

# SEA LINK

EN020026

## Answers to Examining Authority Questions Round 3

Suffolk County Council



## Table of Contents

<b>Glossary of Acronyms</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Purpose of this Submission</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Answers to Examining Authority’s Third Round of Written Questions (ExQ2)</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1 General and Cross-topic Questions (GEN).....	4
2 Landscape and visual .....	19
3 Ecology and biodiversity.....	21
4 Cultural heritage.....	24
5 Water environment .....	29
8 Traffic and transport.....	30
11 Socio-economics, recreation and tourism.....	35

## Glossary of Acronyms

CA	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>
CEMP	<i>Construction Environmental Management Plan</i>
CIL	<i>Community Infrastructure Levy</i>
DCO	<i>Development Consent Order</i>
ES	<i>Environmental Statement</i>
ESC	<i>East Suffolk Council</i>
ExA	<i>The Examining Authority</i>
EXQ3	<i>Third Round of Examiners Questions</i>
NSIP	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>
PINS	<i>The Planning Inspectorate</i>
PPA	<i>Planning Performance Agreement</i>
SCCAS	<i>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service</i>
SECHNLP	<i>Suffolk &amp; Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape Partnership</i>

*“The Council” / “SCC” refers to Suffolk County Council.*

## Purpose of this Submission

The document has been prepared by Suffolk County Council to answer to the Examining Authority's Third Round of Written Questions (ExQ3).

The response format is based on the template provided by the Planning Inspectorate case team. For ease of reference, questions which are not addressed to Suffolk County Council have been deleted. Where another Local Authority is the lead authority, this has been attributed. Examination Library references are used throughout to assist readers.

## Answers to Examining Authority's Third Round of Written Questions (ExQ2)

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>1 General and Cross-topic Questions (GEN)</b>			
<b>General</b>			
3GEN2.	Applicant and all interested parties	<p><b>Critical national priority</b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.15 of NPS EN-1 says that where residual non-habitats regulations assessment or non-Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) impacts remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for CNP infrastructure.</p> <p>It goes onto say that the exception to this presumption of consent are residual impacts onshore and offshore which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health and public safety, defence, irreplaceable habitats or unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero.</p>	<p>There is a possibility that the proposed development, in its current form, may present an unacceptable risk to, or interference with, human health. SCC does not repeat here previous submissions in which it has detailed the ways in which the proposed development will likely affect human health which have not been considered in the Applicant's assessments. This has been set out by SCC in previous submissions such as [REP1-130] and is set out in detail in response to AP 45. The Council has the following to add to its submissions in answer to this question.</p> <p>An important element when considering levels of risk is the degree of certainty one has in relation to the consequences of a decision. Where there is a limited evidence base which is insufficient to justify conclusions of likely effects with a degree of certainty, it follows that there is a likelihood that effects may be greater than anticipated and perhaps also different in kind. Where the</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>The same exception applies to this presumption for residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference offshore to navigation, or onshore to flood and coastal erosion risk.</p> <p>a) Without prejudice to the position of any party, are there any issues in this case that might potentially fall into this category of the exceptions to this presumption of consent? For example, might the issue of flooding and the application of the sequential and exception test potentially fall into this category in the event of there being an “unacceptable risk”?</p> <p>b) Are there any further submissions any party wishes to make on the potential application of CNP policy in this case (should it be required)?</p>	<p>effect in question is related to a phenomenon which is particularly difficult to measure and is not itself fully understood nor how exactly various factors may or may not affect it to varying degrees, the degree of uncertainty over the effects which follow is exacerbated. The effect in question is mental health and wellbeing which forms an essential part of human health. As stated, SCC has presented considerations using its public health expertise to motivate the line of reasoning presented here when considering the potential effects of the proposed development in combination with cumulative developments. SCC does not claim that this point entails that the proposed project presents an unacceptable risk, in policy terms, to human health such that presumption for CNP certainly does not apply; rather, SCC presents this as a consideration to the ExA and decision maker as a potentially relevant one to this question of policy.</p> <p>However, SCC does not consider that the potential risk to human health is unassailable. It is in the context of the complete lack of monitoring or mitigation measures within which SCC has laid out its concerns. If the ExA or decision maker were minded to consider that may be an unacceptable risk to human health, SCC considers that</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>the addition of relevant requirements to the Order which secure a robust monitoring plan of mental health and wellbeing, in addition to procedures to implement mitigation depending on the results of that monitoring, would make substantial process to managing the potential risk to human health. SCC has detailed what it expects to be included in such a plan in [REP5-204] and has provided details of how this may be secured at Deadline 6.</p>
<b>Design, parameters and other details of the Proposed Development</b>			
3GEN8.	Relevant planning authorities	<p><b>Independent design review</b></p> <p>Provide suggested wording to incorporate a post consent independent design review of the converter stations, Kent substation and River Fromus bridge.</p>	<p>SCC has submitted a draft Design Engagement Strategy at Deadline 6 which is intended to serve as an appendix to the Design Principles – Suffolk application document. It is based on that found within the design principles statement within the consented EA1N and EA2 applications and includes provision for independent design review as part of the engagement process. Proposed wording for Requirement 3 by SCC makes reference to this document for the relevant onshore infrastructure. Whilst SCC has circulated this document with ESC, agreement has not been possible to seek between all the Councils. However, SCC envisages that a similar document could be incorporated for the Design Principles – Kent document.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
3GEN10.	Applicant, relevant planning authorities, Dover District Council (DDC), Suffolk County Council (SCC), Kent County Council (KCC)	<p><b>Requirement 3</b></p> <p>Develop an agreed form of wording for the approval of details of the above ground elements of the proposed development. If agreement cannot be reached on specific points, explain what those points are and why agreement cannot be reached.</p>	SCC has progressed the previous iteration of Requirement 3 wording in collaboration with ESC which is set out in SCC’s schedule of proposed changes to the DCO submitted at Deadline 6.
<b>Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>			
3GEN15.	SCC	<p><b>Article 2 (1)</b></p> <p>Following ExQ1GEN15 and the applicant’s response [REP3-069] regarding Article 2(1) definition of ‘maintain’, provide dDCO drafting that would allay your concerns as set out in [REP4-201].</p>	<p>The definition of “maintain” in the latest definition of the draft DCO [REP5-006] is –</p> <p>“maintain” includes inspect, repair, adjust, alter, dismantle, remove, clear, refurbish, paint, surface treat, decommission, improve, reconstruct or replace any part,</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>but not remove, reconstruct or replace the whole of the <b>authorised project</b> including through the use of robots, helicopters, drones, gadgets or similar devices either remote controlled or autonomous, provided such works do not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those identified in the Environmental Statement, and any derivative of “maintain” must be construed accordingly; [Emphasis added].</p> <p>SCC notes that the drafting of “maintain” in the instant order departs from the equivalent provision in two recent precedents: the National Grid (Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project) Development Consent Order 2024 (SI 2024/393) and the National Grid (Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement) Order 2024 (SI 2024/958). For example, where the instant order refers to “authorised project”, the precedents refer to “authorised development”.</p>
3GEN17.	All local authorities	<b>Article 10</b>	SCC has circulated its proposed wording with the other local authorities but confirmation of agreement on this

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>Action point 115 from issue specific hearing 2 (ISH2) [EV6-033] asked all parties (applicant and councils) to meet/liase to agree suitable wording of article 10 which all parties are content with, with an update on progress and any agreement submitted by DL4.</p> <p>To date no suggested alternative drafting for article 10 has been submitted into the examination. Given the advanced stage of this examination and the absence of agreement, it appears likely that this is a matter upon which the ExA will need to adjudicate. To assist the ExA, can SCC work with all relevant local authorities to produce amended drafting for article 10 which addresses its previously discussed concerns, for submission by DL6.</p>	<p>wording has not yet been received from all Councils. The wording adds paragraph (4) and is set out below.</p> <p>For context, agenda item 21.1 of its Deadline 4 submission Written post hearing submissions including written summaries of oral cases made at hearings the w/c 26 January 2026 – Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) [REP4-150] SCC sets out its concerns with the drafting of article 10.</p> <p>In brief, SCC wishes to ensure that (i) the Hillside protection does not open the door to TCPA 1990 applications by NGET for elements of the project/changes to the project that bypass the controls ultimately imposed by the DCO (if made) and (ii) article 10 does not become a mechanism to side-step the controls of the East Anglia ONE North Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022 (SI 2022/432) and the East Anglia TWO Offshore Wind Farm Order 2022 (SI 2022/433), noting that paragraphs (2) and (3) apply to other DCOs whenever made.</p> <p>To address its concerns, SCC considers article 10 should be amended as set out in new paragraphs (4) and (5) below.</p> <p>In addition, SCC considers the reference in paragraph (3) to “under paragraph (1) or (3) or otherwise” should be to</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>“under paragraph (1) or (2) or otherwise” and so SCC has amended paragraph (3) accordingly.</p> <p><i>Planning Permission and other consents</i></p> <p><i>10.—(1) If planning permission is issued pursuant to the 1990 Act for development any part of which is within the Order limits following publication of this Order that is—</i></p> <p><i>(a) not itself a project for which development consent is required under the 2008 Act or part of such a project; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) required to complete or enable the construction, use or operation of any part of the development authorised by this Order,</i></p> <p><i>then the carrying out, use or operation of such development pursuant to the terms of the planning permission is not to constitute a breach of the terms of this Order.</i></p> <p><i>(2) To the extent any development carried out or used pursuant to a planning permission granted under the 1990 Act or development consent granted under the 2008 Act or compliance with any conditions of that permission or requirements of that development consent is inconsistent</i></p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p><i>with the exercise of any power or right under this Order or the authorised project:</i></p> <p><i>(a) that inconsistency is to be disregarded for the purposes of establishing whether any development which is the subject matter of that planning permission or development consent is capable of physical implementation; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) in respect of that inconsistency, no enforcement action under the 1990 Act or the 2008 Act may be taken in relation to development carried out or used pursuant to that planning permission or development consent whether inside or outside the Order limits.</i></p> <p><i>(3) Any development or any part of a development within the Order limits which is constructed or used under the authority of a planning permission granted under the 1990 Act or of a development consent granted under the 2008 Act, including permissions falling under paragraph (1) or (2) or otherwise, is deemed not to be a breach of, or inconsistent with, this Order and will not prevent the authorised project being carried out or used or any other power or right under this Order being exercised.</i></p> <p><i>(4) Where any development to which this article relates is carried out or used pursuant to a planning permission</i></p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p><i>granted under the 1990 Act or development consent granted under the 2008 Act, nothing in this article -</i></p> <p><i>(a) authorises any development that would give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those identified in the Environmental Statement;</i></p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p><i>(b) prevents any enforcement action under the 1990 Act or the 2008 Act being taken in relation to any breach of that permission or consent where that breach is not an inconsistency for the purposes of paragraph (2).</i></p>
3GEN18.	SCC	<p><b>Article 23</b></p> <p>Following the applicant’s response to the ExA’s question 1GEN35 [REP3-069], do you consider there is evidence to support the inclusion of Part 4, Article 23 Removal of human remains? If so, provide reasons for the inclusion of the Article and provide dDCO wording that would satisfy your concerns raised in [REP4-201].</p>	<p>SCCAS would advise that there is no evidence for human remains less than 100 years old to be present within the order limits (as there is no interaction with any known burial grounds). Archaeological human remains have, however, been identified during archaeological evaluation work and will require appropriate mitigation. There is also potential for further archaeological burial remains to be defined during ongoing archaeological assessment and mitigation work.</p> <p>SCCAS understand the reason for the inclusion of Part 4, Article 23 as a safeguard against the unexpected discovery</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>of more recent human remains, although this is very unlikely.</p> <p>SCCAS are also satisfied that part 12 sets out that remains believed to over 100 years old should be treated in a different manner to more recent human remains, which should prevent them from potentially being exposed for an extended period and at a risk from damage or harm. However, the wording of part 13 of the article needs to make clear that archaeological human remains should be treated in line with the Burial Act 1857 and the terms of any issued burial license, as well as the requirements of the OWSI and site specific WSIs and relevant archaeological best practice documents. These additions to the wording would add a level of robustness and clarity to ensure the most appropriate treatment of archaeological human remains.</p>
3GEN27.	SCC, Applicant	<p><b>Requirement 15</b></p> <p>SCC [REP4-201] and [REP5-185] suggests that requirement 15 should be reworded.</p> <p>The ExA request that SCC and the applicant work together to agree alternative dDCO wording for requirement 15. If agreement</p>	<p>SCC considers Requirement 15 should prevent Work No. 1B from being constructed under the Sea Link DCO if it has been commenced under another consent.</p> <p>SCC engaged with the Applicant on this matter and received indication that the Applicant did not consider a</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		cannot be reached, then both parties to submit suggested wording by DL6.	<p>revision to the requirement to be needed and expressed concern over its ability to complete the substation works if the requirement is reworded as suggested by SCC should the SPR projects not progress as envisaged in such a way which prevented Sea Link from building the substation under that consent. However, SCC considers that the inclusion of “save where alterations to that Work are required for the purposes of the Authorised Project” is sufficient to safeguard against this concern. Should, for whatever reason, the Applicant be unable to construct 1B under the SPR consents after that work has commenced, it follows that alterations to that work would be needed, and so the Applicant would no longer be required to use the SPR consents only to construct the substation.</p> <p>Existing Requirement 15 should therefore be amended as follows –</p> <p>“Where any part of Work No.1B has been <b>completed commenced</b> pursuant to another development consent order, <b>those works that Work</b> must not be constructed under this Order, save where <b>alterations amendments</b> to</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p><del>those works</del> <u>that Work</u> are required for the purposes of the Authorised Project”.</p>
3GEN30.	SCC	<p><b>New Requirement – lighting management plan</b></p> <p>In [REP5-181] SCC notes that requirement 3 of the most recent draft of the DCO [REP4-235] requires approval for operational lighting of the converter station but not the Friston substation.</p> <p>SCC does not see why this project would be justified in deviating from the Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) consent in this way. SCC notes ESC’s concerns (e.g. within [REP3-085]) over the control of lighting and supports their ask for an appropriate requirement for a lighting management plan. Provide suggested drafting that you consider would address this matter.</p>	<p>SCC understands that ESC is submitting requirement wording for a lighting management plan. SCC defers to, and supports, the wording supplied by ESC as the relevant authority for these matters.</p>
3GEN31.	SCC, Applicant	<p><b>New Requirement – installation of cable ducts</b></p>	<p>(1) If the cables comprised within the Sea Link cable works are installed prior to the cables comprised within the LionLink cable works, the authorised project may not be</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>In [REP5-181] SCC requests a similar requirement to that in the EA1N/EA2 made DCOs to be inserted into the Sea Link dDCO in relation to Lion Link on account of the overlapping cable routes.</p> <p>SCC considers that this would make progress towards compliance with relevant parts of the NPS for energy, such as paragraph 3.3.80 of EN-1 concerning the avoidance of unnecessary impacts where avoidable through coordination.</p> <p><b>SCC:</b> Provide drafting for the new requirement with reasons to explain why you consider it necessary.</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Do you consider a new requirement could be added to the dDCO. If so, engage with SCC to provide agreed suggested drafting, if not explain why not.</p>	<p>brought into operational use unless the cable ducts forming part of the LionLink cable works have been installed concurrently with the installation of the cables comprised within the Sea Link cable works where the routes of the cable works for Sea Link and Lion Link overlap.</p> <p>(2) The requirement in paragraph (1) is considered discharged if no Order for the Lion Link cable works is made by the date on which the Sea Link cable works commences</p> <p>(3) For the purposes of this requirement—</p> <p>(a) “the Sea Link cable works” mean Work Nos.2 and 5 of this Order; and</p> <p>(b) “the LionLink cable works” mean the cable works which form part of the proposed electricity interconnector that will link the United Kingdom and the Netherlands via an offshore connection”.</p>
3GEN32.	SCC, ESC, Applicant	<p><b>New Requirement – control of development during operational phase</b></p> <p>SCC [REP5-181], ESC [REP5-172] and FPC [REP5-212] consider that a requirement akin to</p>	<p>SCC and ESC have collaborated to form the following wording which is based on Requirement 44 of EA1N and EA2:</p> <p>Control of development during operational phase</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>requirement 44 of the made orders for EA1N and EA2 is necessary for the Sea Link DCO.</p> <p><b>SCC, ESC and FPC:</b> Provide drafting for the new requirement.</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Do you consider a new requirement could be added to the dDCO. If so, engage with SCC and ESC to provide agreed suggested drafting, if not explain why not.</p>	<p>X-(1) During the operation of and within operational land related to Work Nos. 1B, 2, and 3B in the District of East Suffolk and Work Nos. 9A, 9B,10 and 11 in the District of Thanet and Dover, any development in addition to that authorised in this Order that is permitted under Schedule 2 Part 15 Class B (d), (e), or (f) of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (“electricity undertakings permitted development) or any equivalent successor provision is subject to the following conditions</p> <p>(2) In respect of operational drainage –</p> <p>(a) No electricity undertakings permitted development may commence until an amendment to the Drainage Management Plan approved pursuant to requirement 6 (o) in relation to Suffolk and requirement 6 (p) in relation to Kent that includes provision for the replacement of any existing drainage measures to be removed and maintenance of any new drainage measures to be provided as part of the permitted development, has been submitted to and approved by the relevant lead local flood</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>authority, in consultation with the relevant planning authority and the Environment Agency;</p> <p>(b) The measures in the amendment to the operational drainage management plan in respect of the permitted development must be implemented as approved.</p> <p>(3) In respect of the provision, implementation and maintenance of landscaping –</p> <p>a) No electricity undertakings permitted development may commence until an amendment to the written Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and associated work programme approved pursuant to requirement 6 (f) in relation to Suffolk and requirement 6 (g) in relation to Kent that includes provision for the replacement of any existing landscape measures to be removed and maintenance of any landscape measures to be provided as part of the permitted development, has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority; and</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			(b) The measures in the amendment to the written landscape management plan and associated work programme plan in respect of the permitted development must be implemented as approved.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>2 Landscape and visual</b>			
3LVIA3.	Relevant planning authorities	<p><b>Lighting</b></p> <p>The dDCO includes a provision in requirement 3 for the submission and approval of details of operational lighting.</p> <p>Does this meet your requirements, or do you consider that an outline lighting management plan and/ or maximum parameters for lighting are still required? If so, explain why and provide suggested wording.</p>	<p>SCC understands that operational lighting, together with other items listed in Requirement 3 (b), does, under the current wording, not need to be approved by the relevant local authority.</p> <p>SCC considers that, most importantly, this wording needs to be changed, so that approval is required, as it would be for a TCPA application.</p> <p>SCC considers that the reference to key design principles is insufficient. The aims provided in Key Design Principle</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>N.4 are too high level to be considered lighting design parameters.</p> <p>SCC therefore advocates that, in addition to the need for approval of a detailed lighting design scheme post consent, maximum parameters should be clearly defined in an outline lighting management plan, including, a strategy for the site and how the lighting provision would be reduced to the minimum operational requirements by providing: details of fittings and lighting profiles, controls, energy efficiency ratings; maximum lux levels, differentiated according to the need of illumination in certain areas; specifications for the luminaires to be used, such as being directional LED, with a maximum Kelvin level of 2700K; maximum mounting height for luminaires on buildings; maximum pole heights for lighting columns; specifications, in principle, for provision of hoods and louvres to minimise light spill, glare and sky glow; time limits for use of operational lighting, differentiated for different areas of use.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>3 Ecology and biodiversity</b>			
3ECOL12.	ESC, SCC, TDC, KCC, National Trust	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outline Offshore Construction Environmental Management Plan, outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [REP5-068] and REAC – Environmental Clerk of Works</b></p> <p>Do the local authorities or the National Trust have any concerns relating to the use of an Environmental Clerk of Works as opposed to an Ecological Clerk of Works to oversee works, noting that ecology and biodiversity measures originally referred to use of an Ecological Clerk of Works and the term ECoW is used interchangeably within the document?</p>	SCC Ecology are satisfied that anyone appointed as the Environmental Clerk of Works will be suitably qualified and experienced in ecology matters as well as environmental aspects of the role.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		It is noted that REAC [REP5-115] provision B48 still refers to an ecological clerk.	
3ECOL13.	Applicant, ESC, SCC, TDC, KCC	<p><b>oCEMP [REP5-068] provision B02 – vegetation removal</b></p> <p>Confirm whether the provision should read ‘Wherever possible’ rather than ‘The assumption will be’ and if not, suggest alternative wording.</p>	SCC Ecology would prefer to see the wording ‘wherever possible’.
3ECOL15.	Applicant, ESC, SCC, TDC, KCC	<p><b>oCEMP [REP5-068] provision B05 – two stage habitat manipulation</b></p> <p>Should this provision refer to ‘reptiles’ rather than ‘common reptiles’ and if not, why not?</p>	The term ‘Common Reptiles’ refers to Common Lizard, Grass Snake, Adder and Slow-worm which are widespread throughout Suffolk and the UK. If only ‘Reptiles’ is used, this could be construed to include species such as Sand Lizard and Smooth Snake, which are not found in Suffolk.
3ECOL16.	Applicant, ESC, SCC, TDC, KCC	<p><b>oCEMP [REP5-068] provision B07, B36, B53 – hedgerow gap filling</b></p> <p>Should ‘where practicable’ be removed or an alternative form of wording adopted to ensure that the conclusions of the environmental impact assessment in respect of bats and dormice can be relied on and if not, why not? Where relevant provide alternative wording.</p>	SCC Ecology agree that the phrase ‘where practicable’ should be removed from the documents.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
3ECOL19.	NE, ESC, SCC	<p><b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan</b></p> <p>Should the Suffolk oLEMP [REP4-065], or another control document, be updated to identify sensitive areas for watervole or the need for a watching brief within Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI to minimise risks of impacts in the event of frac out and if not, why not?</p>	<p>SCC Ecology think the Riparian Mammals Survey report should be updated to identify the areas within the Leiston-Aldeburgh SSSI where a watching brief would be needed to minimise potential impacts on Water Vole from a potential frack-out.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>4 Cultural heritage</b>			
3CH1.	SCC, KCC, HE	<p><b>Assessment of heritage assets</b></p> <p>Is there sufficient evidence and level of assessment for the impact from the proposed development on all heritage assets (scoped in and out of the Environmental Statement (ES) assessment)?</p> <p>Furthermore, to clarify, is there any heritage asset (designated or non-designated) where your assessment conclusions would differ from that of the applicant?</p>	<p>SCCAS are satisfied with the scope of archaeological evaluation work which has been completed so far and would generally agree with the assessments made by the Applicant regarding the impact of the scheme upon below ground archaeological remains and the proposals set out to mitigate these impacts. Whilst a number of remains of archaeological significance have been defined, SCCAS are satisfied that scheme impacts upon these heritage assets can be appropriately mitigated through an agreed programme of archaeological mitigation or through Preservation in Situ, to be secured through the OWSI and DCO Requirements (final versions of both still pending agreement). SCCAS are also satisfied that within the small sections of the scheme where evaluation remains outstanding, that suitable provisions are being made by the Applicant to complete further assessment work in</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>these areas post-consent and to undertake appropriate mitigation for any additional heritage assets which are defined.</p> <p>As set out by the Applicant, the D-shaped enclosure which has been defined at Friston is considered to be of regional significance and has the potential to contain settlement evidence and other remains. SCCAS would therefore advise that partial excavation of just a section of this feature would not be appropriate or in line with best practice and would not adequately mitigate the effects of the development upon this monument, resulting in a significant adverse effect. Therefore, this monument needs to be subject to a programme of enhanced mitigation to enable it to be mitigated in full if not going to be completely avoided by the route</p> <p>On the basis of the changes proposed to the order limits in this part of the scheme and the results of the latest archaeological evaluation work, there is a suitable alternative route which would avoid the enclosure entirely and provide an opportunity to preserve this monument in situ, which SCCAS would strongly support as the preferred and optimum mitigation approach, although would not object to excavation of this site in its entirety.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			SCCAS defer to HE and ESC with regards to designated heritage assets.
3CH2.	SCC, KCC, HE	<p><b>Cumulative assessment of heritage assets</b></p> <p>Has the applicant provided a sufficient cumulative assessment on heritage assets, considering not just the impacts to heritage assets from just the proposed development but from other projects in the areas too? Provide reasons for your response.</p>	<p>Although archaeological investigations as part of this scheme and other projects in the area have demonstrated that this is a rich archaeological landscape containing multi-period remains relating to a variety of activities, reasonably defined areas of significant archaeological activity have been identified within different parts of the order limits. As such, aside from the direct impacts to these sites from construction activities and associated works, SCCAS agree with the Applicant that cumulative impacts to specific sites will be fairly limited, as long as appropriate mitigation is undertaken and ongoing assessment work considers the recorded remains in their wider archaeological context and in relation to the archaeological remains defined as part of other local projects.</p> <p>SCCAS defer to HE and ESC with regards to designated heritage assets.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
3CH6.	KCC, SCC, HE	<p><b>Wider Historic Landscapes</b></p> <p>The applicant has submitted the Assessment of Cumulative Effects on the Wider Historic Landscapes [REP5-138]. The ExA requests that you respond to this document and inform as to whether you agree with the conclusions of minor adverse effect for Suffolk and negligible effect for Kent. If not, explain why, and how you would evaluate the cumulative impact to the wider historic landscapes.</p>	<p>Although some parts of the scheme within Suffolk do interact with areas of early (pre-18<sup>th</sup> century) enclosure and will lead to the loss of early landscape features such as historic field boundaries, these areas are relatively minimal. Where there is direct interaction with other schemes within areas of surviving historic landscape, such as at the Friston substation, cumulatively the impacts are increased due to the greater loss of historic landscape features which will be caused as a result of more extensive construction activities. Overall, SCCAS would however agree with the conclusions made in this document, although opportunities to retain surviving historic landscape elements should be taken where possible.</p> <p>SCC defers to HE for detailed comments but offers the following comments.</p> <p>Referring to paragraph 3.1.8, SCC does not follow the point that the large arable field units remaining today can be considered the key elements of the historic landscape. SCC would consider the key elements to include the north-south orientation of the Fromus Valley, the relatively unspoilt approach to Saxmundham from the south, the remaining elements of the former park landscape and the remaining woodland blocks and field boundary hedges,</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>both around Saxmundham and Friston. The scheme adversely affects ProW, which are also part of the historic landscape fabric.</p> <p>At paragraph 5.1.3 the assessment of the landscape character as being predominantly agricultural does not acknowledge the fact that the character is predominantly rural and that the change in character resulting from the development is large. SCC cannot follow that this change would result in a minor adverse, and therefore non-significant effect. SCC considers that the Applicant overstates the element of degradation of the local landscape character and underplays the impact and scale of change resulting from the development.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>5 Water environment</b>			
3WE3.	SCC	<p><b>Flood Risk Assessment</b></p> <p>Does the applicant's Surface Water Flood Risk and Climate Change - Technical Note [REP5-134] address all outstanding concerns with respect to the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment? If not, what concerns remain and what additional information is required?</p>	<p>SCC, LLFA is generally happy with the submission, but the clarity of the mapping on pages 4 to 8 are not clear and they need to show the extend of the proposed developed area.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>8 Traffic and transport</b>			
3TT1.	Applicant	<p><b>Timing of peak traffic flows</b></p> <p>The Supplement to the Preliminary Cumulative Highway Impact Assessment in Suffolk [REP4-099] shows the total cumulative traffic flows, both including and excluding the proposed development construction traffic.</p> <p>It uses a 2028 baseline for heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and for total vehicles for various road links and road junctions. However, whilst the overall peak of traffic may be in 2028, this does not mean that 2028 would be the busiest time for traffic on all the listed road links and junctions, due to different phases of development for example. Therefore, submit an additional set of tables in the form of those submitted with [REP4-099] highlighting only those links and junctions which would have their peak levels of cumulative traffic (with and without the</p>	See ISH3 22 regarding data provided.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		proposed development) in years other than 2028.	
3TT2.	SCC, Applicant	<p><b>A12 enhancements</b></p> <p>From our March unaccompanied site inspections ([EV1-022] and [EV1-023]), the ExA noted the works currently being undertaken along the A12, particularly the junctions at Friday Street A1094 and Yoxford B1122. Provide details of these works and any others along the A12 within the area of the proposed development and set out how they could benefit construction phase traffic for the proposed development, particularly in regard to driver delay.</p>	See response to ISH3 Action Points and oral submissions during ISH 3
3TT3.	SCC, KCC	<p><b>Cumulative assessments</b></p> <p>With the submission of the junction modelling for Kent [REP5-029] and the submission of the junction modelling for Suffolk due at DL6, is it the Council's view that there is sufficient information and a robust cumulative assessment of highway</p>	<p>SCC's position regarding the scope of assessment is unchanged considering that as a minimum a sensitivity test is required to assess the cumulative impact of all NSIP related construction vehicles on the A12 and elsewhere.</p> <p>See also ISH3 22.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		<p>impacts for the construction phase of the proposed development?</p> <p>If not, detail what still needs to be submitted from the applicant to provide this robustness.</p>	
3TT4.	SCC, KCC	<p><b>Junction modelling response</b></p> <p>Provide a response to the junction modelling undertaken by the applicant, particularly with regards to what the results suggest about driver delay and highway safety (see [REP5-029] for Kent). Also confirm whether there was agreement on the junctions modelled.</p>	D7 response as insufficient resources or time to undertake assessment.
3TT5.	SCC, KCC	<p><b>Significance of highway impacts</b></p> <p>Given all the information and assessment submitted to date from the applicant, as highway authorities would you consider that the highway impacts from the proposed development, both alone and in cumulatively with other projects, would be significant in any way?</p> <p>If so, explain how and why, along with any mitigation considered necessary to address</p>	D7 response as insufficient resources or time to undertake assessment.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		significant impacts and how this could be secured.	
3TT7.	KCC, SCC	<p><b>Capping of HGV numbers</b></p> <p>If capping of construction vehicles were considered necessary, would this be for HGVs or all forms of construction traffic? If considered necessary, which road links and/or road junctions should such caps be applied to?</p> <p>Finally, if the Highway Authorities considered capping of construction traffic as necessary to be secured within the DCO, provide suggested drafting for a requirement which would require capping and also sets out the process if the vehicle numbers exceeded these caps.</p>	See ISH3 11
3TT9.	SCC, ESC, Saxmundham Town Council	<p><b>HGV cap for B1121 and B1119 junction</b></p> <p>Within the submitted CTMP [REP5-064] the applicant states that there would be daily cap of ten HGV movements imposed at the B1121 Main Road/ B1119 Church Street signalised junction within Saxmundham, to minimise</p>	Whilst a proposed cap of 10 HGV movements (per day?) is welcome without modelling of the junction to include interpeak hours the assessment of the impact of any construction traffic including light vehicles cannot be considered to be complete. Ideally the junction should be avoided by all construction vehicles as the SZC modelling

<b>ExQ3</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>	<b>SCC Answer:</b>
		potential impacts of construction traffic at this location (associated with works at S-BM12). Respond to this commitment and state whether this would overcome concerns with regards to traffic at this junction?	that is available shows the junction to be over capacity in at least peak hours. Even small changes could have a disproportional impact.  See also ISH3 AP 11.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>11 Socio-economics, recreation and tourism</b>			
3SERT2.	Applicant, KCC, SCC, East Suffolk Council (ESC)	<p><b>Skills and Employment Plan</b></p> <p>Respond to SCC’s suggested DCO requirement for a Skills and Employment Plan, as set out in [REP5-204]. Provide alternative wording if you do not agree to this.</p>	SCC has made slight alterations to the wording set out in [REP5-204] which is set out in SCC’s schedule of proposed changes to the DCO submitted at Deadline 6 in response to AP 1 from ISH 3.
3SERT2.	Applicant, KCC, SCC, ESC	<p><b>Tourism monitoring and contributions</b></p> <p>SCC [REP5-185] has stated that the applicant should commit to monitor effects on accommodation capacity and tourism in coordination with cumulative developments. SCC also suggests a proportionate contribution to foster tourism, similar to the fund created by Sizewell C, if further embedded mitigation is not feasible.</p> <p><b>All County and District Councils:</b> The ExA require that the Councils work together to provide wording for a requirement for the applicant to monitor the effects of the proposed development on tourism and</p>	SCC has worked with ESC and drafted wording which is set out in SCC’s schedule of proposed changes to the DCO submitted at Deadline 6. However, collaboration with the other authorities and confirmation of agreement of wording has not been possible for Deadline 6. SCC will seek to engage with the other Councils to reach agreement for Deadline 7 and provide any amended wording as appropriate.

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
		accommodation, with adaptive management/mitigation if required.	
3SERT3.	Applicant, KCC, ESC, SCC	<p><b>Permissive Paths</b></p> <p>Within the REAC [REP5-115] the applicant has stated under LV13 that it would consider opportunities to provide permissive access across the Saxmundham Converter Station site and establishing an attractive amenity value for users of the permanent PRow diversions.</p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Provide a plan of the potential permissive paths. Furthermore, explain why a permissive path rather than a public right of way is proposed.</p> <p><b>SCC and ESC:</b> Comment on the use of permissive paths as opposed to public rights of way, in terms of value for users and functionality for example.</p>	<p>A Public Right of Way (PROW) is a legally protected route across private land that the public has a permanent right to use, whereas a permissive path is a route where the landowner voluntarily grants access, which can be withdrawn at any time. A PROW is also signed/waymarked and is maintained by local highway authority rights of way.</p> <p>Whilst permissive access across the converter site is welcomed, it would be preferred if the routes can be secured for future generations for recreation, tourism, wellbeing and for alternative access for visitors and employees as a non-motorised route.</p> <p>The route needs to be available for use by the public for the life of the site, be clearly signed and waymarked, and link to existing highway/PROWs.</p> <p>Therefore, SCC PROW would require these permissive routes to be included in the PROWMP, to be in place for the life of the application and to meet local highway authority specifications for signing and surfacing. The surfacing should be fit for public use, ensuring paths remain open and unobstructed. The surfacing should be</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>suitable for the user types including pedestrians and mobility scooters. Any gates should be accessibility friendly, and fencing should be set back at least 0.5m and hedges and trees set back 2m.</p> <p>SCC PROW still considers the route to the south of the B1119 to be provided as a PROW, to take pedestrians etc off of the carriageway and to provide an alternate route away from the converter station that will be better screened by vegetation. If this offsetting cannot be secured the applicant and is agreed by both parties, then a financial contribution can be agreed for local mitigation which could include the provision of new connecting routes and associated works.</p> <p>Due to the presence of Lionlink, we expect the applicant and Lionlink to work in a co-ordinated way to provide meaningful permissive routes to link communities and employees. Opportunities should be sought for making permissive routes PROW should be sought with Lionlink.</p> <p>Aldeburgh footpath 006 is recognised that there will be significant impact during construction and use due to cumulative effects. No mitigation has been confirmed at this stage. This is part of the Suffolk Coast Path, an important regional/national trail and walkers will have to contend with the landfall site at one end – noise, traffic,</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
			<p>visual intrusion and loss of tranquillity, in what is a very tranquil and beautiful area. Suggested mitigation for Adleburgh footpath 006 is: Re-surfacing of FP6 from Sluice cottage at the beach to the old railway line with some minor/suitable vegetation clearance to be agreed with the local highway authority or a financial contribution can be agreed for this work to be undertaken.</p> <p>APP-059 A6.2 acknowledges that there will be significant impact during construction and use due to cumulative effects. The applicant has stated that the developing PROW management plan will include measures to ensure adequate co-ordination. This approach is welcomed, however, no mitigation has been identified for the scenario that coordinated closures cannot occur due to different work programmes by SPR or EAN1 for example. No mitigation has been confirmed at this stage.</p>

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	SCC Answer:
<b>12 Health and wellbeing</b>			
3HW3	Applicant	<p><b>Mental Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Plan</b></p> <p>SCC [REP5-178] considers that the applicant should develop and implement a proportionate but robust Mental Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Plan for the duration of the proposed development (construction and early operation), with clear reporting routes and defined review points. The ExA requires the applicant to commit to such a monitoring plan. If the applicant does not agree to this, explain in detail why</p>	<p>SCC welcomes the ExA position regarding the development of a proportionate but robust Mental Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Plan for the duration of the proposed development.</p> <p>SCC would be willing to work with the applicant on the development of the monitoring plan</p>