



Planning Inspectorate

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Sea Link Project.

Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) on environmental issues held on Wednesday 28 January to Friday 30 January 2026. This list also includes questions rolled over from the hearing which could not be asked due to time constraints or to parties who were not in attendance.

Action	Description	Action by	When
Ecology and biodiversity			
1.	<p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) to respond to the following questions relating to horizontal directional drilling (HDD) for Nemo Link:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">provide a brief explanation as to why the decision was taken to switch from a trenchless landfall solution to an open cut solution at the detailed design stage. In particular, whether there were any ground conditions or other constraints that affected this decision?Comment on whether unexploded ordnance was a particular constraint in Pegwell Bay as suggested by Save Minster Marshes [REP1-246].Share any ground information that NGV has not previously shared with the applicant relating to unexploded ordnance (UXO)/ground conditions.Confirm whether NGV has any plans to undertake further mitigation or enhancement works in Pegwell Bay.Provide any monitoring data relating to the recovery of the intertidal area (benthic ecology and bird foraging) following Nemo Link works.	National Grid Ventures (NGV)	Deadline (DL) 4
2.	<p>Natural England (NE) was unable to attend the hearing. NE to respond to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">NE to share any additional data relating to the post implementation phase of Nemo Link or Thanet cable works in Pegwell Bay, for example in terms of changes in benthic ecology or bird foraging.The applicant's comments regarding progress with quantifying the number of red-throated diver impacted by the works in line with NE requirements.	Natural England (NE)	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
3.	<p>Kent County Council (KCC) was unable to attend the hearing. KCC to respond to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's comments in response to Matthew Denny that reptile surveys are unnecessary at the former hoverport site as reptiles would not generally be present on the hardstanding area and would be unlikely to be affected if present in cracks in the hardstanding due to the proposed track reinforcement. • The applicant's comments that wider invasive non-native species control measures are not required to be undertaken by the applicant at the hoverport to offset the wider effects of the works. • Provide comment on the approach to non-significant enhancements as outlined in item 3.5.17 of the applicant's DL3 statement of common ground (SoCG) with Dover District Council. • The applicant's comments that there are no industry standard metrics relating to the quantity of land required to mitigate for impacts on skylark. 	Kent County Council (KCC)	DL4
4.	<p>The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) was unable to attend the hearing. The RSPB to respond to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant's proposed revision of the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) [REP3-078] wording to commit to a minimum 3 metre (m) high acoustic fence at the proposed HDD compound. • The amendment of Suffolk Ecology and Biodiversity chapter [REP1-047] paragraph 2.9.14 to reflect that generators would operate for 6 months rather than 3 years and would therefore not give rise to acid deposition or related air quality effects. • The applicant's statement that stage 5 plant is not required to be used at the HDD compound in Suffolk, given the lack of identified air quality impact. • The necessary control measures in respect of UXO, if UXO were to be identified at the HDD compound. 	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	DL4
5.	<p>The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) was unable to attend the hearing. The IUCN to respond to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The International Union for the Conservation of Nature's (IUCN) relevant representation (RR) [RR-2128] suggests that it has credible/ up to date documentation regarding 	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	<p>connectivity and function of the proposed development site, the River Stour and associated waterways. IUCN to expand on this and share this information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RR also highlighted the need for adaptive management measures to address the impacts of the proposed development. IUCN to expand on this and explain what those measures should be. • The IUCN proposed that a ‘proper mitigation hierarchy assessment’ accompanied the planning process. IUCN to explain what additional information it considers is required to be submitted to the examination. • Is the IUCN able to comment on the potential implications of this project might for the tentative listing of the East Atlantic Flyway as a natural world heritage site. 		
6.	Explain why there is no terrestrial based requirement for trenchless works and draft an equivalent terrestrial provision unless otherwise justified.	Applicant	DL4
7.	Reinsert reference to an intertidal survey in Provision B70 of the REAC [REP3-078] or clarify why this is not required.	Applicant	DL4
8.	Comment on Natural England’s [REP3A-028] suggestion that a second marine licence would be required for vehicle activity in the intertidal environment.	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	DL4
9.	Provide additional detail regarding the hoverport construction access route width and whether/ what type of fencing the route and the order limits would need.	Applicant	DL4
10.	Provision GG06 of the REAC [REP3-078] should be revised to include reference to carrying out a precondition structural survey at the hoverport.	Applicant	DL4
11.	Provide details of any construction compounds and parking needed at the hoverport or provide wording for a requirement or REAC measure to preclude use of the hoverport for these purposes.	Applicant	DL4
12.	Update REAC provision B23 [REP3-078] to reference a minimum 3m fence height, or greater where the noise assessments undertaken at detailed design stage indicate that a taller fence would be appropriate.	Applicant	DL4
13.	Update REAC provision B23 [REP3-078] to include a commitment to adaptive management at the HDD compound to address potential breaches in thresholds.	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
14.	Amend paragraph 2.9.14 of the Suffolk Ecology and Biodiversity chapter [REP1-047] which currently suggests that HDD generators would operate for “up to 3 years” to reflect the 6 month construction period.	Applicant	DL4
15.	Confirm whether reference to construction vehicles using Suffolk Access S-BM13 off Thorpe Road in the Construction Traffic Management Plan [CR1-041] is correct. The ExA understands that the applicant has committed that no vehicles would access the beach (except in a limited number of cases in the event of frac-out).	Applicant	DL4
16.	Clarify how UXO impacts on the Sandlings Special Protection Area (SPA) and Leiston-Aldeburgh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) would be managed in the event that they were found at the HDD compound and in shallow drilling. Update management plans and/or UXO risk management accordingly.	Applicant	DL4
17.	Provide clarification regarding measures that have been required by Natural England to mitigate the impact of ground investigations within the designated sites in Kent and Suffolk in the event that mitigation is required to be secured for further ground investigations in designated sites.	Applicant NE	DL4
18.	Respond to ExA comments on the potential to remove ancient and veteran trees due to the conflicting controls in Article 51 and REAC provisions A02 and A05 and update wording to address issues unless otherwise justified.	Applicant	DL4
19.	Provide clarification regarding item 3.5.17 [REP3-036] in the Dover District Council SoCG. This should explain which habitat creation measures would be considered non-significant enhancements and therefore not subject to 30 years monitoring and which habitat creation measures would be subject to legal agreement. The clarification should address any implications for the applicant’s Biodiversity Net Gain assessments.	Applicant	DL4
Ornithology			
20.	REAC provision B45 [REP3-078] states that works to install the pylons either side of Sandwich Bay to Hacklinge Marshes SSSI will not cover the whole breeding season (March to September included) but will either take place outside the breeding season or only occupy approx. 2 months of the breeding season. Given that works could occur in the core breeding season, explain how this provision can be relied on to avoid likely significant effects on breeding birds.	Applicant NE	DL4
21.	Provide commentary, or where relevant an updated habitats regulations assessment, to address the implications of moving the cable works in Pegwell Bay to their southern extent	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	within the limits of deviation. In particular, address the implications for sensitive roosting and foraging areas.		
22.	Provide quantified information relating to the effect of vessel movements on Red-Throated Diver of the Outer Thames Estuary as requested by Natural England. Update the habitats regulations assessment as necessary and where adverse effects on integrity cannot be ruled out through the further information and discussions with Natural England, provide a derogation case in respect of pre-lay grapnel works and maintenance activity effects on Red-Throated Diver.	Applicant	DL4
23.	Confirm likely vessel numbers required for operation and maintenance by reference to similar cable operations in the marine environment and provide additional evidence regarding likely maintenance duration periods.	Applicant	DL4
24.	Provide a specification for bird diverters to demonstrate that they are able to function throughout the entire night period. The applicant should demonstrate how this functionality is secured through the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) or control documents.	Applicant	DL4
25.	Applicant to respond to hearings questions deferred to action points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefly explain what the primary mortality factors are for bird collisions. Is it the physical collision with infrastructure or is it electrical shock? Explain whether the earth wire is a specific collision risk? What proportion of the bird species identified in the vantage point surveys as regularly commuting up and down stream are likely to fly through the area proposed for the overhead line crossing. 	Applicant	DL4
26.	NE to respond to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant's statement that birds tend to divert up and over overhead lines rather than seeking to turn away from them. 	NE	DL4
Benthic ecology			
27.	Would the applicant be prepared to commit to a type of cable protection that is most easily removable at decommissioning?	Applicant	DL4
28.	Provide some indication in map/plan form where cable protection would likely be required for the offshore works.	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
29.	Confirm who would sign off approval of a submitted benthic mitigation plan and its proposed mitigation. How would the approval of a benthic mitigation plan and its implementation be secured?	Applicant	DL4
30.	Would the scope and methods used for the offshore pre-construction surveys be agreed with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and/or NE prior to their undertaking? How would this be secured?	Applicant	DL4
31.	Does the applicant intend to undertake a post-installation cable route survey which could provide information on benthic ecology and whether there is the need for adaptive management?	Applicant	DL4
32.	Consider the submission of an outline In-Principle Monitoring Plan, indicating what would likely be the focus for post-cable installation monitoring and the methods that would be used, for example.	Applicant	DL4
33.	NE [REP3A-027] advised that reef features within the Thanet Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC) should have 'Medium' sensitivity to suspended sediment concentrations (SSC) and deposition in line with the precautionary principle. If the assessment of suspended sediment is updated to a medium sensitivity for receptors, how would this change the ES assessment on benthic ecology at Thanet Coast SAC as a result of potential suspended sediment and smothering impacts? Would this then be a potential significant effect?	Applicant	DL4
Fish and shellfish			
34.	The MMO notes in its RR [RR-3476] that if a seasonal restriction from 01 November – 31 March inclusive would be implemented for all offshore cable installation activities and a restriction of 01 January to 31 March inclusive, for landfall works to protect red-throated diver in the Outer Thames Estuary SPA, then this may limit adverse impacts during these sensitive periods on herring and sandeel. For clarification, does this mean that as long as the proposed seasonal restrictions related to red-throated diver remain in place, then there would be no significant impact to either herring or sandeel, and no need for further mitigation?	MMO	DL4
Marine mammals			
35.	To provide clarification as to whether there is evidence of a recent increase in cetacean species as highlighted by Kent Wildlife Trust, close to the Kent landfall, including bottlenose dolphin.	Kent Wildlife Trust	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
36.	Respond to Natural England's comments at DL3, including those on the outline Marine Mammal Management Plan.	Applicant	DL4
Landscape and visual			
37.	Consider whether similar wording with respect to failed planting/ adaptive management as secured in the dDCO as per the wording for Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) East Anglia 1 (EA) North and EA2 could be applied to Sea Link.	Applicant	DL4
38.	Clarify whether advance planting includes any riparian planting.	Applicant	DL4
39.	Provide detailed response to landscape impacts at viewpoints (VP) identified in Suffolk and if any improved mitigation can be provided and secured within the order limits (VP1, VP2, VP4, VP5, VP20, VP21) including whether additional landscaping, either woodland or parkland trees, in the vicinity of the permanent access route to the west of Bloomfield's Covert.	Applicant	DL4
40.	Provide detailed consideration of Suffolk County Council's (SCC) suggestion that additional planting around the converter station could be designed to avoid 'channelling' of views towards the converter station but could assist in filtering of views.	Applicant	DL4
41.	Provide a detailed response to landscape impacts at viewpoints identified by Thanet District Council (TDC) regarding significant effects (VP3, VP4, VP5, VP6 and VP7) and if any improved mitigation can be provided and secured within the order limits.	Applicant	DL4
42.	Consider whether any additional mitigation can be included to reduce likely significant effects in terms of landscape and visual.	Applicant	DL4
43.	Provide updated oLEMP for Suffolk to include additional planting alongside B1119 as discussed.	Applicant	DL4
44.	With reference to NE's comments in [REP2-058] , a response is required regarding the possible future use of land to the south of the pig farm and north of the acid grassland enhancement area, which is still within the order limits. If it is used in the future for pig farming or similar intensive use could run off and nutrient enrichment interfere with the achievement of acid grassland enhancement.	Applicant	DL4
45.	In terms of cumulative effects on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the applicant identifies significant residual cumulative effects on natural beauty indicators at construction in the Suffolk onshore inter-project effects – table 13.35. in relation to– landscape quality, scenic quality, relative wildness, relative tranquillity. The assessment that has led to these conclusions	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	lacks clarity. Provide an updated assessment clarifying how the conclusions have been arrived at.		
46.	Heritage Coast – Notwithstanding the applicant's response to the written question, define the natural beauty and special character of the Heritage Coast.	Applicant, (SCC), East Suffolk Council (ESC)	DL4
47.	Having regard to paragraph 5.10.11 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1, can you explain whether you consider the development is compatible with the special character of the Heritage Coast?	Applicant, SCC, ESC	DL4
48.	If you consider the development is not compatible with the special character of the Heritage Coast, explain why not and suggest whether this could be overcome by mitigation and if so, provide details of suggested mitigation.	SCC, ESC	DL4
49.	Having regard to paragraph 5.10.32 of the NPS EN-1 which sets out the exceptional circumstances in which the SoS may grant development consent in the AONB, can the relevant local authorities explain whether they think the circumstances are exceptional, and if not, why not?	SCC, ESC	DL4
50.	Kiln Lane substation mitigation. The overlay [AS-063] with SPR mitigation indicates much less landscape mitigation planting to the north of the Kiln Lane substation than is shown for the SPR landscape mitigation. Whilst it is understood that the SPR landscape mitigation has since evolved, if the SPR consented scheme did not come forward and or was not fully implemented (scenario 2), explain how the rest of the landscape mitigation would be secured as it is not shown in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP). Provide an updated oLEMP for scenario 2 indicating the entirety of the outline landscape mitigation for Kiln Lane substation.	Applicant	DL4
51.	The ExA notes the applicant's comments in response to the first written question 1LVIA4 and the provision of the illustrated lux plots. However, there is insufficient information to assess the lighting effects in areas of relatively dark skies. A more detailed nighttime assessment is therefore requested.	Applicant	DL5

Action	Description	Action by	When
Cultural Heritage			
52.	<p>Heritage assets listed by the applicant [REP3-070] which are scoped out of the ES include those which are described as experiencing an adverse impact, though less than substantial at the lower end of this scale. For example, asset ID 1215749 - Buxlow Manor in Suffolk. For this example and the others like it, provide additional information as to the potential impact to the significance of each asset and further justification as to why it was scoped out.</p> <p>For all relevant Councils and Historic England, is it appropriate to scope out from the ES assessment heritage assets which are considered to have (lower end of) less than substantial impact on their significance?</p>	Historic England, All relevant Councils, Applicant	DL4
53.	For other heritage assets within the scoped-out list [REP3-070] , there is sometimes the reason given that the asset was assessed as part of the consent for the East Anglia (EA)1 North and EA2 proposals and as no additional impacts were predicted it was considered a neutral impact. The ExA requests that for these heritage assets, it is also expressed as to the potential effect of the Sea Link proposed development alone, and not based on potential additional impacts over and above that assessed for the EA projects?	Applicant	DL4
54.	Applicant to provide a similar list of heritage assets to the scoped-out list in [REP3-070] , but for all the heritage assets scoped in for any level of ES assessment, clearly stating the anticipated impact of both the Sea Link and cumulative impact to the significance of these assets.	Applicant	DL4
55.	Applicant to submit a more thorough and detailed assessment of the cumulative impacts on settings of cultural heritage assets and the historic wider landscapes.	Applicant	DL4
56.	Agree on a plan to submit showing the extent of the Ebbsfleet Peninsular Multi Period Complex with the proposed order limits, proposed compounds and haul roads overlaid.	Applicant KCC	DL4
Traffic and transport			
57.	Regarding the Preliminary Cumulative Highway Impact Assessment [APP-142] , explain what developments have been included and for what time period or scenario? Furthermore, submit a revised table to also include the worst-case Sea Link construction traffic.	Applicant	DL4
58.	Submit an assessment of feasibility of both proposed options for the use of abnormal loads across Benhall Railway Bridge.	Applicant	DL4
59.	Updates provided for junction modelling for both Kent and Suffolk (to include cumulative traffic), if the modelling is not fully submitted at DL4.	Applicant KCC, SCC	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
60.	Provide an update to the ExA as to whether concerns relating to the potential impact from Sea Link on the strategic road network, such as the A14 in Suffolk, have been addressed and whether any further mitigation is required.	National Highways	DL4
61.	Applicant to provide an updated cumulative traffic assessment based on an updated list of other projects and developments or provide an update as to when this will be submitted.	Applicant	DL4
62.	Consider and discuss between County Councils and applicant whether information regarding predicted journey time analysis is required to be part of a robust traffic and transport assessment, including cumulative assessments.	Applicant KCC, SCC	DL4
63.	Clarify whether it is likely if the rail line under Benhall Rail Bridge would have to close if either proposed option from the applicant (bridge strengthening works or use of a mini-bridge) were undertaken to allow for abnormal load crossings? If so, what would the implications for this be?	Network Rail	DL4
64.	Provide a map showing the main diversion routes if Benhall Rail Bridge needed to be closed for a period of time to traffic.	Applicant	DL4
65.	Provide an explanation and commitment as to when any closure of Benhall Rail Bridge would be phased in to occur, such as prior to other proposed onshore works in Suffolk for example.	Applicant	DL4
66.	Would there be a preference as to the option chosen by the applicant for abnormal load crossings of Benhall Rail Bridge, if both options were feasible?	Applicant	DL4
67.	On proposed new accesses, the applicant has stated that road safety audits have been carried out to show that the proposed new accesses are feasible and can be safe. Provide comments on this and whether it is considered that further information on road safety audits or other forms of information and evidence is necessary for the proposed new accesses during the Examination stage?	KCC, SCC	DL4
Noise and vibration			
68.	<p>Applicant to respond to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B of the applicant's Pegwell Bay Construction Method Technical Note [REP2-011] states 'not available' under the sound source for the Offshore trencher, argocat and mass flow excavator. Does this mean that these elements were or weren't assessed and in which case what assumptions were used and what are the implications for the noise contour mapping? The applicant's response to ExQ 1NV15 [REP3-069] explains that noise contour mapping work assumes that the hoverport is soft ground and that this is proportionate due to the size 	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	<p>of the area modelled. Given that the hoverport is largely hardstanding with vegetation and that it will be extensively used by construction vehicles, can the applicant provide further justification for this assumption?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First written question 1NV4 [PD-017], asked about use of hovercraft in Pegwell Bay. The applicant's response to 1NV4 [REP3-069] explains that the use of hovercraft is for safety purposes only and won't be used on a regular basis. Can the applicant explain how they would be brought to the site and how they would be stored? Can the use of the hovercraft be limited to emergency use in the dDCO or REAC? ExQ 1MO4 [REP3-069] regarding piling noise levels and the use of an L_{AFmax} of 91dB at 10m. This confirmed that the maximum piling noise level in the applicant's data set was 104dB but values were more typically in the low 90dB range. Is the applicant able to provide this dataset to the examination to support this assumption? At DL3 the applicant provided an operational noise contour plan for Saxmundham [REP3-075]. Produce a similar plan for Minster converter station. Explain why in figure 2 of the Operational Noise contour Plan [REP3-075] the noise level change contours are being compared with a 38dB L_{Aeq8h} level. 		
69.	Provide a form of requirement wording, co-ordinated with SPR, that would enable the previous East Anglia 1 North Requirement 27 noise limit requirements for Friston/Kiln Lane substation to be satisfied.	Applicant and SPR	DL4
70.	Provide a detailed assessment of low frequency noise impacts for proposed operational sites, based on the most up to date level of design detail available, incorporating comparison of dB(A) and dB(C) levels.	Applicant	DL5
Marine physical environment			
71.	<p>The MMO was unable to attend the hearings. The MMO to respond to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MMO's response to ExQ 1PE4 [REP3-094] explains that there would be a need for a designated disposal site for dredge arisings. MMO to explain the necessary steps required to be taken by the applicant prior to the close of examination to ensure that a dredge disposal area is defined. The MMO's DL2 response [REP2-056] highlighted a number of issues relating to the terminology associated with substances used in the marine environment (e.g. bentonite), emphasising the need for substances to be on the OSPAR pose little or no risk 	MMO	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
	(PLONOR) list. Is there a need for the Deemed Marine Licence (DML) to explicitly secure that only substances from the OSPAR list are used in addition to the current provisions in Part 2, Condition 8 of the DML?		
72.	<p>The applicant is asked to respond to the following question that was moved from the agenda to action points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MMO [REP2-056] suggests that further work is necessary to assess contamination in the lagoon area including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and copper. The applicant comments that the lagoon would be avoided by trenchless crossing and that there would be testing for contamination at the HDD exit location – can the applicant explain whether there is any risk that contaminants might be exposed due to open cut trenching in Pegwell Bay and whether any testing of these sediments is also required? 	Applicant	DL4
73.	NE and the Environment Agency (EA) to comment on the contrasting positions in [REP3A-028] and [REP2-051] regarding the potential for morphological change in Pegwell Bay due to the presence of HDD reception facilities.	Environment Agency (EA) NE	DL4
74.	Provide an explanation of whether a 3m depth of lowering in Pegwell Bay (3m below the bed level of the River Stour) is feasible and what the implications would be for the applicant's Environmental and Habitats Regulations assessments.	Applicant	DL4
75.	Provide details of remedial measures that would be considered/implemented if buried cables in Pegwell Bay became exposed by future possible migration of the river channel from the HDD exit seaward.	Applicant	DL4
76.	Provide a technical note in relation to the effect of the HDD bore emerging at the seabed on the Coralline Crag, explaining in detail why it would not create a longer term point of weakness within the wider sub crop.	Applicant	DL4
77.	Submit draft wording for a requirement in relation to decommissioning at the Suffolk landfall and River Fromus crossing.	EA	DL4
78.	Provide a clearer plan in relation to the HDD bore exit location, including a 45m offset from the Coralline Crag and suggested requirement or REAC wording to provide certainty regarding the exit location.	Applicant	DL4
79.	Provide a technical note additional to the information provided in [APP-044] explaining the reasons for not moving the proposed cable route entirely south of the Coralline Crag as previously proposed.	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
Climate change			
80.	KCC to provide response to ExQ1 1CC1 [PD-017] regarding climate change and the Finch judgement.	KCC	DL4
Water environment			
81.	Set out all outstanding concerns regarding the adequacy of the DCO and outline management plans in relation to minimising the residual risk for surface water flooding and associated REAC commitments.	SCC	DL4
82.	Applicant to update the drainage plan for Friston substation in coordination with SPR	Applicant	DL4
83.	Set out position with respect to the Minster Converter Station and Substation footprint and any impacts on land drains are present which address surface water in the associated fields and these could be affected in a manner which increases the risk of flooding including having regards to the applicant's position as set out in the response to Kent County Council's Local Impact Report [REP2-028].	EA, KCC	DL4
84.	Set out position regarding land / coastal erosion with respect to flood risk and the Flood Risk Assessment.	EA	DL4
85.	Provide an update on if it is necessary to relocate the proposed location of attenuation ponds for functional need including fluvial flooding matters.	EA and Applicant	DL4
86.	Set out all remaining areas of disagreement regarding the applicant's approach to applying the sequential and exception tests.	EA, SCC and Applicant	DL4
87.	Set out position with respect to requested wording for requirement in dDCO regarding the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and a 4m bridge soffit height at the proposed River Fromus bridge crossing.	EA	DL4
88.	Confirm any outstanding concerns with respect to meeting the objectives of the WFD.	KCC, EA and SCC	DL4
Shipping and navigation			
89.	Updated navigation and installation plan (NIP) to be provided, to include additional geographical area(s) of interest requested by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and matters relating to vessel management for the entire cable route (not just the defined areas of interest). Alternatively provide a stand alone vessel management plan for the entire offshore scheme.	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
90.	Applicant to provide update on avoiding planned cable joints in the areas of interest, taking into account the Port of London Authority's (PLA) view that it needs to be secured through a condition on the DML and that the REAC is not sufficient.	Applicant	DL4
91.	MCA to clarify the additional area of interest that it stated it is seeking and provide the reasoning for seeking its inclusion in the NIP.	MCA	DL4
92.	Provide update on securing future dredging depths through the dDCO requirements and DML condition(s) in consultation with the relevant stakeholders.	Applicant, MCA, PLA	DL4
93.	Provide an update on whether REAC SN22 provision should be secured in the dDCO/DML	Applicant, MCA	DL4
94.	Provide an update on safeguarding location for crossing with Gridlink. Provide an update on discussions with Gridlink including as to whether this should be through a cable crossing agreement or whether an area needs to be safeguarded as an area of interest to provide adequate certainty.	Applicant, Gridlink, MCA	DL4
95.	Provide an update to the REAC to include exclusion zones.	Applicant	DL4
96.	Provide an update to the REAC in relation to safety zones, in response to the PLA's request at DL3 for improved commitment in terms of communication.	Applicant	DL4
97.	Provide an update to the 3.5 Consents and Agreements Position Statement [APP-010] in relation to including cable crossing agreements in the appropriate section of the document (table 2.1 or section 1.5).	Applicant	DL4
98.	MCA to provide the applicant with an updated defined area for the avoidance of concurrent restricted ability to manoeuvre activities and restriction on activities when visibility is poor in relation to Sea Link activities.	MCA	DL4
99.	Consider whether REAC points in relation to shipping and navigation need to be secured in DML.	Applicant	DL4
100.	Provide a list of any additional REAC points you consider should be secured in the DML.	PLA	DL4
Socio-economics and tourism			
101.	Respond to requests for there to be monitoring and adaptive management at the post-construction phase in terms of tourism impacts, including accommodation availability and demand, and how this could be secured.	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
102.	District and County Councils to provide details as to what tourist accommodation may be available for tourists, taking into account Sea Link and other development workers who may be staying in such accommodation within the construction phases.	All relevant Councils	DL4
103.	TDC to provide relevant data from its 2025 visitor survey.	Thanet District Council	DL4
104.	Outline the worst-case level of rental accommodation levels that may be required for workers in Suffolk and Kent for Sea Link, considering the cumulative number of other development workers that may also require accommodation.	Applicant	DL4
105.	Provide a skills and employment plan, which shall include a local education/training strategy, or provide a timetable for its submission.	Applicant	DL4
Health and wellbeing			
106.	Applicant to confirm whether bank holiday working could be by agreement with the local planning authority rather than permitted within set hours (as currently included in the dDCO). This is given that the applicant has suggested that bank holiday working would be unlikely and it is also possible that necessary works on bank holidays could be programmed in advance with local authority agreement.	Applicant	DL4
Cumulative effects			
107.	Update relevant Sea Link cumulative and in-combination assessments based on the new information released for LionLink, including but not limited to the Environmental Statement, Habitats Regulations, Marine Conservation Zone and WFD assessments.	Applicant	DL5
108.	Note confirming timescales for producing the updated cumulative assessments referred to in the previous action point.	Applicant	DL4
109.	Cumulative visualisations to be prepared using information now available for LionLink. This will include the LionLink converter station. Provide clarification as to whether this will include the additional bays to Friston substation required for LionLink as set out in their statutory consultation documentation.	Applicant	DL4
110.	Update list of committed developments in inter-project cumulative assessments and provide supporting note to assessment approach.	Applicant	DL4

Action	Description	Action by	When
111.	Provide further justification for the applicant's approach to quantification of magnitude/degree of significance of effects in cumulative (intra-project) assessments and how the various effects interact with each other.	Applicant	DL4
112.	Provide a full response to the request from East Suffolk Council for an additional commitment in the REAC to review possible mitigations for 'no mitigation confirmed at this stage' items secured via relevant management plans / requirement 6. In responding draft the REAC commitment and address SCC related issues raised in its' ExQ1 response.	Applicant	DL4
113.	KCC's comments responding to ExQ 1CEIntra2 [REP3-091] relate entirely to traffic. Confirm if there are any other concerns regarding the mitigations of other environmental effects.	KCC	DL4
Draft development consent order			
114.	Consider and provide a response to the position that SPR do not have an equivalent to article 10 in their DCOs	Applicant Scottish Power Renewables ESC, SCC	DL4
115.	All parties (applicant and councils) to meet/liaise to agree suitable wording of article 10 which all parties are content with, with an update on progress and any agreement submitted.	Applicant All local councils	DL4
116.	All parties (including NGV, SPR and Manston airport) from onshore or offshore existing or potential future consent to comment on article 10.	All parties	DL4
117.	Applicant to respond to councils' DL3 submissions regarding the 35 day decision period at DL4.	Applicant	DL4
118.	KCC to consider ExQ1 question 1GEN28 [PD-017] and the applicant's response [REP3-069] regarding the inclusion of the words "which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed" and the applicant's proposed 35 day decision period.	KCC	DL4
119.	Confirm which documents are submitted in outline and set out details of the relevant planning authorities and consultees (such as the EA) in a table within the explanatory memorandum.	Applicant	DL4
120.	Councils and consultees to provide comments on the table setting out the relevant planning authorities and consultees.	All local councils and consultees identified	DL5

Action	Description	Action by	When
121.	Consider whether there is need for the word 'substantially' in accordance with, for requirements.	Applicant	DL4
122.	Applicant to strengthen wording of requirements 5 and 6 to ensure that the dDCO requirements explicitly cover both the operational and maintenance periods.	Applicant	DL4
123.	Applicant to develop wording in consultation with the local authorities in relation to Article 51 and REAC provisions A02 and A05 to provide certainty that retention of ancient and veteran trees is robustly controlled.	Applicant	DL4
124.	Consider whether a specific noise design parameter is required in relation to the converter and substation sites, equivalent to requirement 12 of the EA1 North DCO.	Applicant	DL4
Design			
125.	Develop a joint design approach with LionLink to cover above ground works and landscaping and consider how this can be secured to ensure coherent landscape and design vision for the site as a whole.	Applicant NGV	DL4
126.	Provide wording for securing the River Fromus bridge design as a requirement in the dDCO.	Applicant	DL4
127.	Provide additional detail regarding the design of Friston sub-station and how that would be secured in the dDCO to reflect the SPR consent and details.	Applicant	DL4
128.	Provide updated wording for requirement 3 to reflect the applicant's commitment made to allow relevant planning authorities control over Kent substation layout, design and scale.	Applicant	DL4
129.	Provide response to requests for rewording of requirement 3 to give relevant planning authorities greater control as to the design of the converter stations, substations, pylons, River Fromus bridge, lighting etc.	Applicant	DL4
130.	Consider whether future engagement with the Independent Design Review Panel can be secured through the dDCO, to include the panel rather than just the chair.	Applicant	DL4
131.	Suggest alternative wording for requirement 3 including which above ground elements of the proposed development should be included.	Relevant planning authorities	DL4
132.	Consider whether schedule 3 requirement 9(2) is necessary, in view of article 27(5) and whether provision in relation to trees could be covered in a similar way that does not undermine the effectiveness of requirement 9.	Applicant	DL4