

## Ecology and Biodiversity

### **2ECOL 21 - Impact of pylon base installation.**

Table 9.23 of Kent chapter 9 noise and vibration [AS-111] identifies use of pad foundations for pylon construction as an example means of achieving 10 to 20dB reduction in noise levels. Should this measure be secured to reduce noise and vibration effects on bird species in Kent?

**KCC response:** Yes

### **2ECOL29 - Hoverport access – reptiles.**

In light of the acknowledged presence of reptiles within the hoverport, should two stage clearance of any vegetation, or other measure, be secured as a REAC or oLEMP provision and if not, why not?

**KCC response:** Yes – the exact detail should be agreed in the REAC and informed (where necessary) by updated reptile surveys.

### **2ECOL43 - REAC provision B14.**

The REAC [REP4-235] explains that a precautionary method would be followed “when undertaking vegetation clearance potentially suitable for dormice”. Comment on whether this provision should specify particular locations or the process for establishing ‘potentially suitable’ vegetation.

**KCC response:** The finalised mitigation strategy must be finalised on at least an updated preliminary ecological appraisal. Therefore the REAC should not be specific with plans as the habitat suitable for dormouse may increase prior to works commencing.

### **2ECOL44 - REAC provision B18.**

Confirm whether provision B18 of the REAC [REP4-235] provides sufficient detail to provide certainty regarding eel mitigation measures. Is any additional construction mitigation for eel required during eel migration periods in addition to the measures identified in the REAC for Minster Marshes and if not, why not?

**KCC response:** KCC did not comment on EELS so will defer to the relevant consultee on this

### **2ECOL48 - REAC provision B55.**

Are the local authorities and NE satisfied with the commitment in REAC [REP4-235] provision B55 to “making the lines visible in adverse weather or low light conditions” or

should specific reference be made to night time? The ExA has considered the applicant's response to ISH2 AP24 [REP4-086] but considers that based on plain English, 'low light' may not be inclusive of the night period.

**KCC response:** KCC would defer to NE on this matter and agree with their approach. I'm not sure how lines would be made visible in the dark without creating an additional issue due to increase in lighting.

## Water Environment

### **2WE1 - Water environment – joint position statement (KCC, SCC, Applicant, EA)**

Notwithstanding previously submitted documents, representations and statements of common ground, the ExA requires a joint position statement on areas of agreement and differences with respect to meeting the relevant policy requirements in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN1 regarding:

- Flood risk and assessment
- Compliance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive
- Sequential and Exception test (in answering clearly set out all reasonings relating to NPS EN1, paragraph 5.8.42)

**KCC response:** We would expect the applicant to provide us with a draft statement for us to comment on (although the sequential test is not a function undertaken buy us as the LLFA and so we will offer no response with that regards).

### **2WE3 - Loss of floodplain storage**

Do all parties agree with the findings of the Kent Onshore Scheme - Fluvial Flooding from the River Stour [REP4-096]? In answering, can parties specifically have regard to the requirements of NPS-EN1, paragraph 5.8.2 and address:

- that floodplain compensation is required to ensure there is no net loss of storage,
- that there is sufficient space to create the compensation areas within the order limits, and
- if it can be appropriately secured through addition of a new REAC commitment?

**KCC response:** Matters relating to loss of floodplain storage are outside of our remit.

### **2GH1 - Kent Council - Local Impact Report**

The KCC LIR [REP1-129] does not comment on geology or hydrogeology. Can KCC set out their position in this regard, including identifying any concerns?

**KCC response:** Matters relating to geology and hydrogeology are outside of our remit.

## Traffic and Transport

### 2TT1 - Junction modelling

It is understood that some of the junction modelling is set to be submitted at DL6. However, given the remaining time within the examination period after DL6, the ExA requests this information at DL5. If this is not possible then explain why this is the case and update on progress.

**KCC response:** The applicant has informed KCC that it is endeavouring to provide us with the junction modelling by DL5, at which point we will be able to comment.