

Sea Link

Volume 7: Other Documents

Document 7.4.11 Draft Statement of Common Ground Between National Grid Electricity Transmission and the Port of London Authority.

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020026

Version: A
March 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(q)

Page intentionally blank

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	This Statement of Common Ground	1
1.3	Role of the Port of London Authority in the DCO Process	1
1.4	Description of the Proposed Project	1
	The Suffolk Onshore Scheme	2
	The Offshore Scheme	2
	The Kent Onshore Scheme	3
1.5	Format of Document and Terminology	3
2.	Record of Engagement	5
2.1	Summary of pre-application discussions	5
3.	Areas of Discussion Between the Parties	7
3.1	Shipping and Navigation	7
3.2	Environmental Matters	15
4.	Approvals	16
5.	References	17
	Table 1.1 Abbreviations	4
	Table 2.1 Pre-application discussions	5
	Table 3.1 Shipping and Navigation	7
	Table 3.2 Environmental Matters	15

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement produced as part of the application process for a Development Consent Order (DCO) and is prepared jointly between the applicant and another party. It sets out matters of agreement between both parties, as well as matters where there is not an agreement. It also details matters that are under discussion.
- 1.1.2 The aim of a SoCG is to help the Examining Authority manage the Examination Phase of a DCO application. Understanding the status of the matters at hand will allow the Examining Authority to focus their questioning and provide greater predictability for all participants in examination. A SoCG may be submitted prior to the start of or during Examination and then updated as necessary or as requested during the Examination Phase.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG is between National Grid Electricity Transmission Ltd (National Grid) and the Port of London Authority (PLA) relating to the DCO application for the Sea Link Project (the Proposed Project). It has been prepared in accordance with the guidance published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2024).

1.2 This Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared to identify matters agreed and matters currently outstanding between National Grid and the PLA. The SoCG will evolve as the DCO application progresses through examination.
- 1.2.2 For the purpose of this SoCG, National Grid and the PLA will jointly be referred to as the “Parties”. When referencing the PLA alone, they will be referred to as “the Consultee”.

1.3 Role of the Port of London Authority in the DCO Process

- 1.3.1 The Consultee is a trust port, which is a port that is an independent statutory body, controlled by a local independent board, responsible for the tidal area of the river Thames. The Consultee’s operations cover 95 miles from Teddington to the North Sea.
- 1.3.2 The Consultee works to keep commercial and leisure users safe, to protect and enhance the environment, and promote the use of the river for trade and travel.
- 1.3.3 The Consultee operates under the legal framework set out under the Port of London Act 1968 (as amended) to ensure that all users of the tidal part of the river Thames are safe, secure and sustainable.

1.4 Description of the Proposed Project

- 1.4.1 The Proposed Project is a proposal by National Grid to reinforce the transmission network in the South East and East Anglia. The Proposed Project is required to accommodate additional power flows generated from renewable and low carbon generation, as well as accommodating additional new interconnection with mainland Europe.

- 1.4.2 National Grid owns, builds and maintains the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Under the Electricity Act 1989, National Grid holds a transmission licence under which it is required to develop and maintain an efficient, coordinated, and economic electricity transmission system.
- 1.4.3 This would be achieved by reinforcing the network with a High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) Link between the proposed Friston substation in the Sizewell area of Suffolk and the existing Richborough to Canterbury 400kV overhead line close to Richborough in Kent.
- 1.4.4 National Grid is also required, under Section 38 of the Electricity Act 1989, to comply with the provisions of Schedule 9 of the Act. Schedule 9 requires licence holders, in the formulation of proposals to transmit electricity, to:
- 1.4.5 *Schedule 9(1)(a) ‘...have regard to the desirability of preserving natural beauty, of conserving flora, fauna and geological or physiographical features of special interest and of protecting sites, buildings and objects of architectural, historic or archaeological interest;’ and*
- 1.4.6 *Schedule 9(1)(b) ‘...do what [it] reasonably can to mitigate any effect which the proposals would have on the natural beauty of the countryside or on any such flora, fauna, features, sites, buildings or objects’.*
- 1.4.7 The Proposed Project would comprise the following elements:

The Suffolk Onshore Scheme

- A connection from the existing transmission network via Friston Substation, including the substation itself. Friston Substation already has development consent as part of other third-party projects. If Friston Substation has already been constructed under another consent, only a connection into the substation would be constructed as part of the Proposed Project.
- A high voltage alternating current (HVAC) underground cable of approximately 1.9 km in length between the proposed Friston Substation and a proposed converter station (below).
- A 2 GW high voltage direct current (HVDC) converter station (including permanent access from the B1121 and a new bridge over the River Fromus) up to 26 m high plus external equipment (such as lightning protection, safety rails for maintenance works, ventilation equipment, aerials, similar small scale operational plant, or other roof treatment) near Saxmundham.
- A HVDC underground cable connection of approximately 10 km in length between the proposed converter station near Saxmundham, and a transition joint bay (TJB) approximately 900 m inshore from a landfall point (below) where the cable transitions from onshore to offshore technology.
- A landfall on the Suffolk coast (between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness).

The Offshore Scheme

- Approximately 122 km of subsea HVDC cable, running between the Suffolk landfall location (between Aldeburgh and Thorpeness), and the Kent landfall location at Pegwell Bay.

The Kent Onshore Scheme

- A landfall point on the Kent coast at Pegwell Bay.
- A TJB approximately 800 m inshore to transition from offshore HVDC cable to onshore HVDC cable, before continuing underground for approximately 1.7 km to a new converter station (below).
- A 2 GW HVDC converter station (including a new permanent access off the A256), up to 28 m high plus external equipment such as lightning protection, safety rails for maintenance works, ventilation equipment, aerials, and similar small scale operational plant near Minster. A new substation would be located immediately adjacent.
- Removal of approximately 2.2 km of existing HVAC overhead line, and installation of two sections of new HVAC overhead line, together totalling approximately 3.5 km, each connecting from the substation near Minster and the existing Richborough to Canterbury overhead line.

1.4.8 The Proposed Project also includes modifications to sections of existing overhead lines in Suffolk (only if Friston Substation is not built pursuant to another consent) and Kent, diversions of third-party assets, and land drainage from the construction and operational footprint. It also includes opportunities for environmental mitigation and compensation. The construction phase will involve various temporary construction activities including overhead line diversions, use of temporary towers or masts, working areas for construction equipment and machinery, site offices, parking spaces, storage, accesses, bellmouths, and haul roads, as well as watercourse crossings and the diversion of public rights of way (PROWs) and other ancillary operations.

1.5 Format of Document and Terminology

- 1.5.1 Section 2 of this SoCG summarises the engagement the Parties have had with regard to the Proposed Project.
- 1.5.2 Section 3 of this SoCG summarises the issues that are ‘agreed’, ‘not agreed’ or are ‘under discussion’. ‘Not agreed’ indicates a final position where the Parties have agreed to disagree, whilst ‘Agreed’ indicates where the issue has been resolved.
- 1.5.3 Abbreviations used within the SoCG are provided in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 Abbreviations

Abbreviation/Term	Definition
BAS	Burial Assessment Study
CBRA	Cable Burial Risk Assessment
CD	Channel Depth
DCO	Development Consent Order
DoL	Depth of Lowering
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HVAC	High Voltage Alternating Current
HVDC	High Voltage Direct Current
MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Agency
NIP	Navigation Installation Plan
NMRL	Non-Mobile Reference Level
NRA	Navigation Risk Assessment
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PLA	Port of London Authority
PRoW	Public Right of Way
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
TJB	Transition Joint Bay
TSS	Traffic Separation Schemes
VTs	Vessel Traffic Services

2. Record of Engagement

2.1 Summary of pre-application discussions

2.1.1 Table 2.1 summarises the consultation and engagement that has taken place between the Parties prior to submission of the DCO application.

Table 2.1 Pre-application discussions

Date	Topic	Discussion points
26 April 2021	National Grid, PLA, Arup, Aecom, 4C offshore Ltd - Project introduction meeting	<p>Introductions and objectives, project background, approach to developing proposals, Sea Link – project overview, indicative programme, progress to date, study areas, indicative marine routing and marine survey scope, next steps; AOB/questions,</p> <p>Actions: National Grid to consult with Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) on Traffic/Vessel Management Plan once prepared, PLA to speak to pilots to double check feedback/concerns, PLA to confirm minimum sea level that is acceptable, National Grid to meet with Sunk User Group and Trinity House and other relevant marine stakeholder bodies.</p>
07 June 2021	National Grid, PLA, MCA, Arup, Aecom, 4C Offshore Ltd - Routeing meeting	<p>Introductions and objectives, route update – PLA confirmed new route is better than previous, questions and AOB.</p> <p>Actions: National Grid to consult MCA and PLA on Vessel Management Plan and National Grid to confirm final marine route.</p>
04 July 2022	Surveys	Additional marine survey
05 August 2022	National Grid, Aecom, PLA, Red Penguin – Routeing Meeting	<p>Project update and status of the Project – Sea Link completed marine survey in October 2021, Sea Link reviewing survey results, Sea Link looking to undertake additional surveys in this area.</p> <p>Actions: PLA to email Sea Link documents that outline future plans for PLA (including any future dredging plans).</p>
28 April 2023	Shipping and navigation consultation meeting and Hazard workshop	Consultation remote meeting with Port and Harbour Authorities to present initial results from Navigational Risk Assessment and Hazard workshop to identify potential shipping and navigation impacts
December 2023	Preliminary Environmental	PLA response to statutory consultation

Date	Topic	Discussion points
	<i>Information Report (PEIR)</i>	
<i>July-August 2024</i>	<i>Survey</i>	<i>Notification of Survey</i>
<i>August 2024</i>	<i>Further consultation</i>	<i>PLA response to consultation</i>

3. Areas of Discussion Between the Parties

3.1 Shipping and Navigation

Table 3.1 Shipping and Navigation

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
3.1.1	Application Document 6.3.4.7.A ES Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment	Water depth	<p>The Consultee expressed concerns surrounding any reduction in water depth.</p> <p>The proposed marine route is running close to northeast spit boarding and landing diamond and the Consultee cannot afford any reduction in water depth in that area. Grid Link runs close to Elbow Buoy, where water depth is also critical. Container ships can sometimes come through here, using Northeast Spit/Elbow. Where it is shallower, further south, there are less concerns as ships don't navigate through this area.</p> <p>In terms of dredging, there are plans to increase access depths. The Consultee want to maximise their opportunities for large vessels, but future trade is not completely known, so it is a balance to future proof.</p> <p>Water depth needs to be safeguarded at the deep-water routes. Consensus is that access needs to be safeguarded for vessels of 20m draft, and accounting for 10% under keel clearance that means that -22 m CD needs to be safeguarded. Five Estuaries have agreed this is realistic future scenario and are designing their scheme accordingly, and North Falls is expected to do the same.</p> <p>The Consultee also requires 12.5m for the southern access to the port (see also 5.1.7 Routeing below).</p>	<p>Impacts of potential reduction in water depth is discussed in Application Document 6.3.4.7.A ES Appendix 4.7.A Navigational Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Generally, the Proposed Project will avoid crossings within channels because of the risk of them deepening them at some stage but would keep informed on any areas of concern.</p> <p>National Grid has recently carried out additional survey areas in order to investigate moving into deeper waters. National Grid has provided the latest Order Limits to the Consultee (in July 2022 and again in December 2024) and will update on the survey area results. National Grid's current position is that a co-engineered solution would be designed which minimises the height of rock berms / protection structures but maintains required protection levels.</p>	Under discussion

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
3.1.2		Cable crossings	<p>The Consultee expressed concerns surrounding cable crossings with other cables projects, including Grid Link and Nemo Link. The Consultee's preference is for crossings to be in deeper water.</p> <p>At cable crossings, one cable will need to be buried deeper in order to allow the second cable to be placed on top of the first cable and still maintain water depths. The Consultee has concerns over what happens in the future, not just the design impacts, i.e. despite what was agreed at the time, scour occurs, and rock protection is needed in the future (and depth is reduced).</p> <p>The Consultee is also concerned about cumulative impacts, and the multiple cables that are proposed in this area, sterilising significant areas of riverbed. Crossings involve the placing of rock protection on the riverbed and the more cables that are proposed the more crossings that will inevitably be required. Parties need to work together wherever possible to minimise impacts and to maximise the potential for other projects to come forward in the future.</p> <p>Any cable crossings will not be acceptable at the long sand head two-way route.</p> <p>Any cable crossings should be avoided in the vicinity of the NE Spit Pilot Station to avoid disruption to this crucial service when laying the cable.</p> <p>The Consultee requests shapefiles to allow the crossing with GridLink to be interrogated further, but also other projects that are being brought forward at the same time (Five Estuaries, North Falls, Neuconnect etc.).</p>	<p>Potential cable crossings are set out in the Environmental Statement. As above, National Grid's current position is that a co-engineered solution would be designed which minimises the height of rock berms / protection structures but maintains required protection levels.</p> <p>Concerns around the GridLink crossing to be discussed in Q1 2025.</p> <p>National Grid has provided the latest Order Limits to the Consultee (in July 2022 and again in December 2024).</p>	Under discussion
3.1.3		Vessel Management Plans & Vessel Communication Protocol	Any cable laying vessels and ships need to be set apart.	National Grid notes the importance of communication and commits to producing a Navigation Installation Plan (NIP) post-DCO	Under discussion

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
			<p>A Vessel Management Plan will be crucial once contractors are on board, including for survey and construction.</p> <p>Recommended that dialogue occurs with the contractor through SUNK user group (which includes interested parties e.g. representatives from aggregate dredging and Chamber of Shipping).</p> <p>An Outline Navigation Installation Plan is something we would expect Sea Link to produce and submit in support of this application.</p> <p>The Consultee needs to know exactly where the cable vessel installation vessel is at all times. On the approach to London arrival and departure arc and the approach to the NE Spit pilot boarding station particularly is a very high traffic route, so this would need to be strictly managed with London Vessel Traffic Services (VTS). Daily reports to specify which section the project is working in have been requested by the Consultee.</p> <p>It would be useful to have communication of when the works will happen and where (how long and which section).</p>	<p>submission, which will provide this mechanism for ensuring communication and collaboration with shipping and navigation stakeholders.</p> <p>National Grid attended a Sunk User Group meeting to provide project update on 14th January 2025.</p> <p>National Grid will bear in mind the need for enhanced communications with VTS and Traffic Separation Schemes (TSS) operators, and plan to generate a communications protocol. This shall take the form of a Navigation Installation Plan (NIP). Generally, the installation vessels will give a 48hr lookahead to interested parties.</p> <p>The guard vessel will be transmitting warnings and notices.</p>	
3.1.4		Sunk TSS and VTS	<p>The Consultee has no issues with being near or in the SUNK TSS's as long as there is a robust Vessel Management Plan in place, which should be consulted on with the SUNK VTS Manager who will also have a view on this.</p>	<p>National Grid noted that proximity to the TSS is acceptable as long as this is managed robustly.</p> <p>National Grid noted that the Sunk VTS Manager should be consulted. They were in attendance at the 7 June 2021 meeting with the MCA and PLA, and the 4 July 2022 meeting with the MCA and PLA.</p> <p>National Grid commits to producing a Navigation Installation Plan (NIP) post-DCO submission, to communicate information regarding construction phase with the relevant stakeholders including the Sunk VTS Manager.</p>	Agreed

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
3.1.5		<p>Rerouteing in 2021 -moving cable crossing points outside Margate and Long Sands Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and into deeper water and deviation south of Thanet</p>	<p>The proposed cable route should be the shortest route across the Long Sand Head two-way route.</p> <p>On moving cable crossing points outside Margate and Long Sands SAC, the Consultee has advised that the amended marine route is a better proposal compared to the previous version shared and keeps clear of the congestion of the other cable crossings and crossings are kept in deep water. There will be a temporary issue whilst cable is laid in northern part, but this can be managed through a robust vessel management plan.</p> <p>Deviation South of Thanet Amended route is in deeper water - new route is preferred, with deeper vessels using shelter and want to protect future depths.</p> <p>The Consultee is satisfied with the revisions to the cable location between the NE Goodwin and NE Spit that now includes an additional curve to increase water depth by approximately 3.5m (crossing is now in 16.5m water depth).</p> <p>Subsequent PEIR consultation had large order limits and didn't give the certainty in relation to the crossing of GridLink. At the Sunk the route goes east of the pilot diamond in water deeper than 20m. The route then crosses the Long Sand Head two-way route, again in deeper water. The Consultee has no in principle concerns about this.</p> <p>The Consultee does however have concerns about the crossing of GridLink on the inshore side of the Thanet Windfarm. The charts used in the figures are not at a scale where it can be assessed if a 5% reduction in water depth would impact the 12.5m the Consultee needs to safeguard in this area for southern access to the port. It is therefore not clear whether the</p>	<p>National Grid noted that the route refinement in 2021 resulted in a preferable route to the PLA.</p> <p>National Grid has provided the latest Order Limits to the Consultee (in July 2022 and again in December 2024).</p> <p>Concerns around the GridLink crossing to be discussed in Q1 2025. The GridLink meeting due in Q1 of 2025 has been delayed. As such, there has not been any progression on National Grid's position on this matter, so remains under discussion.</p>	Under discussion

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
			<p>Consultee's previously raised concerns have been fully addressed.</p> <p>The Option Selection and Design Evolution Report lists the factors considered in determining the corridor in Section 4.5.5 the Consultee is broadly content with the criteria but would suggest that National Grid should also consider port facilities such as pilot stations which play a crucial role in the successful operation of a port.</p> <p>Whilst in broad terms the project seems to have considered the avoidance of crossings in shipping lanes and there is direct reference to cable crossings being outside the navigation channel and the need to maintain 20m depth in DW routes, the Consultee cannot be fully re-assured until more detail is provided on the route.</p>		
3.1.6		Routing in 2023 (response to PEIR)	<p>At the Sunk the route goes east of the pilot diamond in water deeper than 20m. The route then crosses the Long Sand Head two-way route, again in deeper water. The Consultee has no in principle concerns about this.</p> <p>The Consultee does however have concerns about the crossing of GridLink on the inshore side of the Thanet Windfarm. The charts used in the figures are not at a scale where it can be assessed if a 5% reduction in water depth would impact the 12.5m the Consultee needs to safeguard in this area for southern access to the port. It is therefore not clear whether the Consultee's previously raised concerns have been fully addressed.</p> <p>The Option Selection and Design Evolution Report lists the factors considered in determining the corridor in Section 4.5.5, the Consultee is broadly content with the criteria but would suggest that they should also consider port facilities such as pilot stations which play a crucial role in the successful operation of a port.</p>	<p>Potential cables crossings are set out in the Environmental Statement (ES). As above, National Grid's current position is that a co-engineered solution would be designed which minimises the height of rock berms / protection structures but maintains required protection levels.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the planned crossing with GridLink to be further discussed in Q1 2025.</p> <p>Concerns about port facilities such as pilot stations are noted, and National Grid is in communication with ports and harbour authorities in order to manage such potential risks. National Grid commits to producing a Navigation Installation Plan (NIP) to effectively communicate with relevant stakeholders including ports and harbour authorities, in order to reduce any potential disruption to port and harbour facilities including pilot stations.</p> <p>National Grid has provided the latest Order Limits to the Consultee (in July 2022 and again in December 2024).</p>	Under discussion

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
			Whilst in broad terms the project seems to have considered the avoidance of crossings in shipping lanes and there is direct reference to cable crossings being outside the navigation channel and the need to maintain 20m depth in DW routes, the Consultee cannot be fully re-assured until more detail is provided on the route.		
3.1.7		Routing in 2024 (response to consultation)	The Consultee remains concerned about the Order Limits where Sea Link would cross GridLink. It is understood that the cable route was adjusted to allow the crossing to be slightly further east, in deeper water, to avoid a reduction in depth in the area of pilot boarding and landing at the NE Spit however the cable could still be buried on the western side, resulting in a crossing with GridLink, where a minimum 12.5m depth could be compromised. As the Consultee has previously explained the Consultee needs to safeguard 12.5m in this area for southern access to the port.	Potential cables crossings are set out in the ES. As above, National Grid's current position is that a co-engineered solution would be designed which minimises the height of rock berms / protection structures but maintains required protection levels.	Under discussion
3.1.8	Application Document 6.2.1.4 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Project	Approach to cable laying	<p>In relation to cable laying where the proposed route goes near the Sunk area and close to boarding and landing areas, the Consultee expects the cable to be laid using the quickest method with no barges in the shipping channel.</p> <p>The consultation documents also advise: "Areas across the offshore route have been identified as high-risk shipping areas (KP35.089 to KP57.887 ('SUNK') and KP81.301 to KP96.343 (North Foreland)). The use of rock as trench backfill is preferred for these KP ranges, to protect the lowered cable within the trench. The additional rock emplacement being proposed to backfill the marine cable trench should not overtop the top of the trench, i.e. above Original Seabed Level. No different impacts have been identified on the seabed morphology and is likely to result in the same effects (no new or different effects) to those presented in the original PEIR for rock protection."</p>	<p>The installation will be undertaken utilising Dynamic Positioning 2 cable installation vessel (it is only envisaged that a barge will be used in the nearshore area, primarily at Pegwell Bay). National Grid will discuss the matter of barges at Pegwell Bay with the Consultee to try to reach agreement on this matter.</p> <p>National Grid plan to avoid the use of cable joints where practicable in the Sunk region, in order to minimise the time spent during cable lay in this area.</p> <p>National Grid have committed in the PEIR and ES to not overtop the seabed.</p> <p>Detail on the approach for use of rock as trench backfill will be provided within the EIA Project description (see Application Document 6.2.1.4 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Project). Where detail is not available at this stage of the construction procurement process a design envelope has</p>	Under discussion

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
			The Consultee would expect further details to be provided about the proposed use of rock as trench backfill, including the safeguards that will be in place to ensure that all the fill is placed within the trench and that none ends up being placed/left on top of the surrounding seabed.	been provided, and further details will be communicated with stakeholders when they are known.	
3.1.9		Order Limits	The Consultee considers the draft Order Limits to be wide and would expect the limits to be reduced as the project is refined. The Consultee is generally supportive of any reduction in the Order Limits offshore as Order limits should be the minimum necessary to deliver the scheme. The Consultee remains concerned about the Order Limits where Sea Link would cross GridLink.	Updated draft order limits and indicative route point line have been shared with the Consultee on 12.12.24. It is standard practise to consent a corridor to allow for any necessary flexibility. Regarding the crossing of GridLink, National Grid's current position is that a co-engineered solution would be designed which minimises the height of rock berms / protection structures but maintains required protection levels.	Under discussion
3.1.10		Burial Depth	<p>The PEIR Non-technical Summary states a minimum DOL to the top of the cable of 0.5m in areas of bedrock and a target DOL of approximately a minimum 1.5m. It is assumed this is burial depth, but it was not clear from the document. There is further reference to depths of drilling being unknown at this stage.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to how burial depth is secured and how depths would be maintained e.g. avoidance of future rock protection for unplanned remedial activities which reduces depth.</p>	<p>A preliminary Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA) has been undertaken which defines the target Depth of Lowering (DoL). The target DoL, is lowering of the cable relative to the seabed and/or a Non-Mobile Reference Level (NMRL). In areas of bedrock, 0.5m DoL is specified, and in areas where geological conditions allow (sediment areas) a depth of lowering of between 1.0m to 2.5m has been specified. The preliminary CBRA identifies environmental factors which inform the derivation of DoL and also whether it can be met.</p> <p>A Burial Assessment Study (BAS) will be completed by the Contractor and will propose the primary and back-up cable lowering methodologies to ensure the DoL requirements can be met.</p>	Under discussion
3.1.11		Consultation	The Consultee has repeatedly strongly urged National Grid to engage with the Consultee, including when further surveys have been completed, before the route is finalised.	See Table 2.1 for a summary of engagement.	Under discussion

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
3.1.12		Channel Depth	Maintain a 20m depth at PLA, but request keeping the Consultee informed if the Proposed Project discovers that there is an area which can't be buried and has to be covered.	<p>Generally, the Proposed Project will avoid crossings within channels because of the risk of them deepening them at some stage but National Grid would keep the PLA informed on any areas of concern.</p> <p>At this stage, National Grid are unable to confirm whether there is a possibility of not being able to maintain a 20 m depth on the approach channels to the PLA. As such, there is no update on this matter at this time.</p>	Under discussion

3.2 Environmental Matters

Table 3.2 Environmental Matters

Ref	Relevant Application Document	Summary of Description of Matter	PLA Current Position	National Grid Current Position	Status
3.2.1	Application Document 6.6 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report	Environmental matters	Given the Consultee’s experience with other projects, it is recommended that all the relevant environmental information (including any HRA information specifically) is provided upfront.	The HRA (Application Document 6.6 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report) will be submitted as part of the DCO application.	Agreed

4. Approvals

Signed	
On Behalf of	National Grid
Name	
Position	
Date	

Signed	
On Behalf of	Port of London Authority
Name	
Position	
Date	

5. References

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. (2024). *Planning Act 2008: Examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-act-2008-examination-stage-for-nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects>

Page intentionally blank

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

Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152
nationalgrid.com