



The Planning Act 2008

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission for the Sea Link Project

East Suffolk Council Submissions on Community Mitigation Payments at Deadline 7

Deadline 7 (29 April 2026)

Application: EN020026

East Suffolk Council: [REDACTED]

1. **Introduction and background**

- 1.1 East Suffolk Council (ESC) makes the following submission at Deadline 7 addressing the matter of Community Mitigation Payments.
- 1.2 In line with ESC's concerns and representations submitted throughout the examination, ESC approached the Applicant proposing that it agree to enter into obligations to make payments to offset the impacts and disruption of the Sea Link Project on the affected local communities in East Suffolk – referred to in this submission as 'Community Mitigation Payments' (CMPs). For this purpose, ESC proposed that the parties agree to enter into a Deed of Obligation made under section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972, being the appropriate mechanism used to secure such CMPs. It should be noted that this relates to CMPs for local impacts entirely separate from the funding that would be provided in line with the published Guidance from the Department of Energy Security and Next Zero (DESNZ) on 'Community funds for transmission infrastructure' which sets out how DESNZ expects projects that have not yet commenced construction (which would include projects where work has not started on site for the full main works contract) to comply with this guidance.
- 1.3 ESC raised the principle of such an agreement with the Applicant at the earliest stages, prior to examination, in its Consultation Response Letter to the 2023 Statutory Consultation¹, dated 18 December 2023 as noted below. Since then, ESC has made numerous references to both parties entering into such an agreement as will be explained below, but as the Examining Authority (ExA) has noted, the Applicant has throughout the examination adopted a practice of not responding to all submissions made by stakeholders and third parties – particularly when, it is suggested, those submissions are not in the interest of the Applicant.
- 1.4 As a consequence, having failed to secure any response from the Applicant on the subject of CMPs, ESC had no choice but to raise the matter formally with the Applicant as the examination was approaching the later stages because (i) the Applicant had simply ignored earlier references and submissions and (ii) there remain a number of matters in respect of which ESC considers there to be unresolved issues and impacts which have not been adequately mitigated by the Applicant. As the ExA will appreciate, this unfortunate and entirely avoidable position is evident from the matters remaining unresolved as identified in the SoCG and ESC's PADSS. One of the critical impacts which the Applicant has failed to mitigate, by way of example, is socio-economic impacts on tourism arising from the project which have been well rehearsed by ESC in its examination submissions.
- 1.5 ESC is extremely disappointed that the Applicant simply refused to countenance entering into negotiations with ESC in respect of securing CMPs to offset impacts on the local community. The Applicant has simply dismissed ESC's concerns on the basis that it does not consider there to be any such impacts arising from the Sea Link Project that require mitigation, and that the initiation of discussions from ESC was unexpected (which, as ESC has demonstrated, is not the case and the Applicant has

¹ <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2026-02/ESC-Response-to-Sea-Link-Statutory-Consultation.pdf>

ignored all the references to mitigation payments made by ESC during the course of the pre-examination and examination process).

- 1.6 ESC is extremely concerned that, on receipt of a suggested draft agreement, based on precedent established with earlier DCO consents, the Applicant has reverted with an outright refusal to engage with the matter, given that ESC has consistently, throughout the examination and indeed before, flagged its position in its written representations. It cannot be the case that the Applicant should be allowed to avoid an obligation to mitigate the harm, disruption and long-lasting damage that the Sea Link Project will cause to the local community and the area generally.
- 1.7 ESC raised the principle of a mitigation agreement during the earliest stages, prior to the examination, in its Consultation Response Letter to the 2023 Statutory Consultation, dated 18 December 2023. This was recognised and acknowledged by the Applicant itself in the SoCGs with ESC (most recently in [REP3-058]) at Appendix A Record of Engagement which reports the matter as a ‘Discussion point’ as follows:
- “ESC raised concerns over the need for the Proposed Project, impact on coastal processes, operational noise and vibration, construction noise and vibration and interproject cumulative effects, air quality, landscape, design and heritage, ecology, tourism and economy and community compensation. ESC also confirmed that they objected to the Proposed Project due to harm to communities, environment and economy of Suffolk.”* (Emphasis added)
- 1.8 Thereafter, the matter was formally raised by ESC during the examination in its Local Impact Report (‘LIR’) [REP1-128] under the heading of ‘Community Impacts’ (at section 6.5.3) which unequivocally stated that: *“ESC expects that suitable mitigation and compensation is fully explored and implemented in order to offset residual community impacts introduced as a result of this project”*.
- 1.9 The matter was also raised elsewhere within the LIR at paragraphs 2.2.2, 3.0.6, 3.1.1, 6.5.3, 7.7.2, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 as copied below.
- (a) *‘2.2.2 Questions were raised about community benefit and compensation to the local communities affected by the construction of the project, including impacts on holiday rentals and tourist accommodation.’*
- (b) *‘3.0.6 ESC will expect the Applicant to provide genuine levels of mitigation and compensation to offset the impacts introduced by the Sea Link project - and will expect those elements to be formally recognised by the inclusion in the Order of Requirements and/or protective provisions – as may be appropriate.’*
- (c) *‘3.1.1 Community Benefits • Engagement with ESC and the local community regarding how the project’s residual impacts can be effectively compensated. (LIR Section 7.7)’*
- (d) *‘6.5.3 ESC expects that suitable mitigation and compensation is fully explored and implemented in order to offset residual community impacts introduced as a result of this project.’*

- (e) *'7.7.2 If the scheme is granted development consent by the Secretary of State, there must be adequate compensation for communities that will be adversely affected. ESC would welcome further engagement with the Applicant on this matter.'*
- (f) *'7.7.4 Where residual harm is identified across the onshore order limits following the application of the mitigation hierarchy, ESC expects NGET first to look to mitigate the effects, and then where appropriate to look at compensation for residual impacts. ESC requires further discussion with the Applicant as to how to compensate the residual impacts.'*
- (g) *'7.7.5 It is again important to reiterate that Sea Link is not being developed in isolation - there are multiple other projects proposing compensatory measures so there is potential for NGET to co-ordinate compensation associated with Sea Link with other measures agreed with other project promoters.'*

1.10 As such, ESC could not have made its position clearer, yet the Applicant never approached ESC to discuss how to mitigate the community impacts.

1.11 Subsequently, ESC expressed the same sentiments in both the draft SoCG (most recently in Table 3.11 of [REP3-058]) and draft PADSS (initially in [REP3-080] and later in [REP5-184]), making the position clear, as follows:

- (a) *"If the scheme is granted development consent by the Secretary of State, there must be adequate compensation for communities that will be adversely affected. The Council would welcome further engagement with the Applicant on this matter. We understand the communities may have ideas on areas to offset or compensate where impacts are directly linked to the project. It is again important to reiterate that SeaLink is not being developed in isolation - there are multiple other projects agreeing compensatory measures, so there is potential for NGET to coordinate compensation associated with SeaLink with other measures proposed by other project promoters."* (SoCG - Ref 3.11.1 – version dated 13 Jan 2026.)
- (b) *"ESC objects to this project given the impacts it will introduce on local communities, whether alone or cumulatively with other projects. Should the Secretary of State grant consent for the project, in light of the concerns raised, ESC will expect compensation to be agreed with the Applicant to offset the impacts and disruption introduced."* (PADSS - Ref 1.01 – version dated 13 Jan 2026.) (Emphasis added)
- (c) Specifically, regarding socio economic impacts, the PADSS (version dated 13 January 2026, reference 7.04) included the following request - *"There is a high degree of interdependency between visitor destinations, employment, and supply chains within East Suffolk. Visitors move from destination to destination, employees need to access their employment, and the potential for the displacement of visitors during construction should not be ignored. Should this project proceed, it is essential that this impact is appropriately considered, and appropriate mitigation and compensation is provided to support the continued success of the visitor economy."*

ESC would expect to see that impacts on individual receptors across the District of East Suffolk, including holiday rentals, tourist accommodation, farms and businesses directly affected by the changes resulting from the cumulative impacts of the Project with other proposed/consented projects in the area, be appropriately mitigated and compensated. ESC requests that these mitigation and compensation measures should be developed in collaboration with ESC and the businesses themselves to maximise the effectiveness of the proposed strategies.” (PADSS - Ref 7.04 – version dated 13 Jan 2026.)

- These sentiments were repeated in the following version of the PADSS, dated 13 March 2026 at Ref D5.1.01 and Ref D5.7.04, and further clarifying that - *“There is a high degree of interdependency between visitor destinations, employment, and supply chains within East Suffolk. Visitors move from destination to destination, employees need to access their employment, and the potential for the displacement of visitors during construction should not be ignored. Should this project proceed, it is essential that this impact is appropriately considered, and appropriate mitigation and compensation is provided to support the continued success of the visitor economy”* at Ref D5.7.04.

1.12 Reference was also made by ESC in the following written submissions during the examination:

- (a) [\[AS-076\]](#) ESC Response to the ExA’s s89(3) Letter dated 8 July 2025 - PADSS:

‘ESC would expect to see that impacts on individual receptors across the District of East Suffolk, including holiday rentals, tourist accommodation, farms and businesses directly affected by the changes resulting from the cumulative impact of the Project, be appropriately mitigated and compensated where impacts are forecast. ESC requests that these mitigation and compensation measures should be developed in collaboration with ESC and the businesses themselves to maximise the effectiveness of the proposed strategies.’ (At Ref 9.01.)

- (b) [\[REP5-189\]](#) ESC Response to response to ExA’s ExQ2 - Response to question 2CEInter1:

‘ESC has no further specific requests for mitigation measures for inter-project cumulative effects at this stage, but notes that it has requested further mitigation for individual topic areas, and these would also help to address significant inter-project cumulative effects. ESC is particularly concerned about inter-project cumulative effects on socio-economic receptors, and disagrees with the Applicant’s conclusion of ‘no significant inter-project cumulative effects’. To help to mitigate these, ESC’s requests in individual topic areas include:...

Notwithstanding ESC’s above requests for further mitigation, where significant residual effects remain, ESC will expect adequate compensation and is in the process of engaging with the Applicant on this matter with a view to securing a Section 111 agreement.’ (Response to 2CEInter1, page 36).

- (c) [REP6-160] ESC Response Post-Hearing Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 3 dealing with environmental matters:

'In terms of mitigation, a coordinated and strategic approach is required. It is not sufficient for each project to propose isolated or siloed measures. Any mitigation—particularly financial contributions—should be designed to operate collectively across projects, recognising that the impact itself is cumulative. This includes, for example, contributions toward tourism support and destination marketing, which should be aligned with and, where appropriate, added to existing initiatives such as those established in connection with Sizewell C. The objective must be to maximise effectiveness through a joined-up approach, rather than fragmenting resources across multiple uncoordinated schemes.' (Section 5.2).

- 1.13 It is clear that the Applicant has wilfully ignored ESC's representations addressing impacts on the affected local communities and avoided seeking to deal with the issue of ESC's clearly expressed expectation that impacts on the affected local communities would be mitigated.
- 1.14 It is not acceptable – in what is meant to be an equitable examination process – for NGET simply to ignore the matter during the course of the examination and before and then dismiss it as never having been raised before. Indeed in this context, it is for the Applicant to seek proactively to resolve all remaining issues with the interested parties and where possible to mitigate the effects of its project, such that at the end of the examination it has sought to remove all objections.
- 1.15 The Applicant's failure to engage, and now its outright refusal to enter into a deed of obligation, is both unreasonable and contrary to precedent set by other major projects in the area. ESC fails to understand the Applicant's position that community mitigation should not be provided in respect of this project. The Applicant is acting entirely contrary to the precedent set by the other consented NSIPs in East Suffolk, namely, EA1N, EA2 and Sizewell C, all of which agreed to provide funding to both mitigate the impact of the projects and provide legacy benefits for local communities or the communities affected by those projects, and entered into deeds of obligation with ESC in recognition of their impacts.
- 1.16 The mechanism for the provision of mitigating in respect of impacts arising as a result of NSIPs is by means of a deed of obligation made under section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972, a principle which is well established. The fact that the Sea Link project is smaller than schemes such as Sizewell C is not an excuse not to mitigate the impacts it will have. It is clear from ESC's submission at the Issue Specific Hearings (and in its subsequent written submissions) on the matter of socio-economic impacts of the project during the course of the examination, that there are identified impacts that have not been resolved.
- 1.17 ESC would stress that the issue of mitigating for the affected communities is not a trivial matter despite the claims by the Applicant. The affected communities are being significantly impacted by this project, as has been made very clear not just in ESC's

examination submissions, particularly in light of the cumulative effect it will have with the other consented NSIP projects in the area, but by the local community itself at the open floor hearings – to which the Applicant has seemingly paid scant regard. The lack of expressions of support for this Project being most noticeable during the entire examination.

- 1.18 The Applicant's attitude in dismissing the principle of entering in a deed of obligation is unacceptable but in the context of the manner in which the applicant has conducted itself throughout the examination, unsurprising, and entirely symptomatic of its persistent failure to acknowledge the impacts that the Sea Link project will have on host communities. Indeed, the Applicant has approached this on the basis that all such impacts have been trumped by the overarching need and urgency for the Project, thus treating local concerns as a hindrance to the Applicant's urgent need for delivery, and viewing the project's proposed impacts in isolation and crucially not cumulatively.
- 1.19 Given that the Applicant has refused to enter into a section 111 Deed of Obligation, ignoring established precedent and indeed denying any expectation of such an agreement, and ESC therefore requests that a Requirement should be included within the dDCO as follows, in order to ensure that CMPs are secured for the affected communities:

'Agreement with Local Planning Authority

[x].—(1) Prior to the commencement of the authorised development the undertaker will enter into an agreement in writing with the relevant planning authority with respect to—

(a) Mitigations for the local community under the powers conferred by section 111 of The Local Government Act 1972; and

(b) such other matters as the parties may agree.

(2) Such an agreement may, without limitation on the scope of paragraph (1)—

(a) include an agreement between the undertaker and the relevant planning authority specifying a reasonable time for undertaking matters; and

(b) contain such terms as to payment and otherwise as the parties consider appropriate.

(3) Any dispute between the undertaker and relevant planning authority in respect of whether any of the terms of the agreement are necessary may be referred by either party to arbitration under article 62 (arbitration).'

- 1.20 ESC would stress, however, that it still remains open to engaging in constructive dialogue with the Applicant to secure CMPs following the close of examination. The approach of the close of examination should not preclude the parties from seeking to negotiate an agreement in the coming months to deal with this matter, in respect of which the which the parties can of course update the Secretary of State as to progress during the post examination period.

1.21 The ExA will appreciate that ESC has sought to work with the Applicant in respect of this Project throughout the examination in order to achieve the best possible outcome for the local community in the circumstances of this nationally significant project and the others in the areas in respect of which construction is already underway. ESC is however dismayed by the Applicant's unreasonable position in simply dismissing the principle of community mitigation and the real impact upon these communities, and its 'surprise' given ESC's written submissions which referred to the need for CMPs. ESC therefore seeks the assurance of a provision within the DCO, if the project is granted consent.

2. **ESC CMPs Heads of Terms**

2.1 ESC has given careful consideration to the impacts of the Sea Link Project, and is proposing that CMPs are made for the following matters which are identified as unresolved impacts in ESC's PADSS.

2.2 The list below represents the Head of Terms for CMPs which ESC would seek in a Deed of Obligation with the Applicant (references below are to ESC's final PADSS submitted at DL7):

- (a) *Tourism Support Fund* - providing mitigation for impacts on tourism and visitor economy in the district. Financial contribution for the purposes of monitoring and mitigating any impacts of the project on the tourism industry in Impacted Areas including but not limited to a) support provided to tourist accommodation providers, b) marketing and promotion activities for East Suffolk and events within the district, c) supporting existing projects within Impacted Areas, and d) the provision of staff to support the tourist industry in Impacted Areas. The residual impacts in respect of the visitor economy, particularly for coastal communities at the landfall, are explained in the PADSS at Ref: D7.4.04 which confirms in conclusion that: '*The Applicant's view that there will be 'no residual significant effects' is therefore not supported by ESC or the local communities it represents*'. ESC also notes that Paragraph 5.13.11 of NPS EN-1 notes that '*The Secretary of State should consider any relevant positive provisions the applicant has made or is proposing to make to mitigate impacts (for example through planning obligations) and any legacy benefits that may arise as well as any options for phasing development in relation to the socio-economic impacts*'. (Emphasis added)
- (b) *Accommodation Monitoring Fund* - to enable the monitoring of any unlicensed accommodation for workers associated with the project. Financial contribution for the purposes of supporting the employment of a suitably qualified Officer to monitor the impacts of the project on accommodation provision in Impacted Areas and support in planning enforcement against any unlicensed use of accommodation for the housing of workers associated with the project. The residual impacts on the visitor economy are explained in PADSS at Ref: D7.4.04, which states ESC's position that '*in a worst-case scenario, there is a very strong potential for the in-combination cumulative demand effects of multiple NSIP developments to exceed the supply of visitor accommodation*'.
- (c) *Tourism Legacy Fund* - to provide mitigation for any latent impacts of the project on the tourism industry and support legacy benefits for the economy of the area. Financial contribution for the purposes of supporting the tourism industry

in Impacted Areas including but not limited to a) monitoring of any latent impacts of the construction of the project, b) marketing and promotion activities for East Suffolk and events within the district and c) the provision of staff to support the tourism industry in Impacted Areas. The residual impacts on tourism in East Suffolk are explained in the PADSS at Ref: D7.4.04, which makes clear that *'ESC considers that the combination of impacts resulting from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and other developments in East Suffolk would have significant effects on visitor perception and experience, resulting in a reduction in repeat tourism, long-term reputational damage, and economic decline. ESC is concerned that the Applicant has failed to adequately recognise these cumulative impacts'*. Further, the need and importance of monitoring effects for this which fund is sought is required because – *'Without ongoing monitoring and evaluation, changes in baseline conditions cannot be assessed and the effects on socioeconomic, leisure and tourism receptors cannot be determined'*. ESC also notes that Paragraph 5.13.11 of NPS EN-1 notes that *'The Secretary of State should consider any relevant positive provisions the applicant has made or is proposing to make to mitigate impacts (for example through planning obligations) and any legacy benefits that may arise as well as any options for phasing development in relation to the socio-economic impacts'*. (Emphasis added)

- (d) *Landscape Mitigation Fund* - to mitigate the landscape impacts of the project. Financial contribution for the purposes of mitigating the impact of the project upon the landscape in Impacted Areas, including but not limited to a) the planting of new hedgerows and woodland, b) the enhancement of existing landscape and c) the removal of land from arable cultivation and the establishment of other habitats. Landscape impacts of the project are addressed by ESC in the PADSS at Refs: D7.3.03 (Landscape Planting), D7.3.04 (Adaptive landscape management), D7.3.05 (Early planting) and D7.3.06 (Impacts on woodland vegetation). ESC notes that Paragraph 5.10.6 of NPS EN-1 states that *'the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate'*.
- (e) *Landscape Legacy Fund* - to mitigate any residual landscape impacts of the project. Financial contribution for the purposes of landscape enhancements in Impacted Areas following the Operation of the project, including but not limited to a) the planting of new hedgerows and woodland, b) the enhancement of existing landscapes, c) the removal of land from arable cultivation and the establishment of other habitats. ESC's concerns regarding residual landscape impacts from the project are outlined in the PADSS at Refs: D7.3.03 (Landscape Planting), D7.3.04 (Adaptive landscape management), D7.3.05 (Early planting) and D7.3.06 (Impacts on woodland vegetation). ESC also notes that Paragraph 5.10.19 of NPS EN-1 highlights the potential for applicants to recognise and incorporate *'opportunities for creating positive benefits or enhancement...into the design, delivery and operation of the scheme'*.
- (f) *Ecological Mitigation Fund* - to mitigate the ecological impacts of the project. Financial contribution for the purposes of mitigating the ecological impacts of the project in Impacted Areas, including but not limited to a) the provision of seed to support farmland birds, b) the establishment of habitats to support species including bats, hedgehogs and reptiles and c) enhancement of existing landscapes to enhance biodiversity. ESC's concerns regarding project wide

ecology impacts are set out in its PADSS at Refs: D7.8.01 (Hazel dormice) and D7.8.03 (Bats). ESC notes that Paragraph 5.4.36 of NPS EN-1 states that *'Applicants should include appropriate avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures as an integral part of the proposed development'*.

- (g) *Ecological Legacy Fund* - to mitigate the any residual ecological impacts of the project. Financial contribution for the purposes of supporting ecological enhancements in Impacted Areas, including but not limited to a) the establishment of habitats to support species impacted by the project including bats, hedgehogs and reptiles and b) the enhancement of existing landscapes to enhance biodiversity. ESC's concerns regarding residual ecological impacts, where there is disagreement with the Applicant, are set out in its PADSS at Refs: D7.8.01 (Hazel dormice) and D7.8.03 (Bats). ESC notes that Paragraph 5.4.36 of NPS EN-1 states that *'Applicants should include appropriate avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures as an integral part of the proposed development'*.
- (h) *Coastal Monitoring Fund* - to monitor and mitigate any impacts of the project landfall on coastal processes. Financial contribution for the purposes of monitoring the impacts of the project on coastal processes in the vicinity of landfall in Thorpeness. ESC's concerns regarding residual impacts on coastal processes from the project landfall are addressed in the PADSS at Refs: D7.2.01 (Depth of cable burial at the Suffolk landfall), D7.2.02 (Final HDD profiles to be approved) and D7.2.03 (Mitigation in the event of cable exposure), D7.2.04 (Post-installation landfall survey reports), D7.2.05 (Risk of frac-out) and D7.2.06 Access to the landfall). ESC notes that Paragraph 5.6.17 of NPS EN-1 states that *'The Secretary of State should ensure that applicants...will undertake pre- and post-construction coastal monitoring arrangements with defined triggers for intervention and restoration'*.
- (i) *Community Projects Fund* - to mitigate impacts on the community as described in ESC's PADSS. Financial contribution for the purposes of Community Projects in Impacted Areas, including but not limited to a) projects that promote community cohesion and wellbeing, b) projects that mitigate any impacts of the project upon wellbeing and c) projects that support those with Protected Characteristics that may be disproportionately impacted by the project. This is required to mitigate the many and wide-ranging impacts on the local communities in East Suffolk arising from the Project as identified by ESC in the PADSS. ESC notes that Paragraph 4.4.6 of NPS EN-1 states that *'opportunities should be taken to mitigate indirect impacts by promoting local improvements to encourage health and wellbeing'*.
- (j) *Heritage Assets Fund* - to provide a legacy fund to mitigate ongoing heritage impacts of the project. Financial contribution for the purposes of the preservation, enhancement and interpretation of heritage assets in Impacted Areas, including but not limited to a) the delivery of community heritage and archaeology projects and outreach work, including by third parties contracted by the Council, b) the preservation of designated heritage assets and c) the implementation of signage and interpretation for heritage assets. ESC's concerns regarding heritage as explained in the PADSS at Ref: D7.3.02 that the project will undoubtedly impact designated heritage assets. ESC notes that Paragraph 5.9.26 of NPS EN-1 states that *'The Secretary of State should consider the desirability of sustaining and, where appropriate, enhancing the significance of heritage assets, the contribution of their settings and the positive*

contribution that their conservation can make to sustainable communities, including to their quality of life, their economic vitality, and to the public's enjoyment of these assets'.

- (k) *Environmental Health Officer Support Fund* - to enable the monitoring and mitigation of noise and vibration impacts of the project. Financial contribution for the purposes of supporting the employment of a suitably qualified Environmental Health Officer to monitor any environmental health impacts associated with the project. ESC has very serious concerns regarding project-wide impacts from noise and vibration for the reasons explained in the PADSS Refs: D7.9.01 to D7.9.04 (inclusive) in respect of which it seeks mitigation to enable the monitoring of any environmental health impacts associated with the project. Given that NPS EN-1 Paragraph 5.12.17 makes clear the need for *'the effective management and control of noise'*, ESC will require additional resource to enable it to monitor and enforce the Applicant's compliance with its committed mitigation and management measures. ESC notes that Paragraph 4.2.14 of NPS EN-1 acknowledges that *'the increasing number of development consent applications coming forward will put pressure on existing systems within the NSIP regime'*, and considers this indicates a need for increased LPA resourcing to support project delivery whilst ensuring maximum community and environment mitigation is secured.
- (l) *Leisure Support Fund* - providing mitigation for impacts on leisure and visitor economy in the district. Financial contribution to support the enhancement and maintenance of sports facilities at Leiston Leisure Centre for the use of workers associated with the Sea Link project, as well as members of the public more widely. ESC sets out the residual impacts on the leisure and visitor economy (particularly for coastal communities at the landfall) in the PADSS at Ref: D7.4.04 in respect of which mitigation is required. ESC also notes that Paragraph 5.13.11 of NPS EN-1 notes that *'The Secretary of State should consider any relevant positive provisions the applicant has made or is proposing to make to mitigate impacts (for example through planning obligations) and any legacy benefits that may arise as well as any options for phasing development in relation to the socio-economic impacts'*. (Emphasis added)
- (m) *Town and Parish Council Support Fund* – to mitigate the impact of the project on town and parish council resourcing. Financial contribution for the purposes of supporting Town and Parish Councils in Impacted Areas to engage with the project, including but not limited to a) the provision of officer support to engage with the discharge of requirements under the DCO and b) the payment of funds to support with increased resources required to engagement with planning applications and the discharge of requirements associated with the project. ESC requests this financial support in order to assist in mitigating the financial impact as a result of the Project based on concerns raised by its constituent local community regarding the town and parish council resourcing.
- (n) *Fund Administration Sum* – to mitigate the cost of providing staff to support with the administration of this funding. Financial contribution for the purposes of administering the funding collected under this agreement.