
(ExQ1: Question 1.3.1)**

Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
1	Pauline Ablitt	20022794	RR-011	N/A	N/A	Parts 1 & 2	Permanent	1-51	Yes – however the area affected comprises an interest (by application of the ad medium filum presumption) in subsoil up to half width of existing public highway which will remain public highway	<p>The Applicant's property advisors have met with Mr and Mrs Ablitt.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to work with Mr and Mrs Ablitt to deal with the issues raised in their relevant representation as set out in Table 4.1 Issue Number LA1 of the Response to Relevant Representations (Document reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/008, Planning Inspectorate reference REP1-002).</p>

Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
2	David Baker	20022800	RR-012	N/A	N/A	Parts 1 & 2	Permanent	1-50, 1-51	Yes - however plot 1-51 comprises an interest (by application of the ad medium filum presumption) in subsoil up to half width of existing public highway which will remain public highway	<p>The Applicant's property advisors have been in correspondence with Mr Baker.</p> <p>Mr Baker has confirmed that the Applicant's proposals for the Cromwell Court turning area and parking are acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>



Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
3	Great Yarmouth Port Company	20022803	RR-014	REP1-016 & REP1-024	N/A	Parts 1 & 2	(a) Permanent  (b) Temporary	Multiple	Yes	Agreement dated 29 March 2019 between the Applicant and Great Yarmouth Port Company Limited covering, inter-alia, land acquisition proposal and compensation settlement. Agreement conditional on DCO being granted, funding being secured and notices for the acquisition of land required for the Scheme being served.



Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
5	Jennifer Elizabeth Baker	20022824	RR-021	N/A	N/A	Parts 1 & 2	Permanent	1-50	Yes	<p>The Applicant's property advisors have met with Ms Baker.</p> <p>Ms Baker has confirmed that the Applicant's proposals for the Cromwell Court turning area and parking are acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing.</p>



Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
7	Royal Mail	20022821	RR-025	N/A	N/A	Parts 1 & 2	Permanent	3-15, 8-01	No – entries relate to post box (plot 3-15) and subsoil up to half width of public highway which will remain public highway (plot 8-01)	The identified land will remain public highway, but the Applicant will work with Royal Mail to mitigate any impact on them or their apparatus. Please refer to Issue Number HW8 in Table 6.1 in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (Document reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/008, Planning Inspectorate reference REP1-002).
8	Great Yarmouth Port Authority	20022815	RR-020	REP1-016 & REP1-021	N/A	Parts 1 & 2 & 3	(a) Permanent  (b) Temporary  (c) Rights	Multiple	Yes	The Applicant and GYPC entered into an Agreement dated 29 March 2019 covering, inter alia, the requirements for land acquisition from the Port Authority.

Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
9	Anglian Water Services	2022835	RR-027	REP1-014	N/A	Parts 1 & 2 & 3	(a) Permanent  (b) Temporary	Multiple	Yes – however area affected comprises an interest (by application of the ad medium filum presumption) in subsoil up to half width of public highway which will remain public highway, or to apparatus within public highway	The identified land will remain public highway but the Applicant will work with Anglian Water Services resolve their concerns and to mitigate any impact on them or their apparatus.

Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
10	Cadent Gas Limited	20022839	RR-028	REP1-020	N/A	Parts 1 & 2 & 3	(a) Permanent  (b) Temporary  (c) Rights	Multiple (majority relate to apparatus within public highway)	Yes	<p>The Applicant has been in discussions with Cadent Gas Limited.</p> <p>Cadent Gas Limited have confirmed that they are content with the permanent acquisition proposals.</p> <p>In respect of rights, temporary possession and where the identified land will remain public highway, the Applicant will work with Cadent Gas Limited to resolve their concerns and mitigate any impact on them or their apparatus.</p>

Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
11	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	Not known by Applicant	RR-001	N/A	N/A	Parts 1 & 2 & 3	(a) Permanent  (b) Temporary  (c) Rights  (d) Airspace	Multiple	Yes	<p>The Applicant has been in discussion with Great Yarmouth Borough Council in its capacity as a landowner affected by the Scheme.</p> <p>Great Yarmouth Borough Council have confirmed that they are content with the land acquisition requirements.</p> <p>Discussions regarding compensation are ongoing.</p>



Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
12	Alan Forder – owner of A Fordable Car Sales Limited	Not known by Applicant	RR-009	REP1-026 (submitted by Ian Blyth on behalf of A Fordable Car Sales Limited)	N/A	Parts 1 & 2	(a) Permanent  (b) Temporary	(a) 3-15  (b) 3-16	Yes – however permanent land entry comprises an interest (by application of the ad medium filum presumption) in subsoil up to half width of public highway which will remain public highway. The temporary	The Applicant has been in discussion with Mr Forder, principally in respect of on-street car parking issues.  In respect of the proposed temporary possession the Applicant will work with Mr Forder to seek to address any concerns and mitigate any impact on the business during construction.

Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
									use covers an area where the Company is an occupier of land owned by Great Yarmouth Borough Council	



Obj. No. <sup>i</sup>	Name/ Organisation	IP/AP Ref No <sup>ii</sup>	RR Ref No <sup>iii</sup>	WR Ref No <sup>iv</sup>	Other Doc Ref No <sup>v</sup>	Interest <sup>vi</sup>	Permanent/ Temporary <sup>vii</sup>	Plot(s)	CA? <sup>viii</sup>	Status of Objection
										seeking a negotiated acquisition of the land required.
14	Hope (Borough of Great Yarmouth)	Not known by Applicant	RR-032	N/A		Parts 1 & 2	(a) Permanent  (b) Temporary	(a) 1-11, 1-12, 1-14  (b) 1-10	Yes	The Applicant has held various meetings with Hope (Borough of Great Yarmouth) and continues to work with them to seek to resolve outstanding matters resulting from the proposed acquisition.

- 
- <sup>i</sup> Obj No = objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence
- <sup>ii</sup> Reference number assigned to each Interested Party (IP) and Affected person (AP)
- <sup>iii</sup> Reference number assigned to each Relevant Representation (RR) in the Examination library
- <sup>iv</sup> Reference number assigned to each Written Representation in the Examination library
- <sup>v</sup> Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination library
- <sup>vi</sup> This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:
- Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of Order land;
  - Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the Order, but who “would or might” be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the Order being implemented, or Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the Order has been implemented;
  - Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the Order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the Order.
- <sup>vii</sup> This column indicates whether the applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land / rights
- <sup>viii</sup> CA = compulsory acquisition. The answer is ‘yes’ if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and **Norfolk County Council** is seeking compulsory acquisition of land / rights