



Suffolk County Council (20050784)

Answers to Examining Authority's Third Written Questions (ExQ3)

North Falls (EN010119)

Deadline 7

15 July 2025

Table of Contents

Glossary of Acronyms	2
Purpose of this Submission	3
1 Answers to Examining Authority’s Third Written Questions (ExQ3)	4
1 General and Cross-topic Questions	4
2 Agriculture and other land uses, ground conditions and soils	4
3 Alternatives and Site selection	4
4 Aviation	4
5 Climate Change & Resilience.....	4
6 Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations.....	4
7 Cumulative Effects	4
8 Design	4
9 Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	4
10 Ecology/Biodiversity/BNG/HRA.....	10
11 Flood Risk, groundwater and surface water	10
12 Historic Environment & Archaeology.....	10
13 Human Health.....	10
14 Landscape and Visual	11
15 Navigation & Shipping.....	20
16 Socio-economic Effects	20
17 Terrestrial Transportation and Traffic	20

Glossary of Acronyms

CCS	<i>Carbon Capture and Storage</i>
CROWA	<i>Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000</i>
DCO	<i>Development Consent Order</i>
EACN	<i>East Anglian Connection Node</i>
EIA	<i>Environmental Impact Assessment</i>
ExA	<i>Examining Authority</i>
ExQ3	<i>Examining Authority’s Third Written Questions</i>
LCT	<i>Landscape Character Type</i>
LIR	<i>Local Impact Report</i>
SECHNL	<i>Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape</i>
SLVIA	<i>Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</i>
WTG	<i>Wind Turbine Generators</i>

“The Council” / “SCC” refers to Suffolk County Council; “ECC” refers to Essex County Council; “TDC” refers to Tendring District Council.

Purpose of this Submission

This document has been prepared by Suffolk County Council in response to the Examining Authority's Third Written Questions (ExQ3) and is based on a template provided by the Planning Inspectorate case team. For ease of use, questions which are not addressed to Suffolk County Council have been deleted and where another authority is the Lead Authority, this has been attributed. Examination Library references have been used throughout to assist readers.

1 **Answers to Examining Authority's Third Written Questions (ExQ3)**

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
1	General and Cross-topic Questions		
2	Agriculture and other land uses, ground conditions and soils		
No ExA third questions.			
3	Alternatives and Site selection		
4	Aviation		
5	Climate Change & Resilience		
No ExA third questions.			
6	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations		
7	Cumulative Effects		
8	Design		
9	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)		

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
Articles Part 2 – Principal Powers			
Schedule 1 Part 3 - Requirements			
Q9.1.5	Applicant, SCC	<p>Proposed new Grampian requirement (SCC)</p> <p>The SCC at ISH1 [REP4-094] and [REP4-095] confirm that they seek a phasing requirements as set out in their LIR paragraph 7.3 [REP1-074]. The Applicant's response to ExQ2 9.1.13 [REP5-054] sets out in some detail its reasons for rejecting the imposition of such a requirement in this case. The SCC response to ExQ2 9.1.13 makes further submissions on this topic [REP5-117] and at Deadline 6 [REP6-092]. In the light of those submissions, the ExA seeks a response to the following points:</p> <p>(i) Does the Applicant agree that whilst Norwich to Tilbury is a critical national priority (CNP) that does not guarantee that it will receive consent and there are other factors to be taken into account as set out EN-1?</p> <p>(ii) Does the Applicant accept that plans</p>	<p>(vi): SCC makes the initial observation that its proposed requirement (as set out at para 7.28 of the LIR [REP1-074] is not strictly a 'Grampian' requirement as conventionally understood but a phasing requirement. A 'Grampian' condition (or requirement in a DCO context) is one that is (a) negative in nature and (b) which prevents commencement of the authorised development until the occurrence of a specified event (in the 'Grampian' case itself a road closure). The phasing requirement proposed by SCC does not prevent the commencement of the authorised development, but it does prevent the carrying out of one part of it (Work No. 1) until the occurrence of a specified event. Nothing turns on this other than phraseology but SCC suggests it would be preferable to avoid describing the phasing requirement as a 'Grampian' requirement.</p> <p>The phasing requirement is necessary to ensure that the project is sensitively designed and in accordance with the updated duty in section 85 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) The Applicant has assessed that the offshore WTG arrays forming part of the project will have moderate-minor effects on the special qualities of the SECHNL (Table 29.21 of [APP-043] under 'Effect significance' and Table 29.39 of [APP-043] under 'Effects on Landscape Designations'). The Applicant's methodology for the SLVIA proceeds on the general assumption that assessed effects are 'adverse (negative)': see p.3 of [APP-170]. There is no material</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>for the EACN may change and that there is potential for the North Falls wind turbine generators (WTGs) to be installed for a significant period of time without being connected to the Grid?</p> <p>(iii) In the light of the submissions made by SCC at Deadline 5, does the Applicant accept that there is no need to establish an ‘exceptional’ basis for the requirement. If not, please explain why.</p> <p>(iv) In the light of the submissions made by SCC at Deadline 6, does the Applicant accept that the phasing restriction is necessary to follow the requirements of the mitigation hierarchy. If not, please explain why.</p> <p>(v) Notwithstanding the submissions already made on this matter, please can the Applicant explain in further detail its submission that the proposed requirement is not necessary to comply with the updated duty in section 85 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.</p> <p>(vi) Notwithstanding the submissions already made on this matter, please can SCC explain in further detail why it</p>	<p>provided (in [REP3-044], or in its update in [REP5-038], or elsewhere) to show that this assumption does not or should not apply to the assessed effects on the special qualities of the National Landscape. Whilst the Applicant assesses those effects as not significant in EIA terms, that does not mean that they are not adverse effects on the special qualities of the National Landscape but merely that the EIA threshold for significant effects has not been reached. SCC addressed the difference between adverse effects on the National Landscape and EIA significant effects in section 3.3 (pp.9-11) of [REP4-096] and in paras 21, 23, and 52-53 of Appendix B of [REP4-094].</p> <p>(b) Because the WTG will result in adverse effects on the special qualities of the National Landscape, that aspect of the project will “<i>affect</i>” the National Landscape so as to engage the updated duty in section 85(A1) CROWA 2000, notwithstanding that the WTG are to be located outside of the National Landscape: see EN-1 paras 5.10.8 and 5.10.20.</p> <p>(c) Because the WTG will result in adverse effects on the special qualities of the National Landscape, that aspect of the project will fail to “<i>conserve</i>” the National Landscape (noting that the objective of ‘conserving’ a National Landscape requires that it to be preserved intact or maintained in its existing state: see para 77 of the <u>New Forest</u> High Court decision provided by the Applicant as [REP4-048]).</p> <p>(d) The updated duty in section 85(A1) CROWA 2000 requires the person subject to the duty (both the Applicant and the Secretary of</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>regards the proposed requirement to be necessary to ensure that the project is designed sensitively and in accordance with the updated duty in section 85 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.</p> <p>(vii) The SCC response to ExQ2 9.1.13 [REP5-117] bullet point 5 refers to the scope for amending the drafting of the requirement to ensure that the notification does not require formal approval. Please can SCC provide that alternative drafting for the proposed requirement.</p> <p>(viii) The Applicant draws support from the Recommendation Report in the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Windfarm Extension Project paragraph 5.4.20. The ExA's comments in that case were in the context of the viability of the proposed grid connection rather than the potential for delay in the context of the section 85 duty. The Applicant is requested to explain further why the existence of the connection agreement provides a sound basis for the assertion that a phasing agreement for the reasons</p>	<p>State in this case) to 'seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the [National Landscape]'.</p> <p>(e) The purpose of the project is 'the generation of low carbon, renewable electricity', and the Applicant relies on this as an important benefit: see paras 5.1.2, 6.1.3, and 6.1.4 of [APP-232]. However, in order to accommodate the electricity produced by the WTGs 'there is the requirement for the construction of a new National Grid substation': see para 2.11.1 of [APP-233]. That substation is the separate EACN which is to be separately consented as part of National Grid's Norwich to Tilbury project and it will be delivered (if consented) by National Grid: see paras 295-297 of [APP-019] and para 2.11.2 of [APP-233]. Without the EACN being consented and delivered, the project will not be able to connect the electricity generated to the National Electricity Transmission System and the renewable energy benefits of the project will not be delivered.</p> <p>(f) In SCC's view, the adverse effects of the WTG on the National Landscape are neither warranted nor justified unless and until it is clear that the EACN is able to proceed. This is because the WTG do not 'conserve' the National Landscape and so should only be consented if it is clear they will be able to deliver the intended renewable energy benefits (which is dependent on the provision of the EACN).</p> <p>(g) In SCC's view, design is a holistic concept which can include the timing of provision as well as the physical form of provision. WTG that cannot be connected to the National Electricity Transmission</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>given by SCC would be unreasonable.</p> <p>(ix) The Applicant is requested to explain in detail its submissions in response to 9.1.13 (iv) in relation to the delay to construction timeframes that it submits would result from the imposition of the proposed requirement. What is the difference in impact on construction timeframes that would result from the requirement as opposed to any delay that might occur due to the timing of any consent for the EACN or other means of connection? Please provide further details of the long lead items referred to and why these need to be ordered prior to March 2027? How would the proposed phasing restriction alter the level of risk in making those commercial decisions?</p> <p>(x) The Applicant's submissions in response to 9.1.13 (vi) refer to landscape policies and the consideration of nationally designated landscapes in the Hinkley Point C area. However, in the case of the Hinkley Point C Connector the 8.5km section through the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) consisted of underground cable.</p>	<p>System (because of the absence of the EACN) serve no purpose (but still give rise to adverse effects). Sensitive design includes not causing adverse effects until/before they are needed/justified. The phasing requirement therefore is needed to ensure that the project is sensitively designed.</p> <p>(h) The phasing requirement is also an available mechanism whereby the relevant authority can 'seek to further' the purpose of 'conserving' the natural beauty of National Landscape, by deferring adverse effects on its special qualities until it is clear they are necessary and justified. It is therefore necessary for the Secretary of State (a) to consider the imposition of the phasing requirement as part of his discharge of the section 85(A1) duty, and (b) to impose that requirement as part of discharging the duty unless persuaded that its imposition would be inappropriate as not meeting the policy and legal tests for requirements. SCC has already made representations on why those tests are met and, therefore, why the phasing requirement should be imposed: see its response to Q9.1.13 in [REP5-117].</p> <p>(i) NB: it is important to note that SCC is <u>not</u> saying that the imposition of the phasing requirement will, in and of itself, allow the section 85(A1) duty to be fully discharged in relation to the adverse effects of the WTG, because once the requirement is met, enabling the WTG in Work No. 1 to be constructed, the adverse effects will still arise. However, those adverse effects are part of the residual adverse effects of the project on the National Landscape which SCC seeks to have offset/compensated for by the separate requirement for a National Landscape Enhancement Scheme (see</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		Does that have a bearing on the comparability of the factual circumstances of the Hinkley Point C case with this case?	<p>SCC comments below on that requirement). The phasing requirement is therefore one part (but only one part) of how SCC suggests that the duty can be met.</p> <p>Q9.1.5(vii)</p> <p>SCC does not consider that any amendment to the wording of its proposed phasing requirement (as set out at para 7.28 of [REP1-074]) is required to ensure that it does not impose any need to seek or obtain formal approval in order to be discharged. The structure of the phasing requirement is no different to the structure of Requirement 4 of the draft DCO [REP6-005], which also requires a notification of specified matters to be given to another body (in that case the discharging authority) but imposes no need for the Applicant to seek or obtain the approval of that other body to that notification in order for the Requirement to be satisfied.</p> <p>However, if additional wording was thought to be either necessary or appropriate to make the position clear beyond any doubt, SCC would suggest adding the following words to the end of the phasing requirement:</p> <p><i>“This requirement is discharged [at 23:59] on the day that the notification is submitted to the relevant planning authority.”</i></p> <p>The inclusion of a specific time provides clarity but may be considered unnecessary precision. Hence, it is shown in square brackets and could be deleted if so desired.</p> <p>SCC notes that the phasing requirement proposed by Essex County Council (ECC) in [REP4-073] has a similar rationale to the phasing</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>requirement proposed by SCC but there are differences. Notably, the ECC phasing requirement does preclude any commencement of any part of the authorised development until it is discharged and it also entails the approval of the Secretary of State being given to the notification. This is based on the precedent provided by Requirement 20 of the Viking CCS Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Order 2025. SCC notes this precedent and would not object if the phasing issue were to be addressed by the requirement sought by ECC. However, SCC remains content that its own proposed phasing requirement is fit for purpose and minimises the burden imposed on the Applicant. SCC notes that the ExA has asked questions to the Applicant, ECC, and TDC about the ECC phasing requirement in Q9.1.6 and SCC reserves the right to comment further at Deadline 8, if necessary, in light of the responses made to those questions.</p>
Schedules 8, 9 and 10 – Deemed Marine Licences under the 2009 Act			
Schedule 14 – Protective Provisions			
10	Ecology/Biodiversity/BNG/HRA		
11	Flood Risk, groundwater and surface water		
12	Historic Environment & Archaeology		
13	Human Health		

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
No ExA third questions.			
14 Landscape and Visual			
Q14.0.4	Applicant, SCC, other IPs	<p>Duty to Enhance National Landscape</p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ2 Q14.0.1 confirmed that the Applicant is a statutory undertaker as defined in s85 of the CROW Act, and that it is therefore a relevant authority for the purposes of the Act. The Applicant set out its position within its Position Statement [REP5-068], as well as [REP5-055] and in further information submitted at Deadline 6, in response the ExA's Rule 17 request dated June 6 2025 [PD-014].</p> <p>In summary, the response [REP6-062] considers, on a without prejudice basis, specific additional compensatory measures that could be applied to enable the Applicant and the Secretary of State to discharge the Duty should the Secretary of State consider that such measures are required, including consideration of principles to form the basis for the development and delivery of</p>	<p>Whilst SCC welcomes the Applicant's approach in [REP6-062] of putting forward 'without prejudice' proposals to address the project's effects on the SECHNL, SCC does not agree that the effects on the SECHNL identified by the Applicant in the SLVIA [APP-043] are 'visual in nature only'. SCC has already drawn attention to the effects identified by the Applicant in [APP-043] in Table 29.21 on the special qualities of the SECHNL and in Table 29.42 on the Landscape Designation of the SECHNL. These effects are in addition to the effects on specific viewpoints, as identified in Table 29.42 of [APP-043]. The Applicant's position is (wrongly) based on its stance that only effects that are significant effects in EIA terms need to be considered when addressing compliance with the section 85(A1) duty. SCC has already set out why it maintains that that position is misconceived. SCC continues to engage in active dialogue with the Applicant and the SECHNLP, providing feedback on the Applicant's proposal. It is SCC's intention for an agreement to be reached on an acceptable proposal prior to Deadline 8.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>a National Landscape Enhancement Scheme (or similar) together with a list of projects identified and a mechanism for securing such a scheme [REP6-062].</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the effects on the SECHNL are visual in nature only. Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 29 Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) [APP-043] concludes that there will be significant effects on views from locations along the southern coastal edge of the SECHNL, between the River Deben and Orford Ness. There will be no significant effects on landscape character, and no significant effects on the special qualities of the SECHNL [REP5-038].</p> <p>The ExA now seeks views from IPs on the response [REP6-062] including the without prejudice Requirement and the content of the National Landscape Enhancement Strategy. Further specific questions are also set out below.</p>	
Q14.0.5	IPs, Applicant	National Landscape Enhancement Scheme Principles: Mechanism for Delivery	SCC welcomes the principle of the proposed ‘without prejudice’ requirement. On the detailed wording, SCC notes that the requirement specifies (in para (1)) the need for the approval of the discharging authority

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>The ExA notes the Applicant's suggested wording for a Requirement to deliver the National Landscape Enhancement Scheme (below), submitted on a without prejudice basis at Deadline 6 [REP6-062]:</p> <p>National Landscape Enhancement Scheme</p> <p><i>(1) Work No. 1 and Work No. 2 must not be commenced until a National Landscape Enhancement Scheme has been submitted to and approved by the discharging authority in consultation with Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape Partnership.</i></p> <p><i>(2) The National Landscape Enhancement Scheme must accord with the principles and fund size set out in the National Landscape Enhancement Scheme principles document.</i></p> <p><i>(3) The National Landscape Enhancement Scheme must be implemented as approved.</i></p> <p><i>(4) In this Requirement "the National Landscape Enhancement Scheme principles document" means the principles set out in Table 1 of Applicant's Response to ExA's Request for further information (Rule 17) - National</i></p>	<p>(which the draft DCO defines as ECC) after consultation with the SECHNL Partnership. Given that the SECHNL lies primarily in Suffolk and the adverse effects are primarily on parts of the SECHNL within Suffolk, SCC would suggest that SCC should also be a named consultee within the requirement.</p> <p>SCC also suggests (in response to later questions) that the National Landscape Enhancement Scheme principles document needs to be revised, and if this is done, the reference to that document in para (4) of the requirement will need to be updated.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p><i>Landscapes.</i></p> <p>Comments from IPs are specifically sought in relation on the wording of above suggested Requirement, submitted on a without prejudice basis.</p>	
Q14.0.6	IPs, Applicant	<p>National Landscape Enhancement Scheme Principles: Scope of Projects</p> <p>The scope of projects is set out in Table 1 of [REP6-062], with a focus on projects and initiatives relating to enjoyment of the coast and coastal views and those in line with the objectives of the Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape Management Plan 2023-2028. Projects could include (but would not be limited to) enhancements to car parking, access or visitor facilities at coastal locations; footpath enhancements including to coastal paths; beach surveys and clean ups. These would be delivered as part of the National Landscape Enhancement Scheme will be selected at the discretion of the Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape Partnership.</p> <p>The ExA requests IPs comments on the</p>	<p>SCC generally defers to the views of the SECHNL Partnership on the details of the Enhancement Scheme's Scope of Projects. SCC considers that the indicative projects listed by the Applicant have a reasonable nexus in planning terms with the adverse effects of the Application proposals on the experience of the coastal parts of the National Landscape because the identified measures would provide opportunities to enhance the experience of (human) receptors within the National Landscape by improving access to it. However, SCC notes that the project's assessed effects on the special qualities of the SECHNL include adverse perceptual effects on the natural beauty of the SECHNL. Therefore, SCC considers measures which seek to enhance the perceptual experience of the natural beauty of the National Landscape to be a necessary component of the enhancement proposal for it to be considered sufficient for the duty to be discharged.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		scope of projects.	
Q14.0.7	IPs, Applicant	<p>National Landscape Enhancement Scheme Principles: Spatial Scope</p> <p>The spatial scope of the projects is set out in Table 1 of [REP6-062], and focuses on the area likely to be affected by views of the Project, ie. the coastal edge between the River Deben and Orford Ness. Table 1 states that “<i>All projects and initiatives must therefore be located within this area</i>”.</p> <p>The ExA requests IPs comments on the spatial scope, and the suggestion that initiatives must be within the area between the River Deben and Orford Ness.</p>	<p>SCC generally defers to the views of the SECHNL Partnership on the details of the Enhancement Scheme’s Spatial Scope. SCC would question whether the northern extent of the Spatial Scope suggested by the Applicant should be Aldeburgh rather than Orford Ness so as to ensure that affected parts of the National Landscape within the environs of Orford Ness are included within the spatial scope.</p>
Q14.0.8	IPs, Applicant	<p>National Landscape Enhancement Scheme Principles: Fund Size</p> <p>The fund size of £10,000 is set out in Table 1 of [REP6-062]. The ExA requests IPs comments on the Applicant’s proposed fund size, and whether or not the measures and fund size can be considered to be proportionate to the type and scale of development as it affects the National Landscape, reasonably related to the identified</p>	<p>SCC generally defers to the views of the SECHNL Partnership on the details of the Enhancement Scheme’s Fund Size, but (subject to such views) SCC would suggest that the Applicant needs to provide a clear justification for the chosen sum and why it should be regarded as sufficient. In the absence of such a justification, and having regard to its experience of the likely costs of footpath/car park improvement measures and other landscape enhancement, SCC would regard the sum of £10,000.00 as likely to be too low to allow for meaningful enhancement measures to be undertaken.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		residual adverse effects, and sufficient to allow for the discharge of the statutory duty by both the Applicant and by the Secretary of State.	
Q14.0.9	IPs, Applicant	<p>National Landscape Enhancement Scheme Principles: Fund Timing</p> <p>The fund timing is set out in Table 1 of [REP6-062], which suggests a single one-off payment made by the Applicant to the Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape Partnership prior to the commencement of construction of Work No. 1 or Work No. 2. The timing of projects and initiatives benefited by the fund would then be at the discretion of the Suffolk & Essex Coast & Heaths National Landscape Partnership.</p> <p>The ExA requests IPs comments on the fund timing.</p>	SCC generally defers to the views of the SECHNL Partnership on the details of the Enhancement Scheme's Fund Timing, but (subject to such views) SCC is content with the principle of a single payment prior to the commencement of Work Nos. 1 and 2.
Q14.0.11	Applicant, Natural England, ECC, SCC, SECHNLP	<p>Impact on LCTs</p> <p>In response to ExQ2 14.0.5 the Applicant confirmed that in its view, at a distance of over 40km from any onshore LCT (Landscape Character Type), that it is satisfied that <i>"the magnitude of change is correctly recorded as 'low'"</i> in each case.</p>	<p>Paragraph 39 of the Applicant's Assessment of the Special Qualities of the Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape and Suffolk Heritage Coast – Technical Note, Revision 1 [REP5-038] states:</p> <p><i>"A clear relationship can be drawn between the characteristics of the landscape, the special qualities of the SECHNL, and the special character of the SHC."</i></p> <p>SCC considers the effects on perceptual qualities of the LCTs to be</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>i) Please can the Applicant confirm what, if any other criteria than distance have been used to estimate the magnitude of change.</p> <p>ii) Please can NE (and others, optionally) comment on factors other than distance which they consider would contradict the Applicant's assertion regarding the 40km distance to any onshore LCT.</p>	<p>factors aside from distance to the project area.</p> <p>The larger scale of the turbines is expected to affect perceptual qualities of the LCTs. The development will be more prominent, when visible, and not blend with other arrays, due to the larger turbine size, exacerbating the cluttering effect. The Applicant states in Table 29.16, Table 29.17, and Table 29.19 of ES Chapter 29 [APP-043]:</p> <p><i>“The Offshore Above-sea development will be larger than operational turbines and will be seen in the context of offshore human activity such as shipping.”</i></p> <p>The assessment has not referred to nighttime effects. It is expected that safety lighting will be visible from the shore affecting the relative tranquillity of the LCTs.</p>
Q14.0.14	SCC, Applicant, other IPs optionally.	<p>Suffolk County Council Comments on submissions received at Deadline 5</p> <p>SCC has submitted comments on Deadline 5 submissions [REP6-092] as a response to the Applicant's Deadline 5 (D5) submissions and representations made by other interested parties at D5, as appropriate. Within this context, please can SCC explain how items 1f - Application of Duty and 1g - Discharge of Duty are sufficiently separate considerations, and are not, in effect, double counting a similar issue.</p>	<p>In its comments in [REP6-092] SCC sought to structure its responses to reflect the way that the Applicant had presented its position in [REP5-068]. Item 1f was intended to address what was said in para 9 of the table in [REP5-068] and item 1g was intended to address what was said in para 10 of the table in [REP5-068]. SCC would accept that the references to 'application' and 'discharge' in the headings are to an extent misnomers because the substantive comments cover two issues (a) whether the proposals “affect” the National Landscape to as to engage the duty in section 85(A1) CROWA 2000 for any relevant authority and (b) if so what needed to be done by the relevant authority in order to discharge the duty.</p> <p>SCC does not consider that by presenting its comments in this way there is any 'double counting' of matters. The comments in both items do cover the discharge of the duty, with those in item 1f being more 'high level' and</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		Other IPs and the Applicant may also comment, optionally.	<p>those in item 1g being more detailed. Both sets of comments are, however, relevant to the discharge of the duty.</p> <p>The issue of ‘double counting’ does arise in SCC’s view in the Applicant’s approach to relying on actions it took <u>before</u> finalising the project that is now presented in the Application that is at Examination as matters that can be relied on to show a discharge of the duty in relation to that Application.</p> <p>To avoid use of the language of ‘double counting’, which might lead to confusion, SCC would suggest that the issue should be considered in terms of the distinction between pre-application actions and the submitted Application. The submitted Application is the project that the Applicant now seeks consent for, and it is the effects of that Application that now have to be assessed in terms of the duty to see whether (a) that Application “affects” the National Landscape and if so (b) what steps need to be taken to discharge the duty in relation to that Application. Addressing those matters will not be influenced by whatever actions the Applicant took in the pre-application stages to minimise the impacts on the National Landscape because those actions have already been built in (or ‘baked in’) to the Application that it is now at Examination and it is the effects of that Application that need to be considered.</p>
Q14.0.15	Applicant, ECC/ other IPs	<p>New visualisation (VP9) from Barn Lane - Grange Road</p> <p>In response to ExQ2 14.04, the Applicant stated that it would be providing an additional photomontage visualisation from Grange Road, to be submitted at</p>	<p>SCC welcomes the additional viewpoint, as it presents what might be visible, albeit from a greater distance, from the Dedham Vale National Landscape. SCC has previously requested an additional viewpoint, but this has so far not been produced.</p> <p>Without prejudice to the narrative which may be provided by the Applicant at Deadline 7, the photomontages demonstrate the level of adverse</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>Deadline 6. The selected viewpoint is immediately north of the proposed onshore substation works area. The ExA notes [REP6-065] and [REP6-066] provide new visualisations for new Viewpoint VP9.</p> <p>This appears to currently be absent of corresponding narrative, such as that which accompanies VPs 1 to VP8 within Chapter 30 of the ES (see Tables 30.21 to 30.28).</p> <p>i) In the interest of consistency and completeness, please can the Applicant provide an update to VP9, or signpost to where this information is contained by Deadline 7.</p> <p>IPs are invited to comment on VP9 photomontages at this stage, and following Deadline 7, to comment further on the accompanying narrative.</p>	<p>landscape and visual effects, which SCC considers could be significant. This is on account of the substantial change to the view caused by the proposed substation. The viewpoint is quite close to the site, but demonstrates what might be visible from the Dedham Vale, albeit at a greater distance and with potential filters/screens.</p> <p>SCC is concerned with regards to the assumed height and density that can be achieved by the proposed mitigative planting by year 15 (growth rates).</p> <p>Referring to the Landscape Mitigation Plan, Figure 30.1.6, in ES Chapter 30 – Figures (Part 1 of 6) [APP-083], SCC would expect the proposed native trees south of the junction of Grange Road and the bridleway and north of the existing overhead powerline to provide filtered views, rather than a solid screen, towards the new woodland planting around the substation in the middle ground, and elements of the substation visible beyond.</p> <p>In technical terms, a slight overlap across the images for the two parts of the viewpoint would have been helpful.</p> <p>Given the time of year during which the viewpoint was produced, it is accepted that only summer views could be made available.</p> <p>However, the year one planting does not appear to be included in the photomontages. While the planting would have been small, and mainly consisted of tree and shrub shelters, it would have aided the understanding of where mitigation planting would be implemented in relation to the substation and the viewpoint, as well as of the progression to the images for year 15.</p>
Q14.0.16	Applicant, IPs	<p>Tranquillity</p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant's response to ExQ2 14.0.8 and the updated technical</p>	<p>SCC agrees with the Applicant's note that the proposed development is likely to be seen as a detractor from tranquillity. However, SCC disagrees with the Applicant that the development will result in no change to this</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		document on special qualities [REP5-038]. Please can IPs including SCC and SCHNLP respond to this update.	<p>special quality.</p> <p>SCC disagrees with the Applicant's statement at the bottom of page 17 that:</p> <p><i>"There will be no effects on dark skies as a result of aviation lighting on the turbines."</i></p> <p>SCC considers that despite the distance the development is likely to adversely affect the National Landscape's relative tranquillity, as it is likely to affect the perceptions of the landscape and of the night sky as natural, with additional lighting out at sea.</p> <p>In the context of other offshore development and activity the project is expected to have a further eroding effect on perceived tranquillity through further intensification.</p>
15	Navigation & Shipping		
16	Socio-economic Effects		
17	Terrestrial Transportation and Traffic		