

AENC-NG-CNS-REP-0032

# Norwich to Tilbury

## Volume 5: Reports and Statements

Document: 5.9.10 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Chelmsford  
City Council - Tracked Changes Version

Final Issue B

February 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027

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

**nationalgrid**

# Revision History

<u>Version</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Submitted at</u>
<u>A</u>	<u>29 August 2025</u>	<u>DCO Application</u>
<u>B</u>	<u>26 February 2026</u>	<u>Deadline 1</u>

# Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Project Description	2
1.3	Format and Structure of this Document	3
<b>2.</b>	<b>Record of Key Engagement</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	Summary of Key Engagement	4
<b>3.</b>	<b>Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Overview	5
3.2	Project Development, Description and Design	6
3.3	Ecology and Biodiversity	20
3.4	Air Quality	36
3.5	Noise and Vibration	41
3.6	Health and Wellbeing	49
3.7	Historic Environment	59
3.8	Landscape and Visual	76
3.9	Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism	92
3.10	Traffic and transport (including Public Rights of Way)	104
3.11	Cumulative Effects	106
3.12	Development Consent Order	132
3.13	Other Matters	136
3.14	Mitigation and Compensation	136
<b>4.</b>	<b>Confirmation of Agreement</b>	<b>139</b>

Table 3.1	Agreement Status for Matters presented in Section 3	5
Table 3.2	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Project Development, Description and Design Matters	6
Table 3.3	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Ecology and Biodiversity	20
Table 3.4	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Air Quality	36
Table 3.5	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Noise and Vibration	41
Table 3.6	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Health and Wellbeing	49
Table 3.7	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to the Historic Environment	59
Table 3.8	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Landscape and Visual	76
Table 3.9	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism	92
Table 3.10	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to traffic and transport	104
Table 3.11	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Cumulative Effects	106

Table 3.12	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Development Consent Order	132
Table 3.13	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Other Matters	136
Table 3.14	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Other Matters	136
Table A.1	Summary of Key Engagement between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council	143

Abbreviations	140
---------------	-----

## Appendix A Summary of Key Engagement between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Project Description	2
1.3	Format and Structure of this Document	3
<b>2.</b>	<b>Record of Key Engagement</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	Summary of Key Engagement	4
<b>3.</b>	<b>Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	Overview	13
3.2	Project Development, Description and Design	14
3.3	Ecology and Biodiversity	29
3.4	Air Quality	35
3.5	Noise and Vibration	39
3.6	Health and Wellbeing	43
3.7	Historic Environment	48
3.8	Landscape and Visual	56
3.9	Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism	65
3.10	Cumulative Effects	69
3.11	Development Consent Order	73
3.12	Other Matters	74
<b>4.</b>	<b>Confirmation of Agreement</b>	<b>75</b>

Table 2.1	Summary of Key Engagement between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council	5
Table 3.1	Agreement Status for Matters presented in Section 3	13
Table 3.2	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Project Development, Description and Design Matters	14
Table 3.3	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Ecology and Biodiversity	29
Table 3.4	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Air Quality	35
Table 3.5	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Noise and Vibration	39
Table 3.6	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Health and Wellbeing	43
Table 3.7	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to the Historic Environment	48
Table 3.8	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Landscape and Visual	56
Table 3.9	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism	65
Table 3.10	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Cumulative Effects	69





# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared relating to the application for development consent for the proposed Norwich to Tilbury project (the 'Project') made by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (referred to as 'National Grid' within this document). It has been prepared in accordance with the guidance published by the Department of Communities and Local Government (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2015).
- 1.1.2 This SoCG has been prepared by National Grid as the Applicant and Chelmsford City Council (CCC). Chelmsford City Council is a prescribed consultee under Section 43 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) as a Host Authority.
- 1.1.3 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and /or the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.4 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties. It identifies areas of the Project within the Development Consent Order (DCO) application ('the Application'), where matters are agreed, under discussion or not agreed between the parties.
- 1.1.5 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and detailed wording within it is still being discussed between the parties.
- 1.1.6 This draft SoCG has been prepared at an early stage phase of the DCO examination process, for deadline 1 ahead of submission. It is intended to be a live and working document which will be updated as the Project progresses and shared with Chelmsford City Council at key points for discussion.
- 1.1.7 Future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. A final SoCG will be prepared ahead of the close of the DCO Examination. Unlike a final SoCG, this draft SoCG has not been officially signed by either party.
- 1.1.8 The parties will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure this SoCG is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.
- 1.1.9 This SoCG has been structured to reflect topics of the Application which are relevant to CCC. The applicable matters considered within this SoCG apply to CCC's statutory remit. The following bullet points present the topics included in this SoCG (they are also presented in Section 3):
- Project development, description and design
  - Ecology and Biodiversity

- Air Quality
- Noise and Vibration
- Health and Wellbeing
- Historic Environment
- Landscape and Visual
- Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism
- Cumulative Effects
- Development Consent Order
- Other Matters

Chelmsford City Council will have regard to any points raised by statutory bodies and other relevant Interested Parties in respect of the matters covered in the SoCG. Therefore, this version reflects the current position of Chelmsford City Council but may be subject to change during the examination. A final position will be recorded in the final SoCG ~~by the to be submitted~~ close ~~of~~to the examination.

## 1.2 Project Description

1.2.1 The Project is a proposal by National Grid to upgrade the electricity transmission system in East Anglia between Norwich and Tilbury, comprising:

- A new 400 kilovolt (kV) electricity transmission connection of approximately 180 km overall length from Norwich Main Substation to Tilbury Substation via Bramford Substation, a new East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) Substation and a new Tilbury North Substation, including:
  - Approximately 159 km of new overhead line supported on approximately 509 pylons, either standard steel lattice pylons (approximately 50 m in height) or low height steel lattice pylons (approximately 40 m in height) and some of which would be gantries (typically up to 15 m in height) within proposed Cable Sealing End (CSE) compounds or existing or proposed substations
  - Approximately 21 km of 400 kV underground cabling, some of which would be located through the Dedham Vale National Landscape (an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB1))
- Up to seven new CSE compounds (with permanent access) to connect the overhead lines to the underground cables
- Modification works to connect into the existing Norwich Main Substation and a substation extension at the existing Bramford Substation
- A new 400 kV substation on the Tendring Peninsula, referred to as the EACN Substation (with a new permanent access). This is proposed to be an Air Insulated Switchgear (AIS) substation
- A new 400 kV substation to the south of Orsett Golf Course in Essex, referred to as the Tilbury North Substation (with a new permanent access). This is proposed to be a Gas Insulated Switchgear (GIS) substation

- Modifications to the existing National Grid Electricity Transmission overhead lines to facilitate the connection of the existing network into the new Tilbury North Substation to provide connection to the Tilbury Substation
  - Ancillary and/or temporary works associated with the construction of the Project.
- 1.2.2 In addition, third party utilities diversions and/or modifications would be required to facilitate the construction of the Project. There would also be land required for environmental mitigation and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).
- 1.2.3 As well as the permanent infrastructure, land would also be required temporarily for construction activities including, for example, working areas for construction equipment and machinery, site offices, welfare, storage and temporary construction access.
- 1.2.4 The Project would be designed, constructed and operated in accordance with applicable health and safety legislation. The Project will need to comply with design safety standards including the Security and Quality of Supply Standard (SQSS), which sets out the criteria and methodology for planning and operating the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS). This informs a suite of National Grid policies and processes, which contain details on design standards required to be met when designing, constructing and operating assets such as those proposed for the Project.

### 1.3 Format and Structure of this Document

- 1.3.1 This SoCG is structured as follows:
- **Section 2** provides a summary of the key engagement undertaken to date with CCC
  - **Section 3** summarises the key matters and captures the status of each issue / matter
  - **Section 4** includes the sign off sheet

## 2. Record of Key Engagement

### 2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 National Grid has engaged with CCC on the Project throughout the pre-application process. This has included:

- Non-statutory consultation in Spring 2022 and Summer 2023
- Statutory consultation in Spring 2024
- Targeted consultations in Spring 2025
- Regular meetings with lead officers about the Project as a whole
- Regular ‘Thematic Group’ meetings bringing together host authorities to discuss specific topics
- One to one / small group technical meetings on specific detailed matters
- Sharing of papers and draft documentation at key stages

2.1.2 Further details on National Grid’s engagement with stakeholders is provided in the Consultation Report and the Environmental Statement.

### 2.2 Summary of Key Engagement

2.2.1 [Table A.1](#) ~~Table 2.1~~ provides an overview of the key engagement that has taken place between National Grid and CCC.

2.2.2 It is agreed that the below is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

# 3. ~~Table 2.1~~ Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion

## 3.1 Overview

3.1.1 This chapter details the matters relevant to Chelmsford City Council which have been agreed, not agreed or are under discussion between the parties. Matters are arranged by topic (using broad headings, or EIA chapter headings where appropriate) and each matter is given a unique reference number to aid identification.

3.1.2 The red, amber, green status shows the level of agreement with CCC. Descriptions of the different levels are summarised in .

Table 3.1 Agreement Status for Matters presented in Section 3

<u>Status</u>	<u>Description</u>
<u>Not Agreed</u>	<u>Indicates a final position, where it has not been possible to resolve the issue to the agreement of both parties and there remains a difference of opinion.</u>
<u>Under discussion</u>	<u>Indicates where issues are the subject of active on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.</u>
<u>Agreed</u>	<u>Indicates where an issue has been agreed or resolved satisfactorily to the agreement of both parties.</u>

3.1.3 Engagement will continue as the Project develops and progresses through the various stages of the DCO process.

3.1.4 ~~Table 3.2~~ to provides the matters agreed, not agreed or under discussion in relation to the various topics.

## 3.2 Project Development, Description and Design

Table 3.2 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Project Development, Description and Design Matters

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>Strategic options/needs case</u>				
<u>3.2.1</u>	<u>Needs case</u>	<p><u>Norwich to Tilbury is being proposed because the existing network in East Anglia does not have sufficient capacity to manage the expected (and in some cases, contracted) increase in offshore wind farms (and interconnectors) needing to connect to the grid as part of the Government's target of reaching net zero by 2050. The project sits alongside other work to reinforce and upgrade the existing network in East Anglia. Norwich to Tilbury is listed as a key project in Appendix 2 of the NESO Clean Power 2030 Report.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>CCC Objects to the Project. Our objection is based on the following grounds:</u></p> <p><u>The preferred strategic option for Norwich to Tilbury remains an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission infrastructure and does not include overhead lines and pylons.</u></p> <p><u>CCC recognises that this option would need to be delivered at pace and without risk to national net zero, renewable energy and decarbonisation targets, and energy security.</u></p> <p><u>CCC consider that the presence of overhead lines and 40 – 50 m high pylons would be visually harmful and would result in unnecessary harm to heritage, landscape, ecology and residential amenity across the Chelmsford area.</u></p> <p><u>CCC accept that the network reinforcement offered by the project is needed to accommodate the additional planned electricity generation in the East Anglia region. It would also assist in the decarbonisation of the UK's energy</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

			<p><u>supply and help deliver the Government targets of net-zero by 2050. CCC recognise the rapidly growing need for electricity as the climate emergency requires us to help support the replacement of fossil fuels such as oil and gas as soon as possible and accept that the network reinforcement is needed to accommodate the expected growth in demand for electricity and the additional contracted/planned electricity generation in East Anglia. However, this does not mean that all proposals which may assist in reducing climate change should be approved at any cost.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.2.2	<u>Project timing</u>	<p><u>Timing for the project is driven by the needs case – when offshore wind farms are contracted to connect to the UK network – the first of which are contracted to connect in 2030. National Grid is legally obliged (under our Transmission Owner License) to provide capacity at the dates formally agreed in contracts with energy generators (or customers) by NESO.</u></p> <p><u>Appendix 2 of the NESO Clean Power 2030 Report shows that the constraint costs associated with a delay to the project timing as being between £2.7 and £2.8 billion.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC recognise the timing for the project is driven by the need for capacity in the transmission system by 2030 and acknowledge NGETs contractual and license obligations.</u></p> <p><u>Yet it is CCC's view that such benefit should not and cannot be secured at the expense of Chelmsford's local communities, landscapes and environments that would be affected by the proposal.</u></p> <p><u>CCC previously raised concerns in</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

**Updated position (February 2026):**

National Grid provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

responses to consultation regarding the uncertainties surrounding the timeframes for planned future connections stated by the National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET). The Hiorns Report (2023, jointly commissioned by Essex County Council, Suffolk County Council and Norfolk County Council) concluded that the case for the Norwich to Tilbury proposal focused solely on the contracted energy generation position to identify the maximum requirement for additional transmission capacity in East Anglia. The report identified that it is extremely unlikely that all of the contracted energy generation projects would come forward and/or connect at the volumes stated or dates contracted. As a result, the report concluded that there was scope for further analysis of potential options, including a potential offshore High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) link, and it could not be concluded that the NGET proposal was the best option. If the timing for the network reinforcement is less acute as suggested in the Hiorns report, CCC considers that alternative schemes to the proposed lattice pylons scheme, such as off-shore and High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) undergrounding, should be explored in more detail to ascertain whether they would achieve better environmental outcomes overall than the current submitted scheme.

			<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.2.3</u></p>	<p><u>Onshore route</u></p>	<p><u>An onshore route allows for greater energy capacity and connectivity to feed into the grid. In assessing offshore options to deliver the same capacity as an onshore overhead line, we would need to build three subsea cables and associated infrastructure, which would add significant cost and not meet the needs case for Norwich to Tilbury.</u></p> <p><u>Updated Strategic Options and Backcheck Review documents</u></p> <p><u>published at each consultation compare the environmental, technical, socioeconomic and financial implications for alternative routes, including offshore alternatives.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>CCC objects to the proposal.</u></p> <p><u>CCC consider that the preferred strategic option for Norwich to Tilbury remains an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission infrastructure and does not include overhead lines and pylons.</u></p> <p><u>CCC recognises that this option would need to be delivered at pace and without risk to national net zero, renewable energy and decarbonisation targets, and energy security.</u></p> <p><u>CCC consider that the presence of overhead lines and 40 - 50m high pylons would be visually harmful and would result in unnecessary harm to heritage, landscape, ecology and residential amenity across the Chelmsford area.</u></p> <p><u>CCC considers that credible alternatives such as an offshore centred approach or High Voltage Direct Current undergrounding, delivered at pace, to minimise onshore infrastructure across Chelmsford and Essex should be explored fully.</u></p> <p><u>CCC recognises that these options would need to be delivered in a timely manner, and without risk to national net zero,</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

			<p><u>renewable energy generation and decarbonisation targets and energy security.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.2.4	<p><u>Predominantly overhead line route</u></p>	<p><u>Norwich to Tilbury has been designed in line with policy statement EN-5 (which covers the development of new energy infrastructure) which concludes that in most cases, the government expects that overhead lines will be appropriate and should be used as standard to reinforce the grid.</u></p> <p><u>Updated Strategic Options and Backcheck Review documents published at each consultation compare the environmental, technical, socioeconomic and financial implications for alternative routes, including underground alternatives.</u></p> <p><u>The work undertaken shows that undergrounding, including using HVDC cables, would be significantly more expensive and have environmental impacts and present engineering challenges. Due to the higher price that would be involved in an underground alternative, we do not believe that this would be the most suitable option as all costs ultimately go onto domestic energy bills.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant</u></p>	<p><u>CCC Objects to the proposal.</u></p> <p><u>The preferred strategic option for Norwich to Tilbury remains an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission infrastructure and does not include overhead lines and pylons.</u></p> <p><u>CCC recognises that this option would need to be delivered at pace and without risk to national net zero, renewable energy and decarbonisation targets, and energy security.</u></p> <p><u>CCC consider that the presence of overhead lines and 40 - 50m high pylons would be visually harmful and would result in unnecessary harm to heritage, landscape, ecology and residential amenity across the Chelmsford area.</u></p> <p><u>CCC considers that credible alternatives such as an offshore centred approach or High Voltage Direct Current undergrounding, delivered at pace, to minimise onshore infrastructure across Chelmsford and Essex should be explored fully. CCC refers to its</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

comments regarding the design of the development to both its Statutory Consultation response and its Targeted Consultation response.

CCC consider that localised design responses involving undergrounding and /or alternate pylon design as part of the application of the mitigation hierarchy, should not be discounted by NG. This approach would not be contrary to national policy statements and would be consistent with Holford Rule 7 where it states projects should be routed to minimise as far as possible effects on development.

CCC has raised significant and material concerns relating to the proposal in relation to Great and Little Waltham.

CCC maintains these concerns and has been unable to resolve them prior to the submission of the application for a Development Consent Order.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

### **Project development process – Design**

3.2.5

Design Principles

The primary design requirement for electricity infrastructure is that it must be safe and secure. These functional constraints, particularly around safety and operational reliability, can significantly

CCC notes that the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to have regard in determining applications for development consent to the desirability of good design. Advice in NPS EN1

Under discussion

limit National Grid's ability to adapt the aesthetic appearance of its infrastructure.

Good design, even with the functional restrictions, is nonetheless achieved through careful consideration of the Holford Rules (relating to the connection routeing and siting), the Horlock Rules (relating to the siting of substations and similar cable sealing end compounds and line entries) and the environmental impact assessment process. These demonstrate the importance of balancing the inherent form and function of electricity transmission infrastructure with technical, economic and environmental considerations to reach reasonably practicable development proposals.

While the overall design is largely fixed by necessity, smaller design details, such as the colour of finishes, are agreed upon and documented through the Development Consent Order process.

Furthermore, NPS EN-1 encourages developers "Applying good design to energy projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, including impacts on heritage, efficient in the use of natural resources, including land-use, and energy used in their construction and operation, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible" within the bounds of functional and safety constraints.

The Planning Inspectorate Good Design advice advises that 'Good design is not primarily about how infrastructure looks, although these considerations (the aesthetics) are important'. EN-1 refers to the importance of process and

Section 4.6 is for applicants to consider the criteria for good design at an early stage when applying projects.

Achieving good design requires a holistic approach to deliver high quality, sustainable infrastructure that responds in place and takes account of often complex environments.

CCC draws on the Planning Inspectorates Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design which has been prepared based on good practice and applicants are encouraged to follow the recommendations set out.

CCC consider there is an opportunity to be innovative in securing the approach to design whilst ensuring the infrastructure remains safe and secure. NG must follow a good design process to ensure that the infrastructure proposed remains functional whilst realising the best local outcomes.

CCC consider that insufficient effort has been provided to mitigate the impact of the Project (particularly on heritage and landscape assets) and introduce good design within the proposal.

CCC has significant concerns regarding the approach to Great and Little Waltham which are set out below at ID3.2.9

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on

		<p><u>addressing sustainability are essential elements of good design. The emphasis placed on the importance of process through the projects evolution and delivering sustainability is set out in the Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.15).</u></p> <p><b>Updated position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.2.6</u>	<u>Green belt</u>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that the new overhead lines and pylons would amount to an engineering operation and are not inappropriate development provided that they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.</u></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding the above, even if the overhead lines were considered to be inappropriate development (which is not accepted by the Applicant as set out in <b>5.6 Planning Statement [APP-085]</b>), it is nevertheless considered that there are very special circumstances which justify their acceptability. Paragraphs 7.3.497 to 7.3.537 of the <b>5.6 Planning Statement [APP-085]</b> consider the Project's compliance with Green Belt policy. The assessment concludes that the overhead line infrastructure should be considered to be an engineering operation and as such should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</u></p> <p><u>The <b>5.6 Planning Statement [APP-085]</b> details the Very Special Circumstances applicable in this instance to justify inappropriate development. In addition, paragraph 4.2.17 of National Policy</u></p>	<p><u>The proposal would conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and would lead to loss of openness</u></p> <p><u>The proposal, as inappropriate development (as per para 5.11.36 of NPS EN-1), would by definition be harmful to the Green Belt. It would result in encroachment and moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt in both visual and spatial terms. The proposed development would conflict with national and local planning policies</u></p> <p><u>The very special circumstances put forward by NGET would need to be considered alongside any other identified harm arising from the scheme, acknowledging that the proposal is inappropriate development.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

		<p><u>Statement EN-1<sup>1</sup> also confirms that ‘...the Secretary of State will take as a starting point that critical national priority infrastructure will meet the following, non-exhaustive, list of tests:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>• Where development within a Green Belt requires very special circumstances to justify development’.</u></li> </ul>	<p><u>will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>
<u>3.2.7</u>	<u>Rural Areas</u>	<p><u>Transmission infrastructure (including overhead lines) is found throughout rural landscapes across England. This includes existing overhead lines which fall within the LVIA study area, as illustrated on <b>6.13.F4 Environmental Statement Figure 13.4 - Settlements and Infrastructure [APP-240]</b>. There are also a high number of nationally designated landscapes, valued for their natural beauty, which have historically been designated despite the presence of transmission infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>The rural landscape will remain in place beneath and around the proposed overhead line, albeit there will be some significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity as reported in the LVIA <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual [APP-226]</b>.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC consider that proposals within the rural area should protect the identified character, beauty and appearance of the countryside.</u></p> <p><u>The proposal would introduce lattice pylons ranging from 40 - 50 (approx.) metres in height, overhead lines and associated infrastructure in the countryside.</u></p> <p><u>The proposal would lead to a harmful change in the identified character and appearance of the landscape, which would lead to a change in the character and quality of the landscape. It would lead to harmful visual intrusion, through the siting of high large-scale industrialised features that cannot be fully mitigated against.</u></p> <p><u>The proposal would lead to the harmful loss of the character and beauty of the countryside.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on</u></p>

<sup>1</sup> Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2024) *Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)*

			<u>15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	
<u>3.2.8</u>	<u>Green Wedge</u>	<p><u>The Applicant notes the position of the Green Wedge designation and the multi-functional purpose of this policy and its role in providing important open green networks and preventing urban sprawl.</u></p> <p><u>The Adopted (and emerging) Chelmsford Local Plan illustrate the location of the Green Wedge. In the context of proximity to the Project, areas identified as Green Wedge are located to the east of Broomfield extending north of Little Waltham to Braintree Road / Main Road (B1008) and its junction with the Essex Regiment Way (A131). In addition, an area of land to the east of Writtle extending to the main urban area of Chelmsford also includes Green Wedge land.</u></p> <p><u>The Project does not physically encroach into either of these areas identified as Green Wedge.</u></p> <p><u>Construction vehicles will use Roxwell Road, the A414 and the B1008 as primarily access roads. No permanent access routes are required to pylons to facilitate future maintenance. As described in <b>Environmental Statement Chapter 4 [APP-130]</b> there would be no physical works associated with these permanent access roads. They are proposed rights of access only to allow for any maintenance or refurbishment required.</u></p>	<p><u>The Green Wedge is a unique designation in Chelmsford and has a multi-functional role providing opportunities for cycling and walking as well as being a wildlife corridor. It overlays both the Green Belt and the Rural Area meaning that policies relating to both the Green Belt and the countryside apply. Within the Green Wedge, the installation of permanent access routes is a symptom of industrialisation and incursion of the development within sensitive designated areas of the countryside.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.2.9</u>	<u>Great and Little Waltham</u>	<u>In line with the strong starting presumption set out in NPS EN-5, the proposed design technology is neither within a nationally designated landscape, nor is it within the setting of a nationally designated landscape.</u>	<p><u>There is a heritage and landscape hotspot in Great Waltham and Little Waltham.</u></p> <p><u>In Great Waltham and Little Waltham, CCC consider that the proposal would harmfully impact upon the setting of the</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

In line with NPS EN-5 we have also considered whether widespread and significant adverse landscape and/or visual impacts in non-designated landscape locations such as this may also justify the use of undergrounding.

National Grid has worked to minimise potential impacts on the historic environment through strategic routing and siting measures, and consideration of the results of archaeological fieldwork and heritage assessments throughout the design process. The Environmental Statement (ES), Chapter 11: Historic Environment (document reference 6.11), provides a detailed assessment of potential effects on both designated and non-designated heritage assets, including those of archaeological interest.

We have taken into account the Secretary of State's decision making criteria set out in the relevant NPSs and do not consider that in this case the level of effects justify the level of cost.

Other forms of lattice designs as a form of mitigation (such as standard low heights) are considered as well as the T-pylon. Appendix C of the Design Development Report (April, 2024) [APP-122] sets out the construction, operation and maintenance requirements of T-pylons including a technical appraisal for Chelmsford.

Grade I listed Langleys, Langleys Grade II Registered Park and Garden and would lead to significant adverse impacts on Great Waltham and Little Waltham Conservation Areas, together with other designated and non-designated heritage assets.

In landscape and visual impact terms, there are concerns regarding the wider impact of the pylons and overhead line on the historical landscape setting associated with Langleys. The introduction of pylons would likely degrade the setting by forming a backdrop of pylons behind the building within the wider landscape.

The proposal would be introduced into a location where views are otherwise absent of overhead lines resulting in a major and significant adverse effects by the introduction of industrialised features. The siting of the pylons and overhead lines within the gap between the two Defined Settlements of Great Waltham and Little Waltham would lead to the introduction of high industrialised features that would be at odds with the rural character and appearance of the area

CCC's preferred option is that alternative mitigation in the form of underground cabling should be used for this section. Alternatively, different alignment should be chosen with further consideration being given to relocating the route to the

north of Great Waltham and Little Waltham.

Finally, upon exhausting the above options, regard should be given to the introduction of T pylons along this part of the route.

To address CCC's concerns, NGET have proposed siting lower height pylons between Great Waltham and Little Waltham. The proposed lower height pylons (TB136 to TB142) would reduce the extent of visibility from Grade I listed Langley's house and its immediate gardens.

CCC is concerned that the wider stance and heavier frame of the lower height pylons would have a greater visual presence in the context of the southern part of Great Waltham Conservation Area and the designated and non-designated heritage assets in this area.

Cumulatively the greater harm to the other heritage assets and on landscape mean that the proposed mitigation strategy is inadequate.

The siting of pylon TB141 adjacent to Windmill House would have a harmful and unacceptable impact upon the occupant's amenities, both visually and spatially, and in respect of Corona Discharge.

CCC request that the pylon is relocated away from the boundary with Windmill House as part of a comprehensive package of mitigation measures.

The Limits of Deviation include flexibility for three of the low (c.40m) height pylons at TB140-TB142 to be increased to full height pylons. This flexibility offers the opportunity to reduce the three pylons to two full height pylons, moving pylon TB141 further away from the edge of Great Waltham Conservation Area and the non-designated heritage asset Windmill House.

The introduction of full height pylons and the omission of one pylon could potentially reduce the level of heritage harm and CCC request that the matter is explored further, with visualisations and plans provided for further assessment.

CCC object to the proposal due to lack of sufficient mitigation and appropriate compensation in relation to the harm to the historic environment, the sensitive landscape, ecology and residents.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

### **Project development process – Consultation**

<u>3.2.10</u>	<u>2022 non-statutory consultation</u>	<u>Non-statutory consultation took place between 21 April 2022 – 16 June 2022. Details of this consultation are outlined in the Consultation Strategy, and responses to feedback received during consultation are included in the Feedback Report.</u>	<u>CCC can confirm that the non-statutory Consultation was held within the prescribed dates.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
---------------	--	--	--	-------------------------

		<u>The non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published Consultation Strategy.</u>	<u>CCC refers to its full response given within its Adequacy of Consultation response dated 15th September 2025.</u>	
<u>3.2.11</u>	<u>2023 non-statutory consultation</u>	<u>Non-statutory consultation took place between 27 June 2023 – 21 August 2023. Details of this consultation are outlined in the Consultation Strategy, and responses to feedback received during consultation are included in the Feedback Report.</u> <u>The non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published Consultation Strategy.</u>	<u>CCC can confirm that the non-statutory Consultation was held within the prescribed dates.</u> <u>CCC refers to its full response given within its Adequacy of Consultation response dated 15th September 2025.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.2.12</u>	<u>2024 statutory consultation</u>	<u>Statutory Consultation took place from Wednesday 10 April 2024 to 26 July 2024 (the end date was extended from 18 June 2024 due to the general election.) Details of this consultation are outlined in the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). Responses to feedback received during statutory consultation are contained within the Consultation Report [APP-066].</u> <u>The statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published SoCC.</u>	<u>CCC can confirm that the statutory Consultation was held within the prescribed dates.</u> <u>CCC refers to its full response given within its Adequacy of Consultation response dated 15th September 2025.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.2.13</u>	<u>2025 targeted consultation</u>	<u>Targeted consultations for Essex took place from 25 February 2025 – 27 March 2025. Details of these consultations are outlined in the Targeted Consultation Strategy and associated targeted consultation leaflets and environmental implications of change documents. Responses to feedback received during targeted consultation are contained within the <b>Consultation Report [APP-066]</b>.</u>	<u>CCC can confirm that the non-statutory Consultation was held within the prescribed dates.</u> <u>CCC refers to its full response given within its Adequacy of Consultation response dated 15th September 2025.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

The targeted consultations were undertaken in accordance with the published Targeted Consultation Strategy.

The approach to targeted consultation was undertaken in accordance with Section 50 of the Planning Act 2008 and associated guidance: Planning Act 2008: Pre-application stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (April 2024).



**Other matters as required**

**3.3 Ecology and Biodiversity**

Table 3.3 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Ecology and Biodiversity

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u></b>				
<u>3.3.1</u>	<u>Policy and legislation</u>	<p><u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Ecology and Biodiversity assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context)</b> [APP-126] and <b>Section 8.2 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>



## EIA – Approach and Methods

3.3.2	<u>Study area</u>	<u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
3.3.3	<u>Data sources</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 8.4 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-158]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>Further survey information from the 2025 season has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2025, achieving coverage of 97% of the Order Limits.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>This matter is considered agreed for all areas apart from in relation to bat survey data which requires further information and is noted in section 3.3.19</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
3.3.4	<u>Assessment Methodology</u>	<u>The assessment methodology was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>The assessment methodology was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
3.3.5	<u>Survey Methodology</u>	<p><u>National Grid issued a technical note in May 2024 outlining survey methods and the scope of surveys for species outside the remit of Natural England for agreement / comment.</u></p> <p><u>All methodologies for surveying licensable species, including water voles have been agreed with Natural England.</u></p> <p><u>Detail on habitat suitability assessment and any survey limitations was provided within the water vole technical report, 6.8.A13 Environmental Statement <b>Appendix 8.13 - Otter and Water Vole Report – Redacted [AS-040]</b>.</u></p>	<p><u>The intended survey methods have been broadly acceptable, but final analysis will depend on the actual survey methods that were executed.</u></p> <p><u>The ecological impact assessments have a heavy reliance on either the quality execution of surveys to be completed post DCO consent and/or the proper implementation of mitigation measures across a very large construction works</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>

		<p><b><u>Updated position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>area and throughout an extended construction period.</u></p> <p><u>This matter is considered agreed for all areas apart from in relation to survey methodology for bats which requires further information as detailed in ID3.3.20.</u>  <u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.3.6	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions</u></p>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Ecology and Biodiversity assessment are summarised in <b>Section 8.4 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>This matter is still under further review. Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>
<b><u>EIA – Baseline Conditions</u></b>				
3.3.7	<p><u>Baseline conditions and receptors</u></p>	<p><u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Ecology and Biodiversity are presented in <b>Section 8.5 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u>  <u>Further survey information from the 2025 season has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in</u></p>	<p><u>This matter is considered agreed for all areas apart from in relation to baseline conditions and receptors for bats which requires further information (see ID3.3.21).</u>  <u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

	<p><u>November 2025, achieving coverage of 97% of the <b>Order Limits [AS-026 to AS-045].</b></u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
--	--	--	--

**EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures**

<u>3.3.8</u>	<u>Embedded mitigation</u>	<p><u>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Ecology and Biodiversity effects, are set out in <b>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the ES [AS-026].</b> Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>This matter is considered agreed.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.3.9</u>	<u>Standard mitigation</u>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Ecology and Biodiversity effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the ES [AS-026]</b> and set out in the Outline CoCP <b>[APP-300].</b></u></p> <p><u>The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid issued the 'Summary of Proposed Protected Species Mitigation' document on 16 January 2025.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>This matter is considered agreed for all areas apart from in relation to standard mitigation for bats which can be found in ID3.3.22.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>

3.3.10	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in <b>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>T this matter is considered agreed.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
--------	------------------------------	---	---	---------------

**EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects**

3.3.11	<u>Construction effects</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>Table 8.23 and 8.24 within <b>Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b> do not restate a specific timeframe for residual effects because the duration of impacts has already been assessed and defined within the magnitude assessment using the agreed categories of short term (up to 1 year), medium term (1–10 years) and long term (greater than 10 years). Duration, along with other magnitude components, is fully considered and described in the earlier stages of the assessment, where it informs the evaluation of unmitigated effects. This approach reflects standard EIA practice, in which the residual effects section presents the final significance outcome, with the underlying factors—such as</u></p>	<p><u>The residual impact assessments would be made more transparent by providing assessments of predicted impacts in the short – medium terms and not just long term.</u></p> <p><u>The completion of only GLTAs is a significant constraint to the roosting bats impact assessment. Impacts on protected species need to be assessed with reasonable confidence and the proposed mitigation considered appropriate, prior to determination to support a lawful decision.</u></p> <p><u>ES sections 8.5.80 - 8.5.89 describe that there are, within the 87.5% of the Order Limits where GLTAs have been completed, 287 PRF-M trees and 1,773 FAR trees; for the unsurveyed 12.5% of the Order Limits, there are an estimated 314 PRF-M/FAR trees. There is no transparency of how many non-minor bat roosts could be lost, the highest significances of roosts that could be lost,</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
--------	-----------------------------	---	---	-------------------------

duration—embedded within the earlier magnitude assessment rather than restated.

The survey approach to bat roost surveys has been agreed with Natural England (the statutory responsible body for bats) and is considered a pragmatic approach to a project of this scale. Full aerial/emergence surveys will be undertaken on trees due to be lost during detailed design. Any roost affected will be covered under a Natural England licence following pre-agreed mitigation measures.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

and the extent to which the different Essex bat species may be affected.

The potential impact without any mitigation measures being applied is described in the ES Table 8.23: “*In the absence of mitigation, the direct loss of roost features and disturbance to roosting bats would have a permanent medium negative effect (large negative in the event of a loss of a maternity roost – mortality) that would be irreversible (in the event of mortality) or reversible in the medium-term if bats are not present at the time of removal. Bats are known to frequently change roost locations and may seek alternative, retained roosting resources within the Order Limits. Effects would be considered significant.*” However, the residual impact assessment assumes that, whatever the number and significance of the bat roosts that end up being destroyed, doing so under derogation licence(s) (i.e. the expected delivering of two compensation bat boxes per roost lost, as stated in ES Table 8.23) will inevitably result in a cumulative negligible impact on all affected bat species/populations. Given our concerns stated in ID 3.3.9, this is not considered to be a reasonably supported assessment.

What is being proposed is a quasi District Level Licence-type approach for roosting bats (i.e. getting DCO without first completing surveys), when ECC is not aware of any such DLL method for bats having been trialled and approved.

			<p><u>This matter is still under discussion, and that further clarification is sought around timeframes.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.3.12	<u>Operational (and maintenance) effects</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>This matter is considered agreed.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	Agreed
3.3.13	<u>Residual effects</u>	<p><u>The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>A detailed ecological impact assessment has been undertaken which covers designated sites, habitats and protected species, this is presented within <b>Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>. This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with CIEEM guidelines. Where potential effects as a result of the Project are unavoidable, appropriate mitigation has been provided within the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management</b></u></p>	<p><u>CCC's main concern is that the proposal minimises the ecological and biodiversity impacts of the development.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's position is that impacts on protected species need to be assessed with reasonable confidence and the proposed mitigation considered appropriate, prior to determination to support a lawful decision. The absence of effective post-mitigation licence monitoring makes it highly uncertain to reasonably anticipate when a mitigation proposal is likely to succeed.</u></p> <p><u>For long-term assessments, the assessment of impacts as temporary</u></p>	Under discussion

Plan (LEMP) [AS-046]. Monitoring has been included for replacement planting and within Environmental Areas as detailed within the Outline LEMP. Where monitoring of any protected species measures under licence are required, this will be outlined within the draft licensing documents agreed with Natural England.

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

habitat loss is not unreasonable in principle. Yet, the potential short-medium term impacts on local fauna species populations are under-emphasised.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

### Specific Chelmsford related issues

3.3.14 Great Waltham and Little Waltham

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

The proposal would lead to a considerable removal of trees, hedgerows and planting and has potential to impact upon Veteran trees which are irreplaceable habits. There is deep concern regarding the amount of vegetation proposed for removal. Pylons TB139 and TB140 would be sited close to the Conservation Area, which contains valued trees which could be removed should the proposal be granted.

The proposal would represent increased and harmful pressures on woodlands, trees, hedgerows and Local Wildlife Site(s) and sufficient mitigations and buffers would need to be provided. Where harm is unavoidable arboricultural compensatory measures should be delivered to offset harm.

Loss to trees and woodland that has not been appropriately justified or mitigated at this stage in time. There is no appropriate

Under discussion

mitigation for the loss of irreplaceable habitats.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

### Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring

#### 3.3.15 Outline CoCP

The Outline CoCP [APP-300] includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in **Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)** of the **ES [AS-026]** and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.

A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP [APP-300].

A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP [APP-300].

A further iteration of the Outline CoCP [APP-300] was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.

#### **Updated Position (February 2026):**

Full details of the ECoW's qualifications / experience will be provided within the Final CoCP. As stated within the management plans the ECoW will be supported by a range of species specialists as required, this will include a bat licenced surveyor.

CCC's response to the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of the draft oCOCP stated 'The CoCP and LEMP need to be fully consistent and not provide contractors with conflicting prescriptions. The Outline CoCP and Outline LEMP need to cross-reference the other document if the other document is the more comprehensive of the two documents on any particular ecological mitigation aspect.'

Given the critical importance of the ECoW oversight and influence throughout the construction stage of the project, CCC would welcome a commitment as to the minimum qualifications/experience levels of the ECoWs to be used for specific tasks. ECC would also advise a clarification of ECoW decision capability and hierarchy, assuming that there will be multiple ECoWs (of varying levels) employed on the project.

B10 - Potential Roost Features (PRFs) should be identified by a Natural England bat survey class licensed (level 2+ if

Under discussion

			<p><u>endoscopy required) ecologist or ECoW. This is advised to clarify who should be accepted as a “competent” person for PRF classification.</u></p> <p><u>B16 – see comments for ID 3.3.9.</u></p> <p><u>This matter is still under discussion, and that further clarification is sought around Ecological Clerk of Works.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.3.16</u></p>	<p><u>Outline LEMP</u></p>	<p><u>The Outline LEMP [AS-026] includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the ES [AS-026]</b> and is appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline LEMP [AS-026].</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline LEMP [AS-026].</u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the Outline LEMP [AS-026] was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>Natural England (the statutory responsible body for bats) have approved the method to classify potential roost features which are in line with standard guidelines. A risk-based approach has been taken when assessing trees for their hibernation potential for bats. While some features assessed as PRF-I or PRF-M may allow individual bats to hibernate for very short periods of time, only tree features where the PRF is highly likely to provide constant cool, stable and humid conditions, and therefore a higher likelihood of being used for longer periods of time, have been highlighted as having hibernation potential. For a project of such a large scale, to assume hibernation for all trees with any PRF is not</u></p>	<p><u>CCC’s response to the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of the draft oCOCP stated ‘The CoCP and Outline LEMP need to be fully consistent and not provide contractors with conflicting prescriptions.</u></p> <p><u>The Outline CoCP and Outline LEMP need to cross-reference the other document if the other document is the more comprehensive of the two documents on any particular ecological mitigation aspect.’</u></p> <p><u>With respect to paragraph 6.1.8, clarity regarding the criteria used for defining a tree’s bat hibernation potential is sought? Given that there appear to be fewer trees with hibernation potential than the totals for PRF-I and PRF-M, how does the hibernation criteria exclude certain PRF-I and PRF-M features?</u></p> <p><u>Further clarification is sought around bat hibernation.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

reasonable and not realistic to apply appropriate and effective mitigation while ensuring project feasibility.  
The approach to mitigation involves all trees with PRFs that will be unavoidably impacted will undergo an updated GLTA survey and aerial / emergence surveys, during which time the potential of each feature can be re-assessed for its suitability for hibernation using the same assessment as outlined above.

### Other matters as required

#### 3.3.17 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

National Grid issued the 'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Strategy' document on 17 January 2025. Comments received from Essex Place Services (EPS) on the 'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Strategy' document – 6 February 2025. These comments will be taken on board for the BNG assessment.

National Grid is committed to delivering 10 % BNG with wider environmental and societal benefits on its construction projects.

#### **Updated Position (February 2026):**

While every effort has been made to deliver the required biodiversity units on-site through replacement planting and on-site mitigation in the form of habitat creation and enhancement, given the scale and nature of the Project, this 10% net gain is not fully achievable on-site. Off-site biodiversity units are therefore proposed to make up this deficit.

Offsite BNG will be delivered through collaboration with partners and purchased from commercially registered providers.

Biodiversity is not bound by Local Authority area and therefore off-site Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will be considered across the length of the Project. However

CCC wishes to emphasise the importance of BNG being delivered on-site wherever possible. Where this is not possible, off-site but local BNG should be delivered, with biodiversity credits only purchased when on-site and off-site delivery options have been exhausted to the satisfaction of the Council. BNG has a narrow focus on habitats, and designing BNG habitat unit creation that also provides improvements for targeted species groups would require focused planning. Assurance is sought that BNG habitats created or enhanced would have a minimum of 30 years secured for management

Tt this matter is still under discussion, and that further clarification is sought around On/Offsite BNG.

Under discussion

		<p><u>as detailed within the 7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-299], the aim is to deliver a biodiversity legacy ideally in each of the three counties crossed by the Project (Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex). Off-site BNG sites will be selected based on a range of factors including proximity to the Project, geographical location, local nature recovery strategies, habitat type, habitat condition, cost and timings amongst others.</u></p> <p><u>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-299] also sets out a commitment to 30 year monitoring and management at the Environmental Areas.</u></p>		
3.3.18	<u>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - Offsite</u>	<p><u>National Grid will deliver at least 10 % BNG with wider environmental and societal benefits on its construction projects. Offsite BNG will be delivered through collaboration with partners and purchased from commercially registered providers.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid shared the Biodiversity Net Gain strategy with stakeholders in January 2025.</u></p> <p><u>No comments received to date on the BNG strategy from ECC.</u></p> <p><u>See response to ID 3.3.15.</u></p>	<u>this matter is still under discussion, and that further clarification is sought around Offsite BNG.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
3.3.19	<u>Draft Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA)</u>	<p><u>National Grid issued the draft AIA in March 2025.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>The Applicant has committed to a 3:1 replacement for individual trees and individual trees within small groups. The tree planting strategy would prioritise replanting within the Order Limits, although off-site provision may be required.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment is not in accordance with BS:5837:2012. There are omissions within the report and contradictory or limited references between the report and the accompanying plans, such that a full assessment of the impacts of the proposal cannot be carried out.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned that the Ancient Woodland and Veteran Tree Strategy identifies a number of high ranking trees and features within category A that would be removed, together with a large loss of</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

high priority habitats. It is understood that two veteran trees next to Langleys in Great Waltham may be removed. The reason for the removal of these trees is unclear, and the loss of irreplaceable habitat and the mitigation has not been adequately justified.

A draft Arboricultural Method Statement should be produced to demonstrate what mitigation is required to appropriately protect retained trees.

CCC is not convinced that NGET would be able to adhere to the standing advice from Natural England and Forestry Commission which proposes 15m buffer zones on distance between development and ancient woodlands.

It is acknowledged that NGET is committed to replacement planting on a 3:1 ratio using stock of native species.

CCC is working with NGET and other Host Authorities to explore the provision of offsite planting within the Chelmsford administrative area and will report back to the ExA once further information becomes available.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

3.3.20	<u>Tree replacement/compensation</u>	<u>The Applicant has committed to a 3:1 replacement for individual trees and individual trees within small groups. The tree planting strategy would prioritise replanting within the Order Limits, although off-site provision may be required.</u>	<u>CCC is working with NGET and other Host Authorities to explore the provision of offsite planting within the Chelmsford administrative area and will report back to the ExA once further information becomes available.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
3.3.21	<u>Data sources (bats)</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 8.4 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>Further survey information from the 2025 season has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2025, achieving coverage of 97% of the Order Limits.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>As for the survey data, circa 12.5% of the Order Limits are still undergoing ecological survey. There are also certain protected species surveys where the results are more incomplete (for otter and water vole only 65% reported; see also ES Chapter 8, Table 8.4).</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
3.3.22	<u>Survey Methodology (Bats)</u>	<p><u>National Grid issued a Technical Note in May 2024 outlining survey methods and the scope of surveys for species outside the remit of Natural England for agreement / comment.</u></p> <p><u>All methodologies for surveying licensable species have been agreed with Natural England.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>The survey approach to bat roost surveys has been agreed with Natural England and is considered a pragmatic approach to a project of this scale. Full aerial/emergence surveys will be undertaken on trees due to be lost during detailed design. Any roost affected will be covered under a Natural England licence following pre-agreed mitigation measures.</u></p>	<p><u>Of specific concern is the approach undertaken in respect of the tree bat roost surveys. The level of tree roost survey was undertaken at only 12 discrete locations, which covers only a fraction of the overall potential for bat roost tree impacts. This creates a survey deficit which appears to be justified by the supposition that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Barbastelle are a more important conservation concern than other bat species (despite the roosts of other species having</u></li> </ul>	<u>Under discussion</u>

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

equivalent legal protection); and

- The Natural England bat mitigation licensing process would ultimately and inevitably result in a neutral or positive impact outcome.

This approach is considered flawed because it lacks the appropriate evidence to support it.

The impacts on all protected bat species need to be assessed with reasonable confidence and the proposed mitigation considered appropriate, prior to determination, to support a lawful decision. Supposing that a greater level of roost tree survey is not feasible pre DCO, it is advised that an evidence based, worst-case scenario estimation of the bat tree roost impact, and the design of a more confidently proportionate bat tree roost mitigation/compensation scheme.

Whilst bat roost climbing inspections for every PRF-M and FAR tree at risk of impact is perhaps not a practical expectation, ECC believes further survey effort prior to DCO consent is feasible. Enough at-height inspection surveys should be possible to facilitate a data-based estimation of the percentage of the PRF-M and FAR trees that will support non-minor bat roosting and will be lost to the project. This would lead to a better supported estimation of impact and the

			<p><u>design of a more confidently proportionate mitigation/compensation scheme.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.3.23</u>	<u>Baseline conditions and receptors (Bats)</u>	<p><u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Ecology and Biodiversity are presented in <b>Section 8.5 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>The survey approach to bat roost surveys has been agreed with Natural England and is considered a pragmatic approach to a project of this scale. Full aerial/emergence surveys will be undertaken on trees due to be lost during detailed design. Any roost affected will be covered under a Natural England licence following pre-agreed mitigation measures.</u></p>	<p><u>The baseline conditions and receptors for roosting bats requires further information and review.</u></p>	<u>Under Discussion</u>
<u>3.3.24</u>	<u>Standard mitigation (Bats)</u>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Ecology and Biodiversity effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b> and set out in the Outline CoCP <b>[APP-300]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>The mitigation approach to bat roost surveys has been agreed with Natural England and is considered a pragmatic approach to a project of this scale. Full</u></p>	<p><u>Measure B16’s assumption that any action requiring a Natural England derogation licence can be “<i>reasonably anticipated to maintain the favourable conservation status of a species or provide a conservation benefit</i>” is considered unsound. ECC considers that the widespread lack of effective post mitigation licence monitoring does not allow for reliable ‘reasonable anticipation’ of success in situations where derogation licensing is covering non-minor impacts.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

aerial/emergence surveys will be undertaken on trees due to be lost during detailed design. Any roost affected will be covered under a Natural England licence following pre-agreed mitigation measures.

This is particularly relevant to the concerns stated for ID3.3.11.  
T the standard mitigation for bats requires further information and review.

### 3.4 Air Quality

Table 3.4 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Air Quality

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u>				
<u>3.4.1</u>	<u>Policy and legislation</u>	<p><u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Air Quality assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP-126]</b> and <b>Section 7.2 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at <b>Deadline 1</b> through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>EIA – Approach and Methods</u>				
<u>3.4.2</u>	<u>Study area</u>	<p><u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u></p>	<p><u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>3.4.3</u>	<u>Data sources</u>	<p>Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 7.4 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</p> <p>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</p>	<p>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.4.4</u>	<u>Assessment methodology</u>	<p><u>The methodology for assessing Air Quality was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u></p>	<p><u>The methodology for assessing Air Quality was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.4.5</u>	<u>Key parameters and assumptions</u>	<p>Key parameters and assumptions associated with Air Quality are summarised in <b>Section 7.4 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</p> <p>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</p>	<p>CCC's main concern relates to the impact of the proposal upon the settlements and residents sited in proximity to the proposal. Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>EIA – Baseline Conditions</u></b>				
<u>3.4.6</u>	<u>Baseline conditions and receptors</u>	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Air Quality are presented in <b>Section 7.5 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p><b><u>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</u></b></p>				
<p><u>3.4.7</u></p>	<p><u>Embedded mitigation</u></p>	<p><u>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Air Quality effects, are set out in <b>Section 7.6 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u>  <b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>
<p><u>3.4.8</u></p>	<p><u>Standard mitigation</u></p>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 7.6 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b> and set out in the Outline CoCP <b>[APP-300]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u>  <b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>		
<u>3.4.9</u>	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 7.6 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</u></b>				
<u>3.4.10</u>	<u>Construction effects</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 7.7 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.4.11</u>	<u>Operational (and maintenance) effects</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 7.7 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p>	<u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u>  National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).  Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</p>	<p><u>provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.4.12</u>	<u>Residual effects</u>	<p>The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 7.7 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b>. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</p> <p><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u>  National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).  Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</p>	<p>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>Specific Chelmsford Related Issues</u></b>				
<u>3.4.13</u>	<u>Specific Chelmsford Related Issues</u>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this error and it has been amended within the <b>8.1 Errata List [Revision A]</b>.</p>	<p>There appears to be a mistake within the air quality documents. CCC believes that the monitoring station CM1 that is referred to is our Chignal St James monitoring station and not Thurrock Council's.</p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<b><u>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</u></b>				
<u>3.4.14</u>	<u>Outline CoCP</u>	<p>The <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-147]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</p>	<p>The Outline Dust Management Plan is set out in accordance with IAQM guidance. As such, the proposed methodology for working in relation to dust is broadly acceptable. This document is generic in form and it should be noted that there are no location specific assessments yet</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>CCC comments are noted, and National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>supplied for identifying and managing dust emissions at sensitive receptor locations.</u></p>	

Other matters as required

### 3.5 Noise and Vibration

Table 3.5 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Noise and Vibration

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u>				
<u>3.5.1</u>	<u>Policy and legislation</u>	<p><u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Noise and Vibration assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP-126]</b> and <b>Section 14.2 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-256]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>		
<b><u>EIA – Approach and Methods</u></b>				
<u>3.5.2</u>	<u>Study area</u>	<u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.5.3</u>	<u>Data sources</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 14.4 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES [APP-256].</b></u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.5.4</u>	<u>Assessment methodology</u>	<u>The methodology for assessing Noise and Vibration was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>The methodology for assessing Noise and Vibration was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.5.5</u>	<u>Key parameters and assumptions</u>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with Noise and Vibration are summarised in <b>Section 14.4 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES [APP-256].</b> The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p>	<p><u>CCC's view is that there is a need for noise levels to be lower where the proposal is sited close to residential properties and urban receptors.</u></p> <p><u>It is unclear where generators will be located. Figure 7.7 needs to be updated to clearly identify where generators are to be</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>housed. There is no information relating to the potential size of generators.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<b><u>EIA – Baseline Conditions</u></b>				
3.5.6	<u>Baseline conditions and receptors</u>	<p><u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Noise and Vibration are presented in <b>Section 14.5 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-256]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's view is that there is a need for noise levels to be lower where the project is sited close to residential properties and urban receptors. At weekends, where overall noise levels are generally lower, there could be a perception that weekend working noise levels could appear higher.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</u></b>				
<u>3.5.7</u>	<u>Embedded mitigation</u>	<p><u>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Noise and Vibration effects, are set out in <b>Section 14.6 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES.</u></p> <p><u>Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>It is noted only embedded mitigation is proposed.</u></p> <p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.5.8</u>	<u>Standard mitigation</u>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 14.6 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES [APP-256] and set out in the Outline CoCP [APP-300]. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>It is noted only embedded mitigation is proposed.</u></p> <p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<u>provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	
<u>3.5.9</u>	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in <b>Section 14.6 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-256]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>It is noted only embedded mitigation is proposed.</u></p> <p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</u></p> <p><u>consider that additional mitigation (such as landscaping) may be needed to mitigate any low frequency hum known as "Corona discharge" that may arise, particularly during damp weather conditions.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</u></b>				
<u>3.5.10</u>	<u>Construction effects</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 14.7 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-256]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p>	<p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>The proposed hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday – Fridays and 07:00 am to 17:00 over weekends/holiday raise concern due to the lack of respite from noise for residents. These hours of working are not accepted by CCC.</u></p> <p><u>Currently it is not clear how noise levels would be affected, should the pylons be relocated in accordance with the Limits of Deviation. This is particularly concerning, with regard to the installation of lower height pylons at Great Waltham and Little Waltham, where the LOD allow for the movement and installation of full height pylons close to Windmill House and properties sited along Chelmsford Road.</u></p>	
3.5.11	<p><u>Operational (and maintenance) effects</u></p>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 14.7 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES [APP-256]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</u></p> <p><u>Post noise impacts will be long standing and permanent and may not be perceived by those living close to the pylons as acceptable.</u></p> <p><u>The Limits of Deviation enable the movement of pylons along the Overhead Line. Noise receptors should be reassessed for any movement along the Overhead Line to ensure that they do not lead to harm to residents amenities.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	
<u>3.5.12</u>	<u>Residual effects</u>	<p><u>The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 14.7 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-256]</b>. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>Specific Chelmsford Related Issues</u></b>				
<u>3.5.13</u>	<u>Specific Chelmsford Related Issues</u>	<p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties, particularly Windmill House in Great Waltham.</u></p> <p><u>The Limits of Deviation enable the movement of pylons along the Overhead Line. Noise receptors should be reassessed for any movement along the</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>Overhead Line to ensure that they do not lead to harm to residents' amenities.</u></p> <p><u>The proposed hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday – Fridays and 07:00 am to 17:00 over weekends/holiday raise concern due to the lack of respite from noise for residents. These hours of working are not accepted by CCC.</u></p> <p><u>In Chelmsford normal working hours are 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays, with no working on Sundays or bank holidays.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u><b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b></u>				
3.5.14	<u>Outline CoCP</u>	<p><u>The <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Chapter 14 (<b>Noise and Vibration</b>) of the <b>ES [APP-256]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p>	<p><u>this matter was still under discussion pending further review of the Outline CoCP</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b> <u>Further discussion will take place following CCC review of the Outline CoCP.</u>		
<b><u>Other matters as required</u></b>				
<u>3.5.15</u>	<u>Hours of working</u>	<u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u> <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>	<u>The proposed working hours of 07:00 to 17:00 across weekends and holidays is not considered acceptable.</u> <u>In Chelmsford normal working hours are 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays, with no working on Sundays or bank holidays.</u> <u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

### **3.6 Health and Wellbeing**

Table 3.6 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Health and Wellbeing

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u></b>				
<u>3.6.1</u>	<u>Policy and legislation</u>	<u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Health and Wellbeing assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP-126]</b> and <b>Section 10.2 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES [APP-192]</b>.</u>	<u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment. This includes the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013 to 2036 (adopted 2020) as referenced in Chapter 2 of the ES [APP-126].</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<b><u>EIA – Approach and Methods</u></b>				
<u>3.6.2</u>	<u>Study area</u>	<p><u>The study area was agreed through the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.6.3</u>	<u>Data sources</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 10.4 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the ES [APP-192].</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>		
<u>3.6.4</u>	<u>Assessment methodology</u>	<p><u>A meeting was held on 24 September 2024 to agree the assessment methodology of the <b>Health and Wellbeing ES chapter [APP-192]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>The Methodology was also agreed through the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024.</u></p> <p><u>Chelmsford City Council requested that reference to WHIASU guidance and vulnerable groups checklist is included within the assessment. National Grid confirmed that the ES chapter will use WHIASU guidance to identify vulnerable groups.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC requested that reference to WHIASU guidance and vulnerable groups checklist is included within the assessment which was agreed by National Grid.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.6.5</u>	<u>Key parameters and assumptions</u>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with Health and Wellbeing are summarised in <b>Section 10.4 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-192]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>EIA – Baseline Conditions</u></b>				
<u>3.6.6</u>	<u>Baseline conditions and receptors</u>	<p><u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Health and Wellbeing are presented in <b>Section 10.5 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-192]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p> <p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties,</u></p> <p><u>Visually, the siting of pylons close to residential properties would have a harmful and unacceptable impact upon the occupant's amenities, both visually and spatially, where the pylons would have an overbearing and dominant impact upon the properties. It is noted that a number of properties are sited less than 200 metres away from the proposed pylons and overhead lines and would be noticeable and potentially overbearing.</u></p> <p><u>The Limits of Deviation enable the movement of pylons along the Overhead Line. Noise receptors should be reassessed for any movement along the Overhead Line to ensure that they do not lead to harm to residents amenities.</u></p> <p><u>The proposed hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday – Fridays and 07:00 am to 17:00 over weekends/holiday raise concern due to the lack of respite from noise for residents. These hours of working are not accepted by CCC.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>In Chelmsford normal working hours are 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays, with no working on Sundays or bank holidays. Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<b><u>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</u></b>				
<u>3.6.7</u>	<u>Embedded mitigation</u>	<p><u>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Health and Wellbeing effects, are set out in <b>Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-192]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>It is noted that only embedded mitigation is proposed.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.6.8</u>	<u>Standard mitigation</u>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-192]</b> and set out in the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC notes that no mitigation is proposed beyond embedded measures.</u></p> <p><u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</u>  <u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.6.9	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-192]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u>  <b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>The ES concludes that no additional mitigation is required beyond embedded measures and proposes no health and wellbeing monitoring.</u>  <u>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</u>  <u>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</u>  <u>Given the scale and duration of construction and the socio-economic characteristics of affected communities, CCC recommends consideration of establishing of a Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Framework to promote best practice. This Framework should include baseline data on active travel, access to green space, amenity satisfaction and mental wellbeing; define clear indicators and reporting intervals; and be co-developed with local communities.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</p>	
<b><u>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</u></b>				
<u>3.6.10</u>	<u>Construction effects</u>	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 10.7 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-192]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</p> <p>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</p>	<p>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.</p> <p>CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.</p> <p>The proposed hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday – Fridays and 07:00 am to 17:00 over weekends/holiday raise concern due to the lack of respite from noise for residents. These hours of working are not accepted by CCC</p> <p>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.6.11</u>	<u>Operational (and maintenance) effects</u>	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 10.7 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-192]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation</p>	<p>There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

(and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

pylons, overhead lines and construction areas.

CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.

The ES concludes that no additional mitigation is required beyond embedded measures and proposes no health and wellbeing monitoring.

CCC recommends consideration of establishing of a **Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Framework to promote best practice**. This Framework should include baseline data on active travel, access to green space, amenity satisfaction and mental wellbeing; define clear indicators and reporting intervals; and be co-developed with local communities.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

3.6.12 Residual effects The residual effects are presented in **Section 10.7 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)** of the **ES [APP-192]**. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.

The **7.8 Electric and Magnetic Field Compliance Report [APP-330]** details the electric and magnetic field (EMF) assessment for the Project, demonstrating compliance with the requirements of National Policy Statement EN-5 in line with the requirements of the government's Code of Practice Power Lines:

The effect and impact of Electro Magnetic Field (EMF') are material to the consideration of the proposal; which should not be granted unless the ExA is satisfied that the proposal is compliant with all relevant legislation.

Under discussion

Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines. This demonstrates that when directly under the overhead lines or directly above the underground cables the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection exposure limits are not exceeded. Any offset from the overhead line or cables reduced the EMF levels significantly ensuring compliance at any distance from the assets.

### **Specific Chelmsford related issues**

3.6.13

Specific Chelmsford related issues

#### **Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

There are a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors sited within 200 metres of the proposed pylons, overhead lines and construction areas. These include Windmill House within Great Waltham.

CCC is concerned about the impact of the proposal upon those properties.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

Under discussion

### **Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring**

3.6.14

Outline CoCP

The **Outline CoCP [APP-300]** includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in **Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)** of the **ES [APP-192]** and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.

A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the **Outline CoCP [APP-300]**.

Under discussion.

Under discussion

A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the **Outline CoCP [APP-300]**.

A further iteration of the **Outline CoCP [APP-300]** was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

**Other matters as required**

3.6.15 Health and wellbeing monitoring framework

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

The ES concludes that no additional mitigation is required beyond embedded measures and proposes no health and wellbeing monitoring. Given the scale and duration of construction and the socio economic characteristics of affected communities, CCC recommends consideration of establishing of a Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Framework to promote best practice. This Framework should include baseline data on active travel, access to green space, amenity satisfaction and mental wellbeing; define clear indicators and reporting intervals; and be co-developed with local communities. Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

Under discussion

## 3.7 Historic Environment

Table 3.7 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to the Historic Environment

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u></b>				
<u>3.7.1</u>	<u>Policy and legislation (Built Heritage)</u>	<u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Historic Environment assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP126] and Section 11.2 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. <u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</u></u>	<u>Agreed</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.2</u>	<u>Policy and legislation (Archaeology)</u>	<u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Historic Environment assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key [APP126] - Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP-126] and Section 11.2 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. <u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</u> <b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b> <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></u>	<u>ECC (Archaeology) is currently reviewing the relevant documentation. The ES Chapter 11.2 looks to contain all relevant legislation, policy and guidance. Further information will be included in the LIR.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>EIA – Approach and Methods</u></b>				
<u>3.7.3</u>	<u>Study area</u>	<u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<u>The study area was also agreed through subsequent thematic group meetings where further comments were addressed.</u>	<u>The study area was also agreed through subsequent thematic group meetings where further comments were addressed.</u>	
<u>3.7.4</u>	<u>Data sources Designated Heritage Assets (DHAS)</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<u>Agreed. CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.5</u>	<u>Data sources Non Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAS)</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC are still awaiting revisions following its statutory consultation response – to include built non-designated heritage assets, protected lanes and designed landscapes. To date this information has not been provided.</u></p> <p><u>The data source is inadequate for built non designated heritage assets and non designated landscape including Coptfold Hall.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>3.7.6</u>	<u>Data sources (archaeology) - Desktop</u>	<u>Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 11.4 of <b>Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES [APP-208].</b></u>	<u>ECC has reviewed the relevant documentation and confirms that sufficient desktop data has been collected (agreement confirmed during meeting January 2026.)</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.7</u>	<u>Data sources (archaeology) – survey data</u>	<u>Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 11.4 of <b>Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES [APP-208].</b></u>	<u>ECC notes the fieldwork proposed prior to application has not been completed and the impact of this to inform the assessment is under review. This matter remains under discussion</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.7.8</u>	<u>Assessment methodology (Built Heritage)</u>	<p><u>The scoping opinion stated: ‘The Applicant should make effort to discuss and agree relevant non-designated heritage assets for assessment and the detailed assessment methodology with relevant local planning authorities.’</u></p> <p><u>The assessment methodology has been discussed at a number of Historic Environment Thematic Group Meetings held between July 2022 and November 2024.</u></p> <p><u>CCC raised at statutory consultation that that ‘Non designated heritage assets have not been adequately considered in the assessment work to date.’</u></p> <p><u>It is considered that the assessment methodology has been agreed, with the exception of non-designated heritage assets, where the method is still under discussion.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>The assessment methodology has been discussed at a number of Historic Environment Thematic Group Meetings held between July 2022 and November 2024.</u></p> <p><u>All relevant designated heritage assets within the 2km and 3km zones are identified. The methodology for assessment is supported. In spite of this, the proposal underestimates the impacts on many designated heritage assets, with additional impacts identified by CCC.</u></p> <p><u>Non designated heritage assets have not been adequately considered in the assessment work: see comments in 3.7.3 and the method is still under discussion.</u></p> <p><u>CCC note that the approach to setting assessment to low and negligible value needs further consideration</u></p> <p><u>CCC’s full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>	<u>January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	
<u>3.7.9</u>	<u>Assessment methodology (Archaeology)</u>	<u>The methodology for assessing Historic Environment was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u>	<u>ECC on behalf of CCC is in agreement with this matter.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.10</u>	<u>Key parameters and assumptions</u>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Historic Environment assessment are summarised in <b>Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>In March 2025, National Grid issued an updated version of the Historic Environment (HE) Viewpoints information.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC does not agree with the methodology for assessing non-designated heritage assets.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.7.11</u>	<u>Key parameters and assumptions (Archaeology)</u>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Historic Environment assessment are summarised in Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES [APP-208]. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>February 2025, National Grid issued Historic Environments (HE) Viewpoints information and held a thematic group meeting on the topic.</u></p>	<u>ECC (Archaeology) is currently reviewing the ES Chapter. Until the completion of intrusive field evaluation there is not agreement with the statement under 11.4.33 that "The information obtained to date provides sufficient detail to characterise the likely nature and extent of any currently unrecorded remains."</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>March 2025, National Grid issued an updated version of the Historic Environment (HE) Viewpoints information.</u></p>		
<b><u>EIA – Baseline Conditions</u></b>				
3.7.12	<p><u>Baseline conditions and receptors (Built Heritage)</u></p>	<p><u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Historic Environment are presented in <b>Section 11.5 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will be held following review of the information within the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC disagrees with the methodology for selecting and assessing non-designated heritage assets. Further assessment is required.</u></p> <p><u>Protected lanes are identified, but their settings are not considered. This is particularly important at Larks Lane, Paulk Hall and Goodmans Lane.</u></p> <p><u>Some locally listed buildings are included, but designated landscapes and other buildings and features of sufficient interest to be considered as non-designated heritage assets are not comprehensively identified and should fully inform the assessment baseline. These include the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>• Coptfold Hall locally designated landscape</u></li> <li><u>• WWII GHQ defence line (pillboxes)The evidence base requires inclusion of built non-designated heritage assets, protected lanes and designed landscapes, as per public consultation response.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<u>January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	
<u>3.7.13</u>	<u>Baseline conditions and receptors (Archaeology)</u>	<u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Historic Environment are presented in <b>Section 11.5 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u>	<u>ECC on behalf of CCC agreed this matter during call in January 2026.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<b><u>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</u></b>				
<u>3.7.14</u>	<u>Embedded mitigation</u>	<u>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Historic Environment effects, are set out in <b>Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u> <u>Statutory response received from CCC – NG will consider this feedback as the assessment progresses and more detail will be provided in the ES.</u> <b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b> <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u> <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>	<u>CCC Considers the embedded mitigation is insufficient.</u> <u>'Mitigation generally should ensure that land take is sufficient to allow for a range of mitigation options, for instance landscaping - potentially from closing up gaps in hedges to large scale woodland planting where necessary. Where harm is unavoidable heritage compensatory measures should also be delivered, for instance repair of listed buildings and/or associated built and landscape features to offset harm to setting.</u> <u>The Project includes no heritage mitigation. Embedded mitigation should be provided at all affected heritage assets</u> <u>Where significant harm has been identified further mitigation measures should be employed to reduced or limit or offset the level of harm. In most cases this will involve positioning the Order Limits, associated access roads and pylons further away from heritage assets to limit the impact on the</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>rural surroundings and how assets are experienced.</u></p> <p><u>Mitigation would be essential at Grade 1 listed Langleys, where there are a number of structures and features within the Registered Park and Garden, as well as the outbuildings and the house, which could have funded repairs to offset the acknowledged harm to the setting.'</u></p> <p><u>There is ia heritage hotspot at Great Waltham and Little Waltham. CCC has concern in relation to the choice of the design approach for the proposed for the area.</u></p> <p><u>CCC would reiterate its preference for a alternative design to be used in this location.</u></p> <p><u>Further information in relation to CCC's view on design principles can be found in Section 3.2.5.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.7.15	<u>Standard mitigation (Built Heritage)</u>	<u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES [APP-208]and set out in the Outline CoCP[APP-300]. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate.</u>	<u>CCC Considers the mitigation is insufficient.</u> <u>'Mitigation generally should ensure that land take is sufficient to allow for a range of mitigation options, for instance landscaping - potentially from closing up gaps in hedges</u>	<u>Under discussion</u> <u>--</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will be held following review of the information within the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>to large scale woodland planting where necessary. Where harm is unavoidable heritage compensatory measures should also be delivered, for instance repair of listed buildings and/or associated built and landscape features to offset harm to setting.</u></p> <p><u>The Project includes no heritage mitigation. Mitigation should be provided at all affected heritage assets</u></p> <p><u>Where significant harm has been identified further mitigation measures should be employed to reduced or limit or offset the level of harm. In most cases this will involve positioning the Order Limits, associated access roads and pylons further away from heritage assets to limit the impact on the rural surroundings and how assets are experienced.</u></p> <p><u>Mitigation would be essential at Grade 1 listed Langleys, where there are a number of structures and features within the Registered Park and Garden, as well as the outbuildings and the house, which could have funded repairs to offset the acknowledged harm to the setting.'</u></p> <p><u>There is a heritage hotspot at Great Waltham and Little Waltham. CCC has concern in relation to the choice of the design approach for the proposed for the area.</u></p> <p><u>CCC would reiterate its preference for a alternative design to be used in this location.</u></p>	

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>Further information in relation to CCC's view on design principles can be found in Section 3.2.5.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.7.16</u>	<u>Standard mitigation (Archaeology)</u>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in Section 11.6 of <b>Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES [APP-208] and set out in the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p>	<p><u>ECC (Archaeology) on behalf of CCC agreed this matter during call held January 2026.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.17</u>	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in <b>Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will be held following review of the information within the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC Considers the mitigation is insufficient.</u></p> <p><u>'Mitigation generally should ensure that land take is sufficient to allow for a range of mitigation options, for instance landscaping - potentially from closing up gaps in hedges to large scale woodland planting where necessary. Where harm is unavoidable heritage compensatory measures should also be delivered, for instance repair of listed buildings and/or associated built and landscape features to offset harm to setting.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>The Project includes no heritage mitigation. Mitigation should be provided at all affected heritage assets.</u></p> <p><u>Where significant harm has been identified further mitigation measures should be employed to reduced or limit or offset the level of harm. In most cases this will involve positioning the Order Limits, associated access roads and pylons further away from heritage assets to limit the impact on the rural surroundings and how assets are experienced.</u></p> <p><u>Mitigation would be essential at Grade 1 listed Langleys, where there are a number of structures and features within the Registered Park and Garden, as well as the outbuildings and the house, which could have funded repairs to offset the acknowledged harm to the setting.'</u></p> <p><u>There is a heritage hotspot at Great Waltham and Little Waltham. CCC has concern in relation to the choice of the design approach for the proposed for the area.</u></p> <p><u>CCC would reiterate its preference for a alternative design to be used in this location.</u></p> <p><u>Further information in relation to CCC's view on design principles can be found in Section 3.2.5.</u></p> <p><u>Additional mitigation should be provided at all affected designated heritage assets including Church of St Mary, Buttsbury, Margaretting Hall, White Tyrells</u></p>	

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>Farmhouse, South Woods Farm and Balls Farm.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<b><u>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</u></b>				
<u>3.7.18</u>	<u>Construction effects (Built Heritage)</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>CCC comments are noted and National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter..</u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will be held following review of the information within the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC has a number of concerns relating to the construction of the proposal and its effect on the built heritage. CCC is particularly concerned regarding the effect upon the Ingatestone Bridge and Grade 1 listed Langleys.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.7.19</u>	<u>Construction effects (archaeology)</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</u></p>	<p><u>Following review of the ES, ECC confirmed agreement on this matter during call in January 2026.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.20</u>	<u>Operational (and</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES</b></u></p>	<p><u>CCC has significant concern regarding the impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets at Little</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
	<u>maintenance) effects (Built Heritage)</u>	<p><u>[APP-208]. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>CCC comments are noted, and National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will be held following review of the information within the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>Waltham and Great Waltham, where the route passes between the two historic villages.' Concerns also raised regarding other locations and lack of mitigation proposed.</u></p> <p><u>CCC consider that landscape planting should be introduced within affected areas to help screen the pylons from affected assets.</u></p> <p><u>A full response will be given within CCC's LIR.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.7.21</u>	<u>Operational (and maintenance) effects (archaeology)</u>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES [APP-208]. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p>	<p><u>Requests have been made for the area at the Walthams to be treated as a priority for further archaeological assessment once the undergrounding sections (regarded by National Grid as Priority areas) have been completed.</u></p> <p><u>Following review of the ES, ECC on behalf of CCC confirmed agreement on this matter during call in January 2026.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.22</u>	<u>Residual effects</u>	<p><u>The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES [APP-208]. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p>	<p><u>Much of the detailed heritage assessment, including the levels of significance and impacts are concurred with.</u></p> <p><u>There are some areas where the findings are not agreed or the evidence base is not complete.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will be held following review of the information within the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<b><u>Specific Chelmsford related issues</u></b>				
<u>3.7.23</u>	<u>Great Waltham and Little Waltham</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC has concerns around heritage throughout the breadth of the project area. There are numerous affected areas. There is a hotspot between Great Waltham and Little Waltham.</u></p> <p><u>From a heritage perspective, the most sensitive area on the route is that between the villages of Great Waltham and Little Waltham, where the route would pass between two Conservation Areas, Langleys Registered Park and Garden and the setting of the Grade I listed house Langleys, the Ash Tree Corner Scheduled Monument, the Church of St Mary and St Lawrence (Grade I) and 65 Grade II listed and two Grade II* buildings within 1km, also numerous non-designated heritage assets including pillboxes associated with the GHQ defence line and various vernacular buildings. Most of these heritage assets have a rural setting which contributes to their significance.</u></p> <p><u>Non-significant impacts are identified to many listed buildings within the setting of Little Waltham and Great Waltham. The proposal would impact upon a number of</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>non-designated heritage assets within the routes vicinity.</u></p> <p><u>CCC assess the impacts to Great Waltham (CA55) and Little Waltham (CA56) as moderate and thus significant. Langleys Registered Park and Garden (1000241) is the only RPG where there are agreed moderate and thus significant effects. The pylons would irreversibly destroy the unique and irreplaceable historic environment of the setting of the Langleys leading to significant adverse heritage impacts that are not adequately mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>Proposed lower height pylons (TB136 and TB142) are proposed as lower height pylons by NG. Whilst the lower height limit their visibility above trees when seen in the context of tree belts, they would have a similar or greater visual presence in exposed locations due to their wider stance and thicker structural sections. This would be the case from Grade I listed Langleys's House.</u></p> <p><u>CCC welcome the introduction of the Alternative Scheme but need further information to understand the heritage impacts of the proposal in this location.</u></p> <p><u>The cumulative impact of identified low level harm on the historic environment within Great Waltham and Little Waltham would be extensive.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact</u></p>	

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<u>Report shared for Policy Board on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	
<u>3.7.24</u>	<u>Alternative pylon route to west of Great Waltham</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC would reiterate its preference for the route of the pylons to be sited to the west of Great Waltham and Little Waltham.</u></p> <p><u>That proposal would have less heritage impacts that the proposed Project.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's full response is set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<b><u>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</u></b>				
<u>3.7.25</u>	<u>Outline CoCP Built Heritage</u>	<p><u>The <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> includes all relevant construction mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>CCC comments are noted, and National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion.</u></p> <p><u>Mitigation for Protected Lanes is included under H06. In order to protect the historic features of the protected lane a permanent record should be completed prior to any changes which would allow more accurate re-instatement. The requirement for this should be included under H06 and the mode and mechanism for this process included in the final Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>3.7.26</u>	<u>Outline CoCP (Archaeology)</u>	<p><u>The Outline CoCP [APP-300] includes all relevant construction mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-208]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p><u>CCC comments are noted, and National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Historic Environment (archaeology) is covered under H01 to H05 and are agreed as appropriate. H04 should add "The Principal Contractor(s) will be responsible for making sure staff are aware of what to do in the event of an unexpected heritage asset. This should include toolbox talks within site inductions."</u></p> <p><u>This section is currently under review (ECC Archaeology). Further comments will be included within the LIR which require action.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>Other matters as required</u></b>				
<u>3.7.27</u>	<u>Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (WSIs) for pre-consent geophysical surveys and archaeological trial trenching.</u>	<p><u>National Grid shared overarching WSIs in March – June 2024 and December 2024.</u></p> <p><u>The scope and methodology of the overarching WSI for pre-consent geophysical surveys and archaeological trial trenching is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</u></p>	<p><u>The scope and methodology of the overarching WSI for pre-consent geophysical surveys and archaeological trial trenching is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.7.28</u>	<u>Site specific Written Schemes of Investigation</u>	<p><u>The scope and methodology of WSIs for archaeological trial trenching is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</u></p>	<p><u>The scope and methodology of WSIs for archaeological trial trenching is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
	<u>(WSIs) for pre-consent archaeological trial trenching.</u>	<u>There are still addenda to site specific WSIs forthcoming that have yet to be issued.</u>		
<u>3.7.29</u>	<u>Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline WSI.</u>	<u>The contents of the Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline WSI (AMS-OWSI) [APP-328] is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required. National Grid issued the Outline AMS-OWSI [APP-328] for the post-consent stage of the project in April 2025.</u>	<u>An Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (OAMS) and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) has been submitted (APP-328 Document:7.5). The document needs to clarify the scope and extent of further evaluation required prior to any agreed mitigation. This would include further geophysical survey, archaeological trial trenching and geoarchaeological investigation. This will allow all parties to be clear about the scope and level of evaluation that may be required should the DCO be granted. It has been agreed, with the archaeological representatives for National Grid, that detailed comments be provided separately in combination with other County Officers in order to come to agreement on the content of the Outline AMS/WSI.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.7.30</u>	<u>Programme for completion of archaeological fieldwork</u>	<u>A summary of the progress to date and future programme for the archaeological evaluation fieldwork for the Project was presented in the technical note: 'Summary of Archaeological Fieldwork - Progress and Programme', issued on the 27 June 2025. A phased approach to archaeological evaluation is being undertaken. The Project has defined 'priority areas' on the basis of the likely scale of impact on archaeological remains, flexibility in design and construction programme. A proportion of the</u>	<u>The programme for archaeological fieldwork is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</u>	<u>Agreed</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>evaluation of 'priority areas' was complete at submission with the rest proposed to be completed pre examination. Evaluation of 'non priority areas' is proposed to be undertaken following completion of 'priority areas'.</u></p> <p><u>The programme for archaeological fieldwork is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</u></p>		

### 3.8 Landscape and Visual

Table 3.8 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Landscape and Visual

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u>				
<u>3.8.1</u>	<u>Policy and legislation</u>	<p><u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Landscape and Visual assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP-126]</b> and <b>Section 13.2 Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-226]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid note that following a meeting to discuss the Statement of Common Ground on 29 January 2026 that this Landscape and Visual Matter requires additional consideration and further discussion. Elements to discuss include</u></p>	<p><u>CCC suggest that reference be made to Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) Para 4.3.4 in relation to compensation for significant negative impacts 'To consider the potential effects, including benefits, of a proposal for a project, the applicant must set out information on the likely significant environmental, social and economic effects of the development, and show how any likely significant negative effects would be avoided, reduced, mitigated or compensated for, following the mitigation hierarchy'.</u></p> <p><u>This matter is considered under discussion. Further consideration is to be considered around compensation as is identified in National Policy. It is noted that</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

	<p><u>National Landscapes and furthering the purpose and landscape mitigation/compensation.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>this approach is not justified where there are significant visual impacts across the scheme.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
--	--	--	--

### EIA – Approach and Methods

<u>3.8.2</u>	<u>Study area</u>	<p><u>The study area for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.</u></p>	<p><u>The study area for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.</u></p>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.8.3</u>	<u>Study area (Viewpoints)</u>	<p><u>The study area for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground on 29th January 2026 that this matter is considered under discussion</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.8.4</u>	<u>Data sources</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 13.4 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-226]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid issued an update on LVIA Viewpoints and Methodology in March 2025.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p>	<p><u>CCC remain unsatisfied with the number of viewpoint assessments proposed generally (Email November 2024).</u></p> <p><u>Whilst CCC welcome the inclusion of criteria against which landscape value will be assessed, they remain unhappy with aspects of the approach to Landscape Value assessment (Email 22.04.2025)</u></p> <p><u>A full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

		<p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>T that this matter is considered under discussion with no change in position identified.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.8.5	<p><u>Assessment methodology (including LVIA methodology and viewpoints)</u></p>	<p><u>The outline methodology for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held on the 25 September 2024 to seek to agree the detailed methodology. A further meeting was held on 28 November 2024 to follow up any additional changes to the assessment.</u></p> <p><u>Viewpoints are still under discussion.</u></p> <p><u>At Statutory Consultation, CCC requested the inclusion of a Valued Landscape Assessment. National Grid propose to consider valued landscape qualities in the LVIA but do not propose to undertake a separate valued landscape assessment.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Whilst CCC welcome the inclusion of criteria against which landscape value will be assessed, we remain unhappy with aspects of the approach to Landscape Value (Email 22.04.2025). There is concern that the value assessment has been carried out just at a character area level rather than looking at the details of the landscape value within the Order Limits and their setting. This could result in the downplaying of specific qualities and value related to the development corridor itself. With regard to the landscape value assessments, there are concerns that the detailed assessments identified in Annex A to Appendix 13.2: Landscape Baseline and Assessment appear to undervalue factors, particularly in relation to 'Distinctiveness', 'Perceptual' and 'Functional' criteria.</u></p> <p><u>It does not appear as though the effects of the proposal on national or regional landscape character have been assessed. Generally the viewpoint assessments are welcomed by CCC, but there are still</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

considerable gaps in the provision including VRA F9 Edney Common (Longer distance) and VRA F6 Chelmsford North-West (Longer distance) The shortfall is particularly noticeable from beyond 1.5 Kms and is in danger of undervaluing the significance of the effects on the PRow network in particular.

CCC considers that the visual assessment should more explicitly extend into sensitive areas beyond the 3Km line in order to demonstrate the effects are not significant.

It is not agreed that the value of the view should be judged substantially on identified viewpoints and promoted views in tourist-focussed documents and that in lieu of local landscape designation and district-wide Valued Landscape Assessments. The value of the view should be judged by how it relates to the LCA. It is considered the sensitivity of receptors and significance of the effects has been downplayed as a result of the approach taken.

CCC also have reservations regarding the methodology for assessing the value of views as this appears skewed towards published data.

At that this matter is considered under discussion. Noted that there was concern around the use of the Holford Rules as an out of date metric in relation to landscape values, which has led to a potential issue when considering the design especially around river valleys. Further consideration

			<p><u>is highlighted in the design and principles section 3.2.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.8.6</u></p>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions</u></p>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Landscape and Visual assessment are summarised in <b>Section 13.4 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-226]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The preliminary key parameters and assumptions are presented at 13.5 in relation to LVIA. It is understood 'This information is iterative and will be updated for the ES as the design evolves and relevant changes are accounted for in the assessment'. CCC/ reserve the right to comment further should the parameters and assumptions change.</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 13.2.9 of Document 6.13.A2 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.2 Landscape Baseline and Assessment states, there are no locally designated landscapes within the 3 km Study Area', without reference to the fact that the districts through which the Project line passes no longer designate landscapes locally, in keeping with National policy from the late 1990s and 2000s. The lack of local landscape designation does not imply lack of landscape qualities or value. The current Holford Rules advise where possible choose routes which minimise the effect on Special Landscape Areas, areas of Great Landscape Value and other</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

similar designations of County, District or Local value.'

There is concern that the landscape value criteria evaluation is flawed. The baseline evaluation and judgements appear to be made solely at a district and not a site/setting level, they do not necessarily address the value of the key characteristics of the landscapes in the study area that are directly affected.

The landscape value assessment was not made available until the submission of the ES and so has not, to our knowledge, informed the alignment in any meaningful way. It is considered the proposed alignment needs to be looked at again in light of this data.

This matter is considered under discussion.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

**EIA – Baseline Conditions**

3.8.7	<u>Baseline conditions and receptors</u>	<u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Landscape and Visual are presented in <b>Section 13.5 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-226]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u>	<u>CCC remain unsatisfied generally with the number of viewpoint assessments proposed as previously outlined. CCC/welcome the inclusion of criteria against which landscape value will be assessed but remain unhappy with aspects of the approach to Landscape</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
-------	--	---	---	-------------------------

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

Value (Email 22.04.2025) and therefore the outcome in terms of the baseline.

CCC also have reservations regarding the methodology for assessing the value of views.

An approach to compensation not just mitigation needs to be identified to meet the EIA Regs and EN-1 requirements and to meet the test of 'as far as possible'. CCC have been calling for engagement on this issue since 2023.

Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.

This matter is considered under discussion. Noted concerns around scale of visual receptor areas.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

**EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures**

**3.8.8**

**Embedded mitigation**

Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Landscape and Visual effects, are set out in **Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)** of the **ES [APP-226]**. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.

Landscape – adequacy of undergrounding, mitigation and lack of compensation are all still under discussion.

CCC concerns regarding the setting of Grade II 'Langleys' Registered Park and Garden and both Great Waltham and Little Waltham Conservation Areas remain

Under discussion

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

unresolved. Although the repositioning of 3no. pylons (TB136, TB142 and TB140) and the use of 'lower height pylons' for 7no locations (TB136 to TB142) is considered to have comparable overall effects, the use of alternative design has been requested.

Alternative routing has been discussed.

The Holford Rules are out of date on the issue of locally designated landscapes and do not capture the concept of valued landscapes. These haven't been reviewed since the 1990s. Since then, landscape characterisation has become the tool for understanding landscape and guidance on valued landscape assessment outside designated landscapes introduced.

Even if 'policy statement EN-5 (which covers the development of new energy infrastructure) ... concludes that in most cases, the government expects that overhead lines will be appropriate and should be used as standard to reinforce the grid' it doesn't follow that there are no significant residual negative effects and that further undergrounding or compensation might be required. the PEIR states that significant landscape and visual impacts will occur along the length of the project.

An approach to compensation is required. CCC have been calling for engagement on this issue since 2023.

			<p><u>This matter is considered under discussion but likely to be considered not agreed leading into final review.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.8.9</u>	<u>Standard mitigation</u>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Landscape and Visual effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-226]</b> and set out in the Outline CoCP <b>[APP-300]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC consider the standard mitigation measures do not wholly mitigate substantial significant temporary impacts caused by construction.</u></p> <p><u>This matter is considered under discussion and further review is to be undertaken by CCC</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.8.10</u>	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in <b>Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-226]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC consider the additional mitigation measures do not address significant residual negative impacts from pylons and the overhead cables. We do not agree that the mitigation hierarchy has been effectively applied as it does not include</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

compensation for the significant residual negative impacts of the overhead lines and pylons.

An approach to compensation is required, where and how it will be identified and described, and how the applicant will engage on this topic with the local authority. We do not consider the applicants have considered or met either the EIA Regs or EN-1 requirements in relation to compensation.

It appears the likely significant negative landscape and visual effects of the project are generally not to be compensated for which is not acceptable.

CCC suggest the test of 'as far as possible' has not been met in any reasonable way in relation to the likely significant permanent negative landscape and visual impacts along the length of the project described by the applicant within the PEIR.

The planting has been identified as Landscape Compensation within 7.4 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. Whilst the inclusion of this element of compensation within the LEMP is to be welcomed, it is not considered to be 'compensation' in Landscape and Visual Impact terms, judging it to be at best reinstatement for existing mature and semi-mature vegetation that is to be removed during construction.

This matter is considered under discussion but likely to be considered not agreed leading into final review.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

### EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects

3.8.11

Construction effects

The assessment of effects during construction is presented in **Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)** of the **ES [APP-226]**. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

The Statutory Consultation response for Chelmsford City Council (2024) identified:

*The PEIR acknowledges that the proposals will have a significant negative landscape and visual impact at both construction and operational stages over the length of the Project. This is identified as up to 1 Km from the Project line in many situations.*

CCC generally accept the judgement that during the construction stage, significant effects occur generally within 1.5 Km of the Project. However, towards the end of the construction period it is considered that the adverse effects, especially visual, could extend beyond this distance, especially in open landscapes as multiple pylons and overhead line runs become visible.

T this matter is considered under discussion. Noted that to further discussions that tree and hedgerow

Under discussion

			<p><u>removal needs to be quantified and provided.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.8.12</u></p>	<p><u>Operational (and maintenance) effects</u></p>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is summarised in <b>Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP-226].</b> The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The Statutory Consultation response for Chelmsford City Council (2024) identified:</u></p> <p><u>The PEIR acknowledges that the proposals will have a significant negative landscape and visual impact at both construction and operational stages over the length of the Project. This is identified as up to 1 Km from the Project line in many situations.</u></p> <p><u>CCC's position is that at the operational stage impacts are likely to still be major significant rather than moderate significant beyond 0.5Kms, particularly where there are multiple pylons 50m high visible in sequence couple with the overhead line and often in landscapes where invisibility is high. CCC consider that based on the information supplied, that significant negative impacts could occur at a distance greater than 1 Km from the Project, including on intangible landscape assets at the operational stage.</u></p> <p><u>Where negative effects are judged not to be significant the experience of receptors is still likely to be negatively affected over a wide area, reducing aesthetic</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

			<p><u>enjoyment, the sense of place, history and identity, and inspiration for learning. In order to reduce significant landscape and visual impacts at the operational stage over the length of the Project, more use of undergrounding is required to protect valued local landscapes, long-distant rights of way and rural amenity sites.</u></p> <p><u>This matter is considered under discussion and requires further review. Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.8.13</u></p>	<p><u>Residual effects</u></p>	<p><u>The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-226]</b>. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>LCA B1: Central Essex Farmlands: CCC generally agree with the judgements in Table A13.2.50 (construction and operational).</u></p> <p><u>LCA C5: Chelmer Valley: CCC agree that the judgements in Table A13.2.52 (construction and operational) are agreed with in regards to this LCA, yet query the magnitude at 0.5-1.5km (construction) which has been judged to be medium in the table but high in para 13.3.707.</u></p> <p><u>LCA D2: Brentwood Hills: CCC generally agree with the individual judgements made for within 0.5km, between 0.5-1.5 km and beyond 1.5 km, which confirm no reduction in effects from construction.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

LCA G2: Chelmsford and Environs: CCC agree with the judgements in Table A13.2.53 (construction and operational).

**Visual receptor areas:**

The following visual receptors were highlighted in the LIR:

- F1 Great Leighs:
- F2 Peverel's Farm
- F5 Chignall Smealy
- F4 Great Waltham
- F5 Little Waltham
- F6 Chelmsford North-West
- F7 Roxwell
- F8 Writtle and Chelmsford West
- F9 Edney Common
- F10 Hylands Park
- F11 Margaretting and Stock

This matter is considered under discussion and requires further review.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

**Specific Chelmsford related issues**

<u>3.8.14</u>	<u>Great Waltham and Little Waltham</u>	<b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b> <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant</u>	<u>In landscape and visual impact terms, there are concerns regarding the wider impact of the pylons and overhead line on the historical landscape setting associated</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
---------------	---	---	---	-------------------------

representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

with Langleys. The introduction of pylons would likely degrade the setting by forming a backdrop of pylons behind the building within the wider landscape.

There would be an introduction of overhead lines into a location where views are otherwise absent of industrialised features. There would be close and sometimes open views of the proposal from local receptors, from residential properties, PRow and from scattered properties where pylons would appear very prominent. Pylons would appear stacked behind each other in some views.

The scale of change would be large, and the effect would be major and significant (adverse), reducing to moderate and significant (adverse) within Little Waltham. The cumulative effect of multiple pylons and the continuous overhead linear nature of the project, means that the collective impacts would create an overall significant adverse effect at both construction and operation.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

### Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring

3.8.15 Outline CoCP The Outline CoCP [APP-300] includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in Chapter 13 (Landscape

T this matter is considered under discussion and requires further review of the Outline CoCP.

Under discussion

	<p><u>and Visual) of the ES [APP-226] and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300].</b></u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300].</b></u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>		
<p><u>3.8.16</u>      <u>Outline LEMP</u></p>	<p><u>The Outline LEMP [AS-046] includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES [APP-226]</b> and is appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline LEMP [AS-046].</b></u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline LEMP [AS-046].</b></u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the <b>Outline LEMP [AS-046]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p> <p><u>Comments received from EPS will be taken on board and addressed in the next iteration of the <b>Outline LEMP [AS-046].</b></u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>This this matter is considered under discussion and requires further review of the Outline LEMP.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

## Other matters as required

3.8.17	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u>	<p>The cumulative effects of the Project have been assessed and are presented in 6.17 <b><u>Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects [APP-281].Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</p> <p>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</p> <p>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>Likely Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impacts with VE, NFOW, EACN.</p> <p>CCC consider that the cumulative effect of multiple pylons and the continuous overhead linear character of the project, mean that the collective effects create an overall significant adverse effect within the VRA at both construction and operation.</p> <p>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
--------	---------------------------	--	---	-------------------------

## 3.9 Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism

Table 3.9 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u>				
3.9.1	<u>Policy and legislation</u>	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism assessment is presented in <b><u>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP-126] and Section 15.2 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism) of the ES [APP-265].</u></b></p>	<p>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

**EIA – Approach and Methods**

**3.9.2 Study area**

The Scoping Opinion stated: “The Applicant should seek to agree the study area with the relevant local authorities”.

A meeting was held on 14 November 2024 to seek to agree this point in the Scoping Opinion. Technical Notes were shared in June 2023 and April 2024.

Following the meeting held on 14 November, it was agreed that the study area for businesses would be expanded from 1 km to 3 km to take into account potential visual effects on businesses.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> Technical Note was issued in March 2025 to seek agreement on the study area and methodology.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.

Under discussion

3.9.3	<u>Data sources</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 15.4 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b>.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
3.9.4	<u>Assessment methodology</u>	<p><u>The Scoping Opinion stated “<i>The ES should detail the criteria used to identify businesses likely to be affected and the Applicant should seek to agree these with relevant local authorities</i>”.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held on 14 November 2024 to seek to agree this point in the Scoping Opinion. A 3<sup>rd</sup> Technical Note is currently being prepared to seek to agree the study area and methodology.</u></p> <p><u>CCC commented in July 2022 that the Project should consider sports pitches and courts as well as Hylands Estate as recreation and tourism assets. The assessment of potential effects on Hylands House Country Estate is detailed in the 6.15.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1 - Built and Other Assets within the 3 km Study Area <b>[APP-266]</b>.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant</u></p>	<p><u>The Project should consider sports pitches and courts as well as Hylands Estate as recreation and tourism assets.</u></p> <p><u>The effect upon the Scout Jamboree site at Hylands Park should also be considered.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

		<p><u>representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>		
3.9.5	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions</u></p>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism assessment are summarised in <b>Section 15.4 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (<b>document reference 8.4.1</b>).Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

**EIA – Baseline Conditions**

3.9.6	<p><u>Baseline conditions and receptors</u></p>	<p><u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism are presented in <b>Section 15.5 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>
-------	---	---	---	--------------------------------

## EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures

3.9.7	<u>Embedded mitigation</u>	<p><u>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism effects, are set out in <b>Section 15.6 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>During the construction of the development, community liaison would be critical to mitigate and address local concerns; with appropriate compensation paid to those whose concerns cannot be mitigated. The construction effects would be particularly noticeable around Margaretting and Writtle, whose communities experience a high number of events including national events hosted at Hylands House. Detrimental effects on access to events and local businesses, however temporary, would be unacceptable.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
3.9.8	<u>Standard mitigation</u>	<p><u>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 15.6 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b> and set out in the Outline CoCP [APP-300]. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant</u></p>	<p><u>During the construction of the development, community liaison would be critical to mitigate and address local concerns; with appropriate compensation paid to those whose concerns cannot be mitigated. The construction effects would be particularly noticeable around Margaretting and Writtle, whose communities experience a high number of events including national events hosted at Hylands House. Detrimental effects on access to events and local businesses,</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

		<p><u>representations process (document reference 8.4.1).Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>however temporary, would be unacceptable.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.9.9	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 15.6 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>During the construction of the development, community liaison would be critical to mitigate and address local concerns; with appropriate compensation paid to those whose concerns cannot be mitigated. The construction effects would be particularly noticeable around Margaretting and Writtle, whose communities experience a high number of events including national events hosted at Hylands House. Detrimental effects on access to events and local businesses, however temporary, would be unacceptable.</u></p> <p><u>A local skills and employment plan is absent from the projects. This should be secured to help maximise the benefits to the local economy and create localised training opportunities and jobs.</u></p> <p><u>Appropriate training should be provided to enable the local workforce to continue to fulfil future projects and provide operational support to the pylons and overhead lines should the DCO be granted.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

CCC is concerned about the inclusion of Sunday and Bank Holidays to the core working hours in relation to socio-economic industry and enjoyment of the countryside. The proposed working hours raise concern due to their extended nature, in particular at weekends and bank holidays where residents and users of the countryside would ordinarily expect respite from operations during the weekend.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

**EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects**

3.9.10 Construction effects

The assessment of effects during construction is presented in **Section 15.7 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)** of the **ES [APP-265]**. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1). Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

During the construction of the development, community liaison would be critical to mitigate and address local concerns; with appropriate compensation paid to those whose concerns cannot be mitigated. The construction effects would be particularly noticeable around Margaretting and Writtle, whose communities experience a high number of events including national events hosted at Hylands House. Detrimental effects on access to events and local businesses, however temporary, would be unacceptable.

A local skills and employment plan is absent from the projects. This should be secured to help maximise the benefits to

Under discussion

the local economy and create localised training opportunities and jobs. Appropriate training should be provided to enable the local workforce to continue to fulfil future projects and provide operational support to the pylons and overhead lines should the DCO be granted.

Regard would need to be had to the impact of the project upon recreation and tourism, through ensuring that Chelmsford's valued rural landscape remains open and accessible.

CCC is concerned about the inclusion of Sunday and Bank Holidays to the core working hours in relation to socio-economic industry and enjoyment of the countryside. The proposed working hours raise concern due to their extended nature, in particular at weekends and bank holidays where residents and users of the countryside would ordinarily expect respite from operations during the weekend.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

3.9.11 Operational (and maintenance) effects  
The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in **Section 15.7 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)** of the **ES [APP-265]**. The assessment of effects during operation (and

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will

Under discussion

		<p><u>maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<u>3.9.12</u>	<u>Residual effects</u>	<p><u>The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 15.7 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>A local skills and employment plan is absent from the projects. This should be secured to help maximise the benefits to the local economy and create localised training opportunities and jobs.</u></p> <p><u>Appropriate training should be provided to enable the local workforce to continue to fulfil future projects and provide operational support to the pylons and overhead lines should the DCO be granted.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

### Specific Chelmsford related issues

<u>3.9.13</u>	<u>Specific Chelmsford related issues</u>	<p><u>The potential effects on Essex International Jamboree during construction and operation has been assessed under the <b>ES Chapter 15: Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism [APP-265]</b>, Table 15.22 and Table 15.28.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p>	<p><u>CCC noted in their review of the Statement of Common Ground on 28 January 2026 to consider the Scout Jamboree Location</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
---------------	---	--	--	-------------------------

	<p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
--	--	---	--

**Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring**

3.9.14	<u>Outline CoCP</u>	<p><u>The <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-265]</b>. and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>A further iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
--------	---------------------	--	--------------------------	-------------------------

**Other matters as required**

3.9.15	<u>Public Rights of Way</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>There are several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within and abutting the Order Limits and CCC defers to Essex County Council PRoW team regarding the impact of the proposal upon these. The PRoW are an important feature in providing access and recreational opportunities within the countryside and contribute to</u></p>	<u>Under Discussion</u>
--------	-----------------------------	---	--	-------------------------

		<p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>the recreational and tourism value of the proposal. The PRow would need to remain open during the construction of the development to maintain recreational access to the countryside.</u>  <u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.9.16</u></p>	<p><u>Skills and Employment Plan and Skills Fund</u></p>	<p><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The proposal would create temporary benefits on local employment generation and the local economy during the construction of the development. Yet a local skills and employment plan is absent from the proposals. This should be secured to help maximise the benefits to the local economy and create localised training opportunities and jobs.</u>  <u>Appropriate training should be provided to enable the local workforce to continue to fulfil future projects and provide operational support to the pylons and overhead lines should the DCO be granted.</u>  <u>The Skills and Employment Plan should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>• Clear delivery plans for apprenticeships, work placements, school engagement and training programmes.</u></li> <li><u>• Commitments to local job creation and use of local contractors where feasible.</u></li> </ul>	

- 
- Evidence-based interventions informed by community engagement and local labour market data,
  - A sustainability and legacy framework to ensure initiatives continue from construction through to operation.

A Skills Fund, proportionate to the scale and impact of the development, should be prepared and used to:

- Invest in local further education facilities and provision
- Support employment and skills programmes
- Enhance careers education and school engagement
- Fund Officer resource for consultation and monitoring of the employment and skills strategy

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

---

### **3.10 Traffic and transport (including Public Rights of Way)**

Chelmsford City Council defers its' position relating to traffic and transport, and public rights of way, to Essex County Council as the relevant highways authority. The following table outlines Chelmsford specific issues related to this topic.

Table 3.10 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to traffic and transport

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>3.10.1</u>	<u>Public Rights of Way (PRoW)</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The main concern is the impact of the proposal upon the local highway network and Public Rights of Way (PRoW).</u>  <u>It is understood the proposal would harmfully impact upon the local highway network and Public Rights of Way (PRoW). The effects would be particularly noticeable during the construction of the development and from the on-going maintenance and operation of the pylons, overhead lines and associated equipment.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.10.2</u>	<u>A1060 Roxwell Road</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>It is noted that the A1060 Roxwell Road is the subject of a potential new road safety scheme involving average speed cameras. The scheme is being worked up as part of Essex County Council's Vision Zero approach to road safety with the aspiration of eliminating all road deaths and serious injuries in Essex by 2040. There are concerns that with the extra number of construction vehicles and large vehicle types using the link as part of the designated construction route that there will be an additional impact on safety.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>Further discussions are needed on areas of the network where accidents have been identified along the construction routes.</u></p> <p><u>The construction of the development would give rise to a wide range of public health impacts, resulting in harm to the local communities that the proposal would sit. Matters including construction routes, hours of operation, the formation of vehicular accesses, traffic management and associated safety operations would need to be fully considered and mitigated as part of the proposals, with appropriate mitigation provided.</u></p>	
3.10.3	<u>Cumulative Impacts</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>Cumulatively, the impacts of the proposal on all other existing NSIPS and strategic sites need to be considered with further consideration given to the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>• Essex residents and businesses;</u></li> <li><u>• Mitigation of traffic impacts at sensitive junction locations on the wider network;</u></li> <li><u>• Mitigation of construction routes on sensitive receptors;</u></li> <li><u>• Measures to reduce localised impacts associated with construction workers and construction traffic;</u></li> <li><u>• The design and monitoring of the traffic management in the relatively long-term situations.</u></li> </ul>	<u>Under discussion</u>

## 3.11 Cumulative Effects

Table 3.11 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Cumulative Effects

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</u></b>				
3.11.1	<u>Policy and legislation</u>	<p><u>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Cumulative Effects assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) [APP-126] and Section 17.2 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES [APP-281].</b></u></p> <p><u>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>EIA – Approach and Methods</u></b>				
3.11.2	<u>Study area</u>	<p><u>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>Cumulative effects of the Project have been assessed and are presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects [APP-281].</b> The</u></p>	<p><u>There are several developments within the area that may be affected by the projects. These include, but are not limited to, the Longfield Solar Farm Development Consent Order – new solar array creating 500 MW of energy, the Countryside zest (Beaulieu Park) LLP – Garden Community and the Lower Thames Crossing Nationally Significant</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

		<p><u>assessment includes Longfield Solar Farm, Beaulieu Park and Lower Thames Crossing. National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The greatest effects would be felt during the construction of the development.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.11.3	<u>Data sources</u>	<p><u>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Sections 17.4 and 17.5 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-281]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></p> <p><u>An assessment of Cumulative Effects that includes consideration of intra-project effects undertaken in accordance with the <b>6.19 Scoping Report [APP-288 to APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion [APP-297]</b> is presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects [APP-281]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.</u></p> <p><u>The effects raised regarding data sources from other ES topics will be applicable here.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
3.11.4	<u>Assessment methodology</u>	<p><u>The methodology for assessing Cumulative Effects was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</u></p>	<p><u>The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>See response to ID 3.10.3.</u>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.</u>  <u>The effects raised regarding assessment methodology from other ES topics will be applicable here.</u>  <u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p>3.11.5 <u>Key parameters and assumptions</u></p>	<p><u>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Cumulative Effects assessment are summarised in <b>Sections 17.5 and 17.6 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-281]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</u>  <b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>See response to ID 3.10.3.</u>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.</u>  <u>The effects raised regarding key parameters and assumptions will be applicable here.</u>  <u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

## EIA – Baseline Conditions

3.11.6	<u>Baseline conditions and receptors</u>	<u>The baseline conditions and receptors for Cumulative Effects are presented within the environmental topic chapters of the ES. (Chapters 6 – 16 of the ES). The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</u>	<u>The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
		<u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b> See response to ID 3.10.3. National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1). Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR. National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u>	<u>The baseline conditions and receptors from other ES topics will be applicable here. Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u>	

## EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures

3.11.7	<u>Embedded mitigation</u>	<u>The assessment of cumulative effects considers the residual effects identified during construction and operation (and maintenance) within the environmental topic chapters (Chapters 6 – 16 of the ES). Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project are therefore set out in the environmental topic chapters of the ES. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u>	<u>The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
		<u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b> See response to ID 3.10.3</u>	<u>The effects raised regarding embedded mitigation from other ES topics will be applicable here. Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27</u>	

		<p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.11.8	<u>Standard mitigation</u>	<p><u>The assessment of cumulative effects considers the residual effects identified during construction and operation (and maintenance) within the environmental topic chapters (Chapters 6 – 16 of the ES). Standard mitigation measures during construction are summarised in the environmental topic chapters (<b>Chapters 6 – 16</b>) of the <b>ES</b> and set out in the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</u></p> <p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The effects raised regarding standard mitigation from other ES topics will be applicable here.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
3.11.9	<u>Additional mitigation</u>	<p><u>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 17.4</b> and <b>17.5</b> of <b>Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-281]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms</u></p>	<p><u>The effects raised regarding additional mitigation from other ES topics will be applicable here.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

**EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects**

**3.11.10 Construction effects**

The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 17.4 and 17.5 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) of the **ES [APP-281]**. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.

**Ecology**

it was determined that inter-project cumulative effects on ecology and biodiversity receptors within the areas surrounding the Project would be not significant during both construction and operation (and maintenance). This is either due to the distance of the project to other development, or due to a lack of notable ecological receptors/lack of connectivity for any protected species to reach the Project, or because of different habitats being affected within the Zone of Influence of other developments.

Under discussion

It is considered that the embedded mitigation of the project route has very largely avoided a potential for significant impacts on any designated sites.

The construction phase is expected to have primarily temporary impacts. After the construction of the pylons, overhead lines, and underground cable sections, those areas are anticipated to be restored back to similar, if not equivalent, natural habitats (although bearing in mind a currently limited habitat establishment commitment and on-going vegetation height management requirements).

The operational stage of the project has very few and limited potential ecological impact pathways.

The Norwich to Tilbury project as a whole has significant ecological impact potential owing to its scale – a 180km electricity transmission route plus compounds and construction infrastructure. However, where a lesser component section of the project may share a zone of influence with another development project, that section alone would be expected to have a much lower impact potential.

### **Landscape and Visual**

A large number of significant Intra project landscape and visual effects associated with the Project have been identified, as reported in Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (document reference 6.13). Based on the data available on the other developments, the assessment identified 47 shortlisted other development with the

potential to contribute to significant inter-project effects on landscape and visual receptors during construction, and 34 during operation (and maintenance).

These other developments have the potential to contribute to major and significant inter-project effects on Landscape Character Types (LCT) or Visual Receptors Areas (VRA). Despite this, para 17.5.58 states 'No additional mitigation measures beyond those proposed in Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (Ref 6.13) have been identified'. Whilst it is agreed that it is not practicable to mitigate these due to scale of the works and the height of the pylons, significant compensation should be secured to mitigate against this impact.

The project would lead to a large number of significant landscape and visual effects during both construction and operation. Whilst it may not be practicable to mitigate these due to scale of the works and the height of the pylons, significant compensation in the form of a funding package should be secured under a side agreement in partnership with the relevant authorities and environmental partners should be provided.

Significant cumulative effects at the construction stage are identified on Pedestrians, Cyclists and Horse Riders in many Visual Receptor Areas (VRAs) and yet paragraph 17.4.21 identifies '... no additional mitigation measures were identified in addition to

those already identified within the environmental topic assessments' (Our underlining). The decision-making assumptions that gave rise to these conclusions need clarifying.

Paragraph 17.4.18 identifies that 'No effects on common receptors during the operation (and maintenance) phase of the Project have been identified which could give rise to intra-project cumulative effects and are therefore not considered further.' This is queried in relation to Agricultural and soil receptors, Landscape, Ecology and Historic receptors.

### **Archaeology**

There are a number of developments which are proposed, or under construction across Essex (in particular, within the Tendring Peninsula, Thurrock and other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) schemes dependant on Norwich to Tilbury) which have potential to have cumulative effects on archaeology due to the scale and nature of the development.

Cumulative effects of the development are split by the application into two categories: intra-project and inter-project.

Archaeological remains are not considered potential receptors to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects.

Inter-project cumulative effects are those which are resultant of the combination of the Norwich to Tilbury project and other existing projects. Effects to non-designated heritage assets/archaeological remains have been identified for the Project and

separately for other developments and are listed in Table A17.3.1 in Document 6.17.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 17.3 - Inter-Project Cumulative Effects [APP 284].

No significant inter-project cumulative effects have been identified for archaeological remains as part of the assessment. The reasoning for this is expanded in Section 17.5.52 [APP-281] which states: "While there would be overlap of the Order Limits for other developments and the Project, effects to archaeology would only occur once by whichever construction would take place first. These effects would be mitigated as appropriate and agreed with the LPA (such as through excavation, recording, and publication). Any affected archaeology would be removed as a result of the mitigation/construction and therefore the inter-project effects for construction and operation (and maintenance) would be negligible and not significant."

This statement is incorrect as the cumulative effects would be derived from the increase in land take across the combined Order Limits of both or more projects and not from overlap. For example, in Tendring District a separate substation is planned to be erected adjacent to the substations required for both Five Estuaries and North Falls Offshore Windfarms and not within the same parcels of land.

Similarly, the Lower Thames Crossing within Thurrock District will result in a

significant impact on archaeological remains that would be increased by the groundworks required for the construction of a substation for Norwich to Tilbury as well as pylon bases and associated infrastructure.

The cumulative impact of the project would be because of the increase in the total area of land take and not overlap, and therefore the scale of potential archaeological remains which could be lost as a result of the mitigation / construction is increased.

Archaeological remains are a finite and non-renewable resource. This cumulative impact may not be determined as significant through the process of the assessment but should be considered an adverse effect of the project wherever they are removed. As the nature of the archaeological remains that may be affected is currently unknown the impact and significance cannot be determined effectively through this form of assessment. While mitigation by record may reduce the cumulative impact in EIA terms, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted (NPPF, 2004 Paragraph 218).

### **Noise, Health and Wellbeing**

CCC is particularly concerned regarding the cumulative noise and construction impacts arising from these developments.

Cumulatively taken all together the project has potential to lead to significant adverse effects. It is crucial that residents get regular breaks, and the proposed development is

well managed, controlled and integrated within existing permitted development schemes. Reasonable hours of work and good construction traffic management are one of the key measures to reduce impact.

### **Other Impacts**

Cumulatively there is concern that should the DCO be granted, it would coincide with the construction of the Lower Thames Crossing. Although the anticipation is that there would be only 10% of local labour, there would be high demand across the area. Subject to season, those staying in local accommodation, could use vital bed space to which CCC is extremely short of. Cumulatively, the impacts of the project on all other existing NSIPS and strategic sites need to be considered with further consideration given to the following:

Essex residents and businesses;

- Mitigation of traffic impacts at sensitive junction locations on the wider network;
- Mitigation of construction routes on sensitive receptors;
- Measures to reduce localised impacts associated with construction workers and construction traffic;
- The design and monitoring of the traffic management in the relatively long-term situations.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be

			<p><u>provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.11.11</u></p>	<p><u>Operational (and maintenance) effects</u></p>	<p><u>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 17.4 and 17.5 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES [APP-281].</b> The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</u></p> <p><u><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></u></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.</u></p> <p><u><b>Ecology</b></u></p> <p><u>it was determined that inter-project cumulative effects on ecology and biodiversity receptors within the areas surrounding the Project would be not significant during both construction and operation (and maintenance). This is either due to the distance of the project to other development, or due to a lack of notable ecological receptors/lack of connectivity for any protected species to reach the Project, or because of different habitats being affected within the Zone of Influence of other developments.</u></p> <p><u>It is considered that the embedded mitigation of the project route has very largely avoided a potential for significant impacts on any designated sites.</u></p> <p><u>The construction phase is expected to have primarily temporary impacts. After the construction of the pylons, overhead lines, and underground cable sections, those areas are anticipated to be restored back to similar, if not equivalent, natural habitats</u></p>	<p><u>Under discussion</u></p>

(although bearing in mind a currently limited habitat establishment commitment and on-going vegetation height management requirements).

The operational stage of the project has very few and limited potential ecological impact pathways.

The Norwich to Tilbury project as a whole has significant ecological impact potential owing to its scale – a 180km electricity transmission route plus compounds and construction infrastructure. However, where a lesser component section of the project may share a zone of influence with another development project, that section alone would be expected to have a much lower impact potential.

### **Landscape and Visual**

A large number of significant Intra project landscape and visual effects associated with the Project have been identified, as reported in Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (document reference 6.13). Based on the data available on the other developments, the assessment identified 47 shortlisted other development with the potential to contribute to significant inter-project effects on landscape and visual receptors during construction, and 34 during operation (and maintenance).

These other developments have the potential to contribute to major and significant inter-project effects on Landscape Character Types (LCT) or Visual Receptors Areas (VRA). Despite this, para

17.5.58 states 'No additional mitigation measures beyond those proposed in Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (Ref 6.13) have been identified'. Whilst it is agreed that it is not practicable to mitigate these due to scale of the works and the height of the pylons, significant compensation should be secured to mitigate against this impact.

The project would lead to a large number of significant landscape and visual effects during both construction and operation. Whilst it may not be practicable to mitigate these due to scale of the works and the height of the pylons, significant compensation in the form of a funding package should be secured under a side agreement in partnership with the relevant authorities and environmental partners should be provided.

Significant cumulative effects at the construction stage are identified on Pedestrians, Cyclists and Horse Riders in many Visual Receptor Areas (VRAs) and yet paragraph

17.4.21 identifies '... no additional mitigation measures were identified in addition to those already identified within the environmental topic assessments' (Our underlining). The decision-making assumptions that gave rise to these conclusions need clarifying.

Paragraph 17.4.18 identifies that 'No effects on common receptors during the operation (and maintenance) phase of the Project have been identified which could give rise to

intra-project cumulative effects and are therefore not considered further.' This is queried in relation to Agricultural and soil receptors, Landscape, Ecology and Historic receptors.

### **Archaeology**

There are a number of developments which are proposed, or under construction across Essex (in particular, within the Tendring Peninsula, Thurrock and other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) schemes dependant on Norwich to Tilbury) which have potential to have cumulative effects on archaeology due to the scale and nature of the development.

Cumulative effects of the development are split by the application into two categories: intra-project and inter-project.

Archaeological remains are not considered potential receptors to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects.

Inter-project cumulative effects are those which are resultant of the combination of the Norwich to Tilbury project and other existing projects. Effects to non-designated heritage assets/archaeological remains have been identified for the Project and separately for other developments and are listed in Table A17.3.1 in Document **6.17.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 17.3 - Inter-Project Cumulative Effects [APP 284]**.

No significant inter-project cumulative effects have been identified for archaeological remains as part of the

assessment. The reasoning for this is expanded in Section 17.5.52 [APP-281] which states: “While there would be overlap of the Order Limits for other developments and the Project, effects to archaeology would only occur once by whichever construction would take place first. These effects would be mitigated as appropriate and agreed with the LPA (such as through excavation, recording, and publication). Any affected archaeology would be removed as a result of the mitigation/construction and therefore the inter-project effects for construction and operation (and maintenance) would be negligible and not significant.”

This statement is incorrect as the cumulative effects would be derived from the increase in land take across the combined Order Limits of both or more projects and not from overlap. For example, in Tendring District a separate substation is planned to be erected adjacent to the substations required for both Five Estuaries and North Falls Offshore Windfarms and not within the same parcels of land.

Similarly, the Lower Thames Crossing within Thurrock District will result in a significant impact on archaeological remains that would be increased by the groundworks required for the construction of a substation for Norwich to Tilbury as well as pylon bases and associated infrastructure.

The cumulative impact of the project would be because of the increase in the total area

of land take and not overlap, and therefore the scale of potential archaeological remains which could be lost as a result of the mitigation / construction is increased. Archaeological remains are a finite and non-renewable resource. This cumulative impact may not be determined as significant through the process of the assessment but should be considered an adverse effect of the project wherever they are removed. As the nature of the archaeological remains that may be affected is currently unknown the impact and significance cannot be determined effectively through this form of assessment. While mitigation by record may reduce the cumulative impact in EIA terms, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted (NPPF, 2004 Paragraph 218).

#### **Noise, Health and Wellbeing**

CCC is particularly concerned regarding the cumulative noise and construction impacts arising from these developments. Cumulatively taken all together the project has potential to lead to significant adverse effects. It is crucial that residents get regular breaks, and the proposed development is well managed, controlled and integrated within existing permitted development schemes. Reasonable hours of work and good construction traffic management are one of the key measures to reduce impact.

#### **Other Impacts**

Cumulatively there is concern that should the DCO be granted, it would coincide with

the construction of the Lower Thames Crossing. Although the anticipation is that there would be only 10% of local labour, there would be high demand across the area. Subject to season, those staying in local accommodation, could use vital bed space to which CCC is extremely short of. Cumulatively, the impacts of the project on all other existing NSIPS and strategic sites need to be considered with further consideration given to the following:

- Essex residents and businesses;
- Mitigation of traffic impacts at sensitive junction locations on the wider network;
- Mitigation of construction routes on sensitive receptors;
- Measures to reduce localised impacts associated with construction workers and construction traffic;
- The design and monitoring of the traffic management in the relatively long-term situations.

Please see CCC’s full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15 January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC’s final Local Impact Report.

3.11.12 Residual effects

The residual effects are presented in **Section 17.4 and 17.5 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)** of the **ES [APP-281]**. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.

The project has potential to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects, and these will need to be considered for all receptors, especially with regard to agriculture and soil, ecology and historic receptors which

Under discussion

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

have not been considered further. Other receptors include ecology, highways, landscape and visual and noise for example.

**Ecology**

it was determined that inter-project cumulative effects on ecology and biodiversity receptors within the areas surrounding the Project would be not significant during both construction and operation (and maintenance). This is either due to the distance of the project to other development, or due to a lack of notable ecological receptors/lack of connectivity for any protected species to reach the Project, or because of different habitats being affected within the Zone of Influence of other developments.

It is considered that the embedded mitigation of the project route has very largely avoided a potential for significant impacts on any designated sites.

The construction phase is expected to have primarily temporary impacts. After the construction of the pylons, overhead lines, and underground cable sections, those areas are anticipated to be restored back to similar, if not equivalent, natural habitats (although bearing in mind a currently limited habitat establishment commitment and on-going vegetation height management requirements).

The operational stage of the project has very few and limited potential ecological impact pathways.

The Norwich to Tilbury project as a whole has significant ecological impact potential owing to its scale – a 180km electricity transmission route plus compounds and construction infrastructure. However, where a lesser component section of the project may share a zone of influence with another development project, that section alone would be expected to have a much lower impact potential.

### **Landscape and Visual**

A large number of significant Intra project landscape and visual effects associated with the Project have been identified, as reported in Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (document reference 6.13). Based on the data available on the other developments, the assessment identified 47 shortlisted other development with the potential to contribute to significant inter-project effects on landscape and visual receptors during construction, and 34 during operation (and maintenance).

These other developments have the potential to contribute to major and significant inter-project effects on Landscape Character Types (LCT) or Visual Receptors Areas (VRA). Despite this, para 17.5.58 states ‘No additional mitigation measures beyond those proposed in Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual (Ref 6.13) have been identified’. Whilst it is agreed that it is not practicable to mitigate these due to scale of the works and the height of the pylons, significant

compensation should be secured to mitigate against this impact.

The project would lead to a large number of significant landscape and visual effects during both construction and operation. Whilst it may not be practicable to mitigate these due to scale of the works and the height of the pylons, significant compensation in the form of a funding package should be secured under a side agreement in partnership with the relevant authorities and environmental partners should be provided.

Significant cumulative effects at the construction stage are identified on Pedestrians, Cyclists and Horse Riders in many Visual Receptor Areas (VRAs) and yet paragraph 17.4.21 identifies '... no additional mitigation measures were identified in addition to those already identified within the environmental topic assessments' (Our underlining). The decision-making assumptions that gave rise to these conclusions need clarifying.

Paragraph 17.4.18 identifies that 'No effects on common receptors during the operation (and maintenance) phase of the Project have been identified which could give rise to intra-project cumulative effects and are therefore not considered further.' This is queried in relation to Agricultural and soil receptors, Landscape, Ecology and Historic receptors.

**Archaeology**

There are a number of developments which are proposed, or under construction across Essex (in particular, within the Tendring Peninsula, Thurrock and other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) schemes dependant on Norwich to Tilbury) which have potential to have cumulative effects on archaeology due to the scale and nature of the development.

Cumulative effects of the development are split by the application into two categories: intra-project and inter-project.

Archaeological remains are not considered potential receptors to give rise to intra-project cumulative effects.

Inter-project cumulative effects are those which are resultant of the combination of the Norwich to Tilbury project and other existing projects. Effects to non-designated heritage assets/archaeological remains have been identified for the Project and separately for other developments and are listed in Table A17.3.1 in Document **6.17.A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 17.3 - Inter-Project Cumulative Effects [APP 284]**.

No significant inter-project cumulative effects have been identified for archaeological remains as part of the assessment. The reasoning for this is expanded in Section 17.5.52 **[APP-281]** which states: “While there would be overlap of the Order Limits for other developments and the Project, effects to archaeology would only occur once by whichever construction would take place first. These

effects would be mitigated as appropriate and agreed with the LPA (such as through excavation, recording, and publication). Any affected archaeology would be removed as a result of the mitigation/construction and therefore the inter-project effects for construction and operation (and maintenance) would be negligible and not significant.”

This statement is incorrect as the cumulative effects would be derived from the increase in land take across the combined Order Limits of both or more projects and not from overlap. For example, in Tendring District a separate substation is planned to be erected adjacent to the substations required for both Five Estuaries and North Falls Offshore Windfarms and not within the same parcels of land.

Similarly, the Lower Thames Crossing within Thurrock District will result in a significant impact on archaeological remains that would be increased by the groundworks required for the construction of a substation for Norwich to Tilbury as well as pylon bases and associated infrastructure.

The cumulative impact of the project would be because of the increase in the total area of land take and not overlap, and therefore the scale of potential archaeological remains which could be lost as a result of the mitigation / construction is increased. Archaeological remains are a finite and non-renewable resource. This cumulative impact

may not be determined as significant through the process of the assessment but should be considered an adverse effect of the project wherever they are removed. As the nature of the archaeological remains that may be affected is currently unknown the impact and significance cannot be determined effectively through this form of assessment. While mitigation by record may reduce the cumulative impact in EIA terms, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted (NPPF, 2004 Paragraph 218).

#### **Noise, Health and Wellbeing**

CCC is particularly concerned regarding the cumulative noise and construction impacts arising from these developments. Cumulatively taken all together the project has potential to lead to significant adverse effects. It is crucial that residents get regular breaks, and the proposed development is well managed, controlled and integrated within existing permitted development schemes. Reasonable hours of work and good construction traffic management are one of the key measures to reduce impact.

#### **Other Impacts**

Cumulatively there is concern that should the DCO be granted, it would coincide with the construction of the Lower Thames Crossing. Although the anticipation is that there would be only 10% of local labour, there would be high demand across the area. Subject to season, those staying in

local accommodation, could use vital bed space to which CCC is extremely short of. Cumulatively, the impacts of the project on all other existing NSIPS and strategic sites need to be considered with further consideration given to the following:

Essex residents and businesses;

- Mitigation of traffic impacts at sensitive junction locations on the wider network;
- Mitigation of construction routes on sensitive receptors;
- Measures to reduce localised impacts associated with construction workers and construction traffic;
- The design and monitoring of the traffic management in the relatively long-term situations.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

**Specific Chelmsford related issues**

3.11.13 Specific Chelmsford related issues

**Updated Position (February 2026):**

National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).

Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.

Under discussion

## Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring

3.11.14	<u>Outline CoCP</u>	<p>The <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES [APP-281]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>A meeting was held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</p> <p>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b>.</p> <p>A further iteration of the <b>Outline CoCP [APP-300]</b> was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<u>Under discussion.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
---------	---------------------	--	--------------------------	-------------------------

## Other matters as required

## 3.12 Development Consent Order

Table 3.12 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Development Consent Order

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>DCO General</u>				
3.12.1	<u>DCO Requirements – timescales</u>	<p><b>Updated Position (February 2026):</b></p> <p>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</p>	<p>CCC is particularly keen to ensure that the proposed 'requirements' are both workable, achievable and deliverable. The current requirements propose a timescale of 28 days from first</p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>registration to decision. Timeframes set out in the DCO must be sufficient for CCC to consider, engage with stakeholders and respond to such applications submitted to it, as well as affording applicants time to feedback and respond to any further comments made.</u></p> <p><u>Further consideration should be given to how the processes and timescales are set out in various parts of the Development Consent Order and their effect on the ability to fully consider and discharge requirements.</u></p> <p><u>CCC would request that a minimum of 56 days is given to determine the Requirement.</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	
3.12.2	<u>DCO Requirements –LoD in Great Waltham and Little Waltham</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b></p> <p><u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p> <p><u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>In Great Waltham and Little Waltham, the Limits of Deviation make provision to increase the height of the lower height pylons TB140 – TB142 to full height pylons. The requirement, as currently worded, enables alteration to the height of these pylons, but is silent on the horizontal limits of deviation which are referred to in the works plans.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>Should the alternative scheme be implemented, the requirement should be worded to refer to the horizontal limits of deviation.</u></p> <p><u>Should the Alternative scheme be implemented, a new requirement, requiring the applicant to publicise the selection of the Alternative scheme should be provided to enable the Host Authority, interested parties and other stakeholders of the decision to implement the Alternative Scheme.</u></p>	
<u>3.12.3</u>	<u>DCO Requirements – consultation on LoD</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>An additional requirement or appropriate mechanism should be provided to enable consultation and notification of any alteration to the height and location of the lower height pylons.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.12.4</u>	<u>DCO Requirements = archaeological mitigation</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>CCC refers to ECC archaeology in respect of the wording of the archaeological requirements.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.12.5</u>	<u>DCO Requirements – wording for</u>		<p><u>CCC refers to ECC archaeology in respect of the wording of the archaeological requirements.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
	<u>Archaeology (Requirement 5)</u>			
<u>3.12.6</u>	<u>DCO Requirements – post-consent ecological mitigation and BNG</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>A post-consent programme of ecological mitigation measures and a BNG delivery plan will both need to be secured through DCO Requirements. The strength of the DCO Requirements in ensuring the delivery of the mitigation measures and BNG plan will be critical to determining what ecological impact the Norwich to Tilbury project ultimately renders (positive or negative) for Essex local authority districts.</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<u>3.12.7</u>	<u>Draft DCO wording</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u>  <u>National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>From CCC draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board:</u>  <u>For consistency within the dDCO, there are a number of definitions and drafting points to be addressed (such as the use of ‘business day,’ ‘working day’ and ‘day’ interchangeably).</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>
<b><u>Other matters as required</u></b>				
<u>3.12.8</u>	<u>Construction working hours</u>	<p><b><u>Updated Position (February 2026):</u></b>  <u>National Grid has provided a response to this matter at Deadline 1 through the relevant representations process (document reference 8.4.1).</u>  <u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information within the LIR.</u></p>	<p><u>In relation to construction hours, CCC propose the following requirement, “No construction works shall take place except between the following hours: 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday, and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturday. No construction works shall take place at any time on Sunday or a Bank Holiday.”</u></p>	<u>Under discussion</u>

National Grid will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.

### **3.13 Other Matters**

Table 3.13 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Other Matters

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>Other matters as required</u></b>				
<u>3.13.1</u>	<u>Agriculture and Soils</u>	<u>Further discussion will take place following review of the information.</u>	<u>CCC's main concern is the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and disruption of agricultural activities as a consequence of the loss of agricultural land.</u> <u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

### **3.14 Mitigation and Compensation**

Table 3.14 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Other Matters

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b><u>Other matters as required</u></b>				
<u>3.14.1</u>	<u>Mitigation and Compensation</u>	<u>Socio-economic impacts on the local economy and the tourism sector are assessed in 6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-</u>	<u>The project would have clear and extensive residual impacts arising that would adversely affect the local economy and environment, as well as the health and</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>economics, Recreation and Tourism [APP-265]. The chapter concludes that there would be no significant impacts on the local economy as a result of the Project.</u></p> <p><u>In addition to the ES, the Applicant is committed to providing a coordinated local and regional approach to community benefits. The Government has published its guidance on community funds for transmission infrastructure (DESNZ, 2025). The Applicant is committed to working with Ofgem, industry partners, local communities and their representatives to ensure community benefits are delivered fairly and effectively, driving lasting, positive change for the people and places integral to our developing electricity network.</u></p> <p><u>This would be delivered outside the development consent process, since it is not a material consideration in the decision on the Project or a matter to be secured as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO), as per the Community Funds for Transmission Infrastructure: Guidance (DESNZ, 2025) 14.. Therefore, any community benefit or investment would be captured under the National Grid Community Grant Scheme and dealt with separately to the EIA.</u></p>	<p><u>wellbeing of communities in Chelmsford. These impacts cannot be sufficiently mitigated or compensated through the planning regime.</u></p> <p><u>CCC contends that while the Norwich to Tilbury Project will deliver significant benefits at a national level, this will not offset the harm at the local level. This is unacceptable to CCC and CCC objects to the lack of appropriate mitigation and compensation.</u></p> <p><u>CCC recognise the timing for the project is driven by the need for capacity in the transmission system by 2030. Yet it is CCC's view that such benefit should not and cannot be secured at the expense of Chelmsford's local communities, landscapes and environments that would be affected by the proposal</u></p> <p><u>The proposal would introduce vast incongruous features of industrial character into a rural landscape, which would have harmfully impact upon the landscape, historic environment and amenities of the communities within which they would sit. The pylons and overhead lines would be visually noticeable and prominent. Many of the effects cannot be mitigated against due to the height and scale of the proposal and would be permanent.</u></p> <p><u>CCC consider that reasonable compensation and benefits to the wider area including a, Skills and Employment</u></p>	

<u>ID</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>National Grid's Position</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council's Position</u>	<u>Status</u>
			<p><u>funds, environmental and landscape enhancement and funding for heritage.</u></p> <p><u>Although separate to planning, affected residents should be appropriately compensate and a Community Benefit fund introduced</u></p> <p><u>Please see CCC's full response set out in its Relevant Representations dated 27 November 2025 and draft Local Impact Report shared for Policy Board on 15th January 2026. Further comments will be provided within CCC's final Local Impact Report.</u></p>	

## 4. Confirmation of Agreement

Both parties agree that this SoCG is a draft document and as such has not been signed the parties. The final version of the SoCG will be signed by both parties in due course upon agreement.

The above SoCG is agreed between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council on the date specified below.

Signed for and on behalf of National Grid:

.....

Date:

.....

Signed for and on behalf of Chelmsford City Council:

.....

Date:

.....

# Abbreviations

<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Full Reference</u>
<u>AIL</u>	<u>Abnormal Indivisible Loads</u>
<u>AIS</u>	<u>Air Insulated Switchgear</u>
<u>AOD</u>	<u>Above Ordnance Datum</u>
<u>AONB</u>	<u>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u>
<u>BNG</u>	<u>Biodiversity Net Gain</u>
<u>CCC</u>	<u>Chelmsford City Council</u>
<u>CoCP</u>	<u>Code of Construction Practice</u>
<u>CSE</u>	<u>Cable Sealing End</u>
<u>CTMP</u>	<u>Construction Traffic Management Plan</u>
<u>DCO</u>	<u>Development Consent Order</u>
<u>EACN</u>	<u>East Anglia Connection Node</u>
<u>EHO</u>	<u>Environmental Health Officer</u>
<u>EIA</u>	<u>Environmental Impact Assessment</u>
<u>EPS</u>	<u>Essex Place Services</u>
<u>ES</u>	<u>Environmental Statement</u>
<u>GI</u>	<u>Ground Investigation</u>
<u>GW</u>	<u>Gigawatt</u>
<u>LLFA</u>	<u>Lead Local Flood Authority</u>
<u>LVIA</u>	<u>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</u>
<u>LIR</u>	<u>Local Impact Report</u>
<u>MIIA</u>	<u>Mineral Infrastructure Impact Assessment</u>
<u>MRA</u>	<u>Minerals Resource Assessment</u>
<u>NCR</u>	<u>National Cycle Route</u>
<u>NETS</u>	<u>National Electricity Transmission System</u>
<u>NG</u>	<u>National Grid</u>
<u>NPSs</u>	<u>National Policy Statements</u>
<u>PEIR</u>	<u>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</u>
<u>PRoW</u>	<u>Public Right of Way</u>
<u>SoCG</u>	<u>Statement of Common Ground</u>
<u>SoCC</u>	<u>Statement of Community Consultation</u>
<u>SPZ</u>	<u>Source Protection Zone</u>
<u>WFD</u>	<u>Water Framework Directive</u>
<u>WHIASU</u>	<u>Wales Health Impact Assessment Support Unit</u>

<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Full Reference</u>
<u>WIIA</u>	<u>Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment</u>
<u>WSI</u>	<u>Written Scheme of Investigation</u>
<u>ZoI</u>	<u>Zone of Influence</u>
<u>ZTV</u>	<u>Zone of Theoretical Visibility</u>

**Appendix A.**  
**Summary of Key**  
**Engagement between**  
**National Grid and**  
**Chelmsford City**  
**Council**

# Appendix A

## Summary of Key Engagement between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council

**Table A.1** Summary of Key Engagement between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
<b>General</b>		
June 2022	Meeting	Informal project catch-up and consultation feedback with CCC.
September 2022	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
October 2022	Meeting	Informal project catch up with CCC
November 2022	Meeting	Briefings on issued response to questions from OffSET with all host authorities.
November 2022	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
January 2023	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
February 2023	Meeting	Pre-consultation session with all host authorities.
March 2023	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
May 2023	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
June 2023	Meeting	Non-statutory consultation preferred alignment briefing to all host authorities.
July 2023	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
September 2023	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
October 2023 - Ongoing	Meeting	Monthly informal catch-up Teams calls.
November 2023	Meeting	All host authority workshop.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
December 2023	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) to all host authorities for comment.
January 2024	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
February 2024	Meeting	Statutory consultation preferred alignment briefing to all host authorities.
March 2024	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
March 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the SoCC to all host authorities for statutory consultation.
May 2024	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
May 2024	Meeting	Consultation plan discussion with CCC.
September 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the draft Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) to all host authorities for comment.
October 2024	Meeting	National Grid held a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on draft versions of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Outline LEMP) and Outline CoCP.
November 2024	Meeting	Meeting to discuss approach to targeted consultations
November 2024	Meeting	All host authority workshop
January 2025	Meeting	Meeting to provide project and design update
January 2025	Meeting	All host authority workshop
January 2025	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the 2 <sup>nd</sup> iteration draft versions of the Outline CoCP and Outline LEMP to all host authorities for comment.
January 2025	Meeting	National Grid held a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> iteration draft versions of the Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP.
March 2025	Meeting	All host authority workshop
May 2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss targeted consultation feedback

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
May 2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss draft Statement of Common Ground
May 2025	Email correspondence	National Grid issued an updated iteration of the draft Outline Code of Construction Practice (oCoCP)
May 2025	Email correspondence	National Grid issued a new appendix to the draft oCoCP - Appendix H, Draft Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy
May 2025	Email correspondence	National Grid issued the Long List of Other Developments
June 2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss draft Statement of Common Ground
<a href="#"><u>June 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Email Correspondence</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>National Grid issued draft DCO, explanatory memorandum and draft requirements</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>July 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>All host authority workshop</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>August 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Email Correspondence</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>National Grid issued draft Heads of Terms for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and off-site tree provision</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>August 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting to provide project and design update</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>September 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>All host authority workshop</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>October 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>An optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the Hydrology and Land Drainage section of the Environmental Statement.</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>October 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting to discuss tree replacement management within Chelmsford</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>November 2025</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>All host authority workshop</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>January 2026</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>All host authority</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>January 2026</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Meeting to discuss the Statement of Common Ground</u></a>

---

## Ecology and Biodiversity

---

July 2022	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the Biodiversity Assessment Methodology and Arboriculture Assessment Methodology for review ahead of the Thematic Group meeting.
July 2022	Meeting	Ecology and Biodiversity Thematic Group meeting - National Grid presented on the Biodiversity Assessment Methodology and Arboriculture Assessment Methodology and sought feedback from CCC and other authorities.
September 2023	Meeting	National Grid discussed the potential off-site scheme/initiatives for BNG.
March 2024	Meeting	Biodiversity Thematic Group to discuss the methodology and scope of ecology surveys outside the remit of Natural England.
May 2024	Technical Note	National Grid issued a technical note to all host authorities outlining survey methods and the scope of surveys for species outside the remit of Natural England for agreement / comment.
May 2024	Meeting	Optional Thematic Group call.
September 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP)
October 2024	Meeting	National Grid hosted a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on draft versions of the Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP.
January 2025	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the Protected Species Proposed Mitigation Measures to stakeholders including CCC
January 2025	Meeting	National Grid hosted a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on proposed mitigation for species outside the remit of Natural England.
January 2025	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy.
January 2025	Meeting	National Grid hosted a meeting to discuss comments received on the draft Biodiversity Net Gain Report.
January 2025	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the second iteration of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP)

January 2025	Meeting	National Grid hosted a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on the second iteration of the Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP.
May 2025	Meeting	National Grid hosted a meeting to discuss comments from the updated proposed mitigation for species outside the remit of Natural England.
<a href="#">May 2025</a>	<a href="#">Email Correspondence</a>	<a href="#">National Grid shared a new appendix to the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) – Appendix D, Outline Landscape Proposals</a>
<a href="#">September 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Option thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the ecology section of the Environmental Statement</a>
<a href="#">January 2026</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Meeting to discuss Statement of Common Ground with Essex Place Services</a>

### Air Quality

September 2022	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the proposed methodology and scope of the Air Quality assessment for review and comment.
----------------	----------------------	---

### Noise and Vibration

September 2022	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the proposed methodology and scope of the Noise and Vibration assessment for review and comment.
----------------	----------------------	---

### Health and Wellbeing

September 2022	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the Health and Wellbeing Assessment Methodology to all host authorities.
September 2023	Technical Note	National Grid issued a Health and Wellbeing technical note on the proposed approach to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including guidance, study area, scope, and assessment methodology.
October 2023	Email Correspondence	Chelmsford City Council requested that Wales Health Impact Assessment Support Unit (WHIASU) guidance and vulnerable groups checklist is included within the assessment.
September 2024	Meeting	National Grid held a meeting to discuss and agree the proposed assessment scope and methodology for the Health and Wellbeing chapter of the ES.

October 2024	Technical note	National Grid issued a refreshed Health and Wellbeing technical note on the proposed approach to the EIA, including guidance, study area, scope, and assessment methodology.
--------------	----------------	--

<a href="#">October 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Option thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the Health and Wellbeing section of the Environmental Statement.</a>
------------------------------	-------------------------	---

## Historic Environment

July 2022	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued a document detailing the scope and methodology for the Historic Environment assessment and baseline to all host authorities and Historic England.
-----------	----------------------	--

July 2022	Meeting	Historic Environment Thematic Group to discuss the proposed approach for the EIA assessment.
-----------	---------	--

September 2022	Meeting	National Grid presented an updated approach to defining study areas, scoping of walkover and scoping of historic buildings to consider in the assessment, in response to feedback received.
----------------	---------	---

January 2023	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the plans showing the proposed viewpoint locations for landscape and heritage ahead of the Thematic Group meeting in February 2023 to all host authorities.
--------------	----------------------	--

February 2023	Meeting	National Grid held a meeting with all host authorities to discuss landscape and heritage viewpoints.
---------------	---------	--

June 2023	Technical Note	National Grid issued a technical note to Historic England and host authorities to agree methodology for the selection of viewpoints for the Historic Environment assessment.
-----------	----------------	--

September 2023	Meeting	Historic Environment Thematic Group meeting to discuss the proposed heritage viewpoint methodology with all host authorities and Historic England
----------------	---------	---

November 2023	Meeting	Historic Environment Thematic Group meeting to discuss the proposed locations of heritage viewpoints with host authorities and Historic England. Feedback was received from stakeholders regarding proposed viewpoints and additional viewpoints were proposed.
---------------	---------	---

November 2023	Meeting	Historic Environment Thematic Group meeting to discuss proposed locations of heritage viewpoints with all host authorities and Historic England. Viewpoint locations shared in PDF and shapefile.
---------------	---------	---

January 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the updated viewpoints (including ZTV) for feedback from all host authorities, Natural England and Historic England.
--------------	----------------------	---

March 2024	Technical Note	National Grid shared the Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment for review and comment.
------------	----------------	---

March 2024	Technical Note	National Grid shared the updated Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Geophysical Surveys with the Archaeology Working Group Members.
March 2024	Email Correspondence	Project response to Stakeholder feedback on Heritage Viewpoints.
May 2024	Meeting	Optional Statutory Consultation Thematic Group call.
<a href="#">June 2024</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
<a href="#">July 2024</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
<a href="#">August 2024</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
<a href="#">September 2024</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
<a href="#">October 2024</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
<a href="#">November 2024</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
<a href="#">December 2024</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
<a href="#">January 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting</a>
<a href="#">February 2025</a>	<a href="#">Email Correspondence</a>	<a href="#">National Grid issued Historic Environment (HE) Viewpoints information</a>
February 2025	Meeting	Historic Environment Thematic Group meeting to further discuss the Historic Environment Viewpoints.
February 2025	Technical note	National Grid shared the Draft Heritage Baseline Report with Annex C and D.
February 2025	Meeting	Historic Environment Thematic Group meeting to discuss the Heritage Baseline report.
<a href="#">February 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting.</a>
March 2025	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued updated the Historic Environment Viewpoints information to stakeholders including CCC.
<a href="#">March 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting</a>

April 2025	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the Draft Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for post-consent stage of the project.
<a href="#">April 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting</a>
<a href="#">June 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">National Grid shared the Archaeological Fieldwork Summary.</a>
<a href="#">June 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group Meeting</a>
<a href="#">August 2025</a>	<a href="#">Email Correspondence</a>	<a href="#">National Grid shared SSWSIs - Site 013</a>
<a href="#">September 2025</a>	<a href="#">Technical note</a>	<a href="#">National Grid shared Priority Geophys Prelim Grayscales with stakeholders for consideration</a>
<a href="#">October 2025</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the heritage section of the Environmental Statement.</a>
<a href="#">November 2025</a>	<a href="#">Technical Note</a>	<a href="#">National Grid shared shapefiles of the Phase 2 Geophysical Survey with the priority survey areas</a>
<a href="#">December 2025</a>	<a href="#">Technical Note</a>	<a href="#">National Grid shared the WSI for the Phase 2 Geophysical Survey</a>
<a href="#">January 2026</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Initial meeting to discuss matters relating to heritage in the Chelmsford Statement of Common Ground</a>
<a href="#">January 2026</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Meeting to discuss matters relating to Archaeology in the Statements of Common Ground being covered by EPS.</a>
<a href="#">January 2026</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Meeting to discuss matters relating to built heritage in the Chelmsford Statement of Common Ground</a>
<a href="#">February 2026</a>	<a href="#">Email Correspondence</a>	<a href="#">National Grid shared the Supplementary Environmental Information submitted to Planning Inspectorate on the geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching completed to date with the Archaeology Working Group Stakeholders.</a>
<a href="#">February 2026</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Archaeology Working Group</a>

## Landscape and Visual

July 2022	Meeting	Landscape and Visual Thematic Group Meeting. National Grid shared the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology and Arboricultural Assessment Methodology for review.
-----------	---------	---

January 2023	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued plans showing proposed viewpoint locations for review and comment to all host authorities.
February 2023	Meeting	National Grid held a Landscape and Visual Thematic Group Meeting to discuss proposed viewpoint locations in Essex. National Grid sought agreement on the viewpoint locations to include in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and the ES.
April 2023	Meeting	National Grid held a meeting to discuss stakeholder's feedback on EIA viewpoints previously shared.
May 2023	Meeting	National Grid presented and discussed the responses to the feedback on the viewpoint locations received from the February meeting (covering both heritage and landscape viewpoints). Stakeholders provided feedback on updated and additional viewpoint locations at the meeting and in subsequent correspondence.
May 2023 – March 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared information, responded to further feedback on viewpoint locations received from the May 2023 meeting, and reviewed subsequent feedback received up to March 2024 with the aim to agree viewpoint locations for the PEIR and ES (based on the information available at this date).
August 2023	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued wirelines and photomontages and proposed the approach to Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping for comment.
January 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the updated landscape viewpoints (and the ZTV) and sought feedback from all host authorities.
May 2024	Meeting	Optional Statutory Consultation Thematic Group call.
September 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the Draft Landscape and Visual Methodology, Proposed LVIA Viewpoints (excel spreadsheet) and Proposed LVIA Viewpoints (map) ahead of the Landscape Thematic Group Meeting.
September 2024	Meeting	National Grid held a Landscape Thematic Group Meeting to find agreement on the LVIA methodology and the format/presentation of photomontages and/or wirelines which will form part of the DCO application.
September 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the shapefiles for the landscape viewpoints and order limits with CCC and other stakeholders following the Landscape Thematic Group Meeting.

September 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the draft Outline LEMP and Sample Mitigation Drawings ahead of the draft Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP discussion.
September 2024	Meeting	Landscape and Visual Thematic Group Meeting – LVIA Viewpoints within Essex South.
October 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the Draft mitigation drawings with stakeholders
October 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared the National landscape setting study with stakeholders
October 2024	Email Correspondence	National Grid shared updated viewpoint information data following from the landscape thematic workshops
November 2024	Meeting	Thematic group meeting to discuss viewpoints and methodology.
March 2025	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued an update on LVIA Viewpoints and Methodology.
<a href="#">January 2026</a>	<a href="#">Meeting</a>	<a href="#">Joint meeting attended by LPA's who are represented by Essex Place service for Landscape to discuss the Statement of Common Ground.</a>

### Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism

July 2022	Email Correspondence	National Grid issued the assessment methodology to stakeholders for review ahead of the Thematic Group Meeting in July 2022.
July 2022	Meeting	National Grid held a Socio-economic, Recreation and Tourism Thematic Group Meeting to seek feedback on the proposed approach to the Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism assessment prior to formal submission of the Scoping Report to the Planning Inspectorate. This meeting was attended by several stakeholders, including CCC.
June 2023	Technical Note	National Grid issued a Technical Note setting out the study area and methodology for assessing businesses where visual impacts are a potential operational consideration, and Public Right of Way (PRoW) during construction and operation.
August 2023	Meeting	National Grid held a Socio-economic, Recreation and Tourism Thematic Group Meeting to discuss the study area and methodology for assessing businesses.

April 2024	Technical Note	National Grid shared an updated technical note with all host authorities to demonstrate how their feedback had been considered in developing the PEIR.
September 2024	Meeting	Meeting to discuss and agree the Scope and Methodology for the updated Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism Technical note on the ES Chapter.
September 2024	Technical Note	National Grid shared the Socio-economic, Recreation and Tourism technical note with stakeholders.
November 2024	Meeting	National Grid held a follow up meeting to discuss and agree the Scope and Methodology for the updated Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism Technical note on the ES Chapter.

September 2025 Meeting

Optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism section of the Environmental Statement

---

### 3.21.1 ~~Project Development, Description and Design~~

~~Table 3.2 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Project Development, Description and Design Matters~~

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del>Strategic options/needs case</del>				
<del>3.2.1</del>	<del>Needs case</del>	<del>Norwich to Tilbury is being proposed because the existing network in East Anglia doesn't have sufficient capacity to manage the expected (and in some cases, contracted) increase in offshore wind farms (and interconnectors) needing to connect to the grid as part of the Government's target of reaching net zero by 2050. The project sits alongside other work to reinforce and upgrade the existing network in East Anglia. Norwich to Tilbury is listed as a key project in Appendix 2 of the NESO Clean Power 2030 Report.</del>	<del>CCC's response is set out in its response to the Targeted Consultation dated 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and Statutory Consultation dated June 2024. Additional comments are provided within CCC's Adequacy of Consultation Milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025. Further comments will be provided within CCC's Local Impact Report. In summary, CCC recognise the rapidly growing need for electricity as the climate emergency requires us to help support the replacement of fossil fuels such as oil and gas as soon as possible. However, this does not mean that all proposals which may assist in reducing climate change should be approved at any cost. CCC maintains an objection in principle to the use of onshore pylons and power lines. The preferred strategic option for Norwich to Tilbury remains an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission infrastructure and does not include overhead lines and pylons. CCC recognises that this option would need to be delivered at pace and without</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>risk to national net zero, renewable energy and decarbonisation targets, and energy security.</p> <p>CCC consider that the presence of overhead lines and 30 – 50 m high pylons would be visually harmful and would result in unnecessary harm to heritage, landscape, ecology and residential amenity across the Chelmsford area.</p>	
3.2.2	Project timing	<p>Timing for the project is driven by the needs case – when offshore wind farms are contracted to connect to the UK network – the first of which are contracted to connect in 2030. National Grid is legally obliged (under our Transmission Owner License) to provide capacity at the dates formally agreed in contracts with energy generators (or customers) by NESO.</p> <p>Appendix 2 of the NESO Clean Power 2030 Report shows that the constraint costs associated with a delay to the project timing as being between £2.7 and £2.8 billion.</p>	<p>CCC's response is set out in its response to the Targeted Consultation dated 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and Statutory Consultation dated June 2024. Additional comments are provided within CCC's Adequacy of Consultation Milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025. Further comments will be provided within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p> <p>In summary, CCC recognise the rapidly growing need for electricity as the climate emergency requires us to help support the replacement of fossil fuels such as oil and gas as soon as possible.</p> <p>However, this does not mean that all proposals which may assist in reducing climate change should be approved at any cost.</p> <p>Although it is acknowledged that the grid capacity offered by the Norwich to Tilbury project is needed, in accordance with the ESO's East Anglia Network Study, there are a multitude of other grid reinforcement options to achieve the same capacity, with potentially with less</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>significant environmental impacts than the Norwich to Tilbury proposals.</p> <p>CCC reiterates that its preferred strategic option for Norwich to Tilbury remains an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission infrastructure and does not include overhead lines and pylons.</p> <p>CCC considers that credible alternatives such as an offshore centred approach or High Voltage Direct Current undergrounding, delivered at pace, to minimise onshore infrastructure across Cholmsford and Essex should be explored fully.</p> <p>CCC recognises that these options would need to be delivered in a timely manner, and without risk to national net zero, renewable energy generation and decarbonisation targets and energy security.</p> <p>CCC consider that a further review of the contracted electricity generation is needed ahead of the final submission of the DCO to assess whether the contracted position and readiness of projects to connect as planned is robust, needed and timely.</p> <p>CCC are aware that National Grid (NG) may undertake further changes to the proposal without consultation.</p> <p>CCC considers that the realignment of pylons along the route could lead to</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>localised harm to heritage, landscape, ecology and residential amenity.</p> <p>CGC regret the decision not to reconsult and consider that as a minimum, the Host Authorities and other relevant stakeholders should be consulted on any further changes to the proposal that fall outside of the scope of the Targeted and Statutory consultations prior to submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>This is so that CGC can assess whether any changes are acceptable in principle in planning terms, and to enable the consideration of alternative options / the development of mitigation as necessary prior to the submission of the application for a Development Consent Order (DCO).</p>	
3.2.3	Onshore route	<p>An onshore route allows for greater energy capacity and connectivity to feed into the grid. In assessing offshore options to deliver the same capacity as an onshore overhead line, we would need to build three subsea cables and associated infrastructure, which would add significant cost and not meet the needs case for Norwich to Tilbury.</p> <p><u>Updated Strategic Options and Backcheck Review documents</u> published at each consultation compare the environmental, technical, socioeconomic and financial implications for alternative routes, including offshore alternatives.</p>	<p>CGC's response is set out in its response to the Targeted Consultation dated 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and Statutory Consultation dated June 2024. Additional comments are provided within CGC's Adequacy of Consultation Milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025. Further comments will be provided within CGC's Local Impact Report.</p> <p>In summary, CGC maintains an objection in principle to the use of onshore pylons and power lines.</p> <p>CGC consider that the preferred strategic option for Norwich to Tilbury remains an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p><del>infrastructure and does not include overhead lines and pylons.—</del></p> <p><del>CCG recognises that this option would need to be delivered at pace and without risk to national net zero, renewable energy and decarbonisation targets, and energy security.—</del></p> <p><del>CCG consider that the presence of overhead lines and 30–50m high pylons would be visually harmful and would result in unnecessary harm to heritage, landscape, ecology and residential amenity across the Cholmsford area.—</del></p> <p><del>CCG considers that credible alternatives such as an offshore centred approach or High Voltage Direct Current undergrounding, delivered at pace, to minimise onshore infrastructure across Cholmsford and Essex should be explored fully.—</del></p> <p><del>CCG recognises that these options would need to be delivered in a timely manner, and without risk to national net zero, renewable energy generation and decarbonisation targets and energy security.—</del></p>	
3.2.4	Predominantly overhead line route	<p><del>Norwich to Tilbury has been designed in line with policy statement EN-5 (which covers the development of new energy infrastructure) which concludes that in most cases, the government expects that overhead lines will be appropriate and should be used as standard to reinforce the grid.—</del></p>	<p><del>CCG's response is set out in its response to the Targeted Consultation dated 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and Statutory Consultation dated June 2024. Additional comments are provided within CCG's Adequacy of Consultation Milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May</del></p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p><del>Updated Strategic Options and Backcheck Review documents published at each consultation compare the environmental, technical, socioeconomic and financial implications for alternative routes, including underground alternatives.</del></p> <p><del>The work undertaken shows that undergrounding, including using HVDC cables, would be significantly more expensive and have environmental impacts and present engineering challenges. Due to the higher price that would be involved in an underground alternative, we do not believe that this would be the most suitable option as all costs ultimately go onto domestic energy bills.</del></p>	<p><del>2025. Further comments will be provided within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del></p> <p><del>CCC maintains an objection in principle to the use of onshore pylons and power lines.—</del></p> <p><del>The preferred strategic option for Norwich to Tilbury remains an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission infrastructure and does not include overhead lines and pylons.</del></p> <p><del>CCC recognises that this option would need to be delivered at pace and without risk to national net zero, renewable energy and decarbonisation targets, and energy security.</del></p> <p><del>CCC consider that the presence of overhead lines and 30–50m high pylons would be visually harmful and would result in unnecessary harm to heritage, landscape, ecology and residential amenity across the Cholmsford area.—</del></p> <p><del>CCC considers that credible alternatives such as an offshore centred approach of High Voltage Direct Current undergrounding, delivered at pace, to minimise onshore infrastructure across Cholmsford and Essex should be explored fully. CCC refers to its comments regarding the design of the development to both its Statutory Consultation response and its Targeted Consultation response.</del></p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<p><del>CCC consider that localised design responses involving undergrounding and /or alternate pylon design as part of the application of the mitigation hierarchy, should not be discounted by NG. This approach would not be contrary to national policy statements and would be consistent with Holford Rule 7 where it states projects should be routed to minimise as far as possible effects on development.</del></p> <p><del>CCC has raised significant and material concerns relating to the proposal in relation to Great and Little Waltham. These concerns need to be bottomed out and addressed prior to submission of the application for a Development Consent Order.</del></p>				
<p><b>Project development process – Design</b></p>				
3.2.5	Design Principles	<p><del>The primary design requirement for electricity infrastructure is that it must be safe and secure. These functional constraints, particularly around safety and operational reliability, can significantly limit National Grid's ability to adapt the aesthetic appearance of its infrastructure.</del></p> <p><del>Good design, even with the functional restrictions, is nonetheless achieved through careful consideration of the Holford Rules (relating to the connection routeing and siting); the Horlock Rules (relating to the siting of substations and similar cable sealing end compounds and line entries) and the environmental impact assessment process.</del></p>	<p><del>CCC's response is set out in its response to the Targeted Consultation dated 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and Statutory Consultation dated June 2024. Additional comments are provided within CCC's Adequacy of Consultation Milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025. Further comments will be provided within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del></p> <p><del>CCC notes that the Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to have regard in determining applications for development consent to the desirability of good design. Advice in NPS EN1 Section 4.6 is for applicants to consider the</del></p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p><del>These demonstrate the importance of balancing the inherent form and function of electricity transmission infrastructure with technical, economic and environmental considerations to reach reasonably practicable development proposals.</del></p> <p><del>While the overall design is largely fixed by necessity, smaller design details, such as the colour of finishes, are agreed upon and documented through the Development Consent Order process.</del></p> <p><del>Furthermore, NPS EN-1 encourages developers "Applying good design to energy projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, including impacts on heritage, efficient in the use of natural resources, including land use, and energy used in their construction and operation, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible" within the bounds of functional and safety constraints.</del></p> <p><del>The Planning Inspectorate Good Design advice advises that 'Good design is not primarily about how infrastructure looks, although these considerations (the aesthetics) are important'. EN-1 refers to the importance of process and addressing sustainability are essential elements of good design. The emphasis placed on the importance of process through the projects evolution and delivering sustainability is set out in the Design and Access Statement (document reference 7.15).</del></p>	<p><del>criteria for good design at an early stage when applying projects.</del></p> <p><del>Achieving good design requires a holistic approach to deliver high quality, sustainable infrastructure that responds in place and takes account of often complex environments.</del></p> <p><del>CCC draws on the Planning Inspectorates Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design which has been prepared based on good practice and applicants are encouraged to follow the recommendations set out.</del></p> <p><del>CCC consider there is an opportunity to be innovative in securing the approach to design whilst ensuring the infrastructure remains safe and secure. NG must follow a good design process to ensure that the infrastructure proposed remains functional whilst realising the best local outcomes.</del></p> <p><del>CCC consider that insufficient effort has been provided to mitigate the impact of the Project (particularly on heritage assets) and introduce good design within the proposal.</del></p> <p><del>In particular, CCC has significant concerns regarding the approach to Great and Little Waltham which are set out below.</del></p>	
3-2.6	Great and Little Waltham	In line with the strong starting presumption set out in NPS EN-5, the proposed design	CCC's response is set out in its response to the Targeted Consultation dated 8 <sup>th</sup>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p>technology is neither within a nationally designated landscape, nor is it within the setting of a nationally designated landscape.</p> <p>In line with NPS EN-5 we have also considered whether widespread and significant adverse landscape and/or visual impacts in non-designated landscape locations such as this may also justify the use of undergrounding.</p> <p>National Grid has worked to minimise potential impacts on the historic environment through strategic routing and siting measures, and consideration of the results of archaeological fieldwork and heritage assessments throughout the design process. The Environmental Statement (ES), Chapter 11: Historic Environment (document reference 6.11), provides a detailed assessment of potential effects on both designated and non-designated heritage assets, including those of archaeological interest.</p> <p>We have taken into account the Secretary of State's decision making criteria set out in the relevant NPSs and do not consider that in this case the level of effects justify the level of cost.</p> <p>Other forms of lattice designs as a form of mitigation (such as standard low heights) are considered as well as the T pylon. <u>Appendix C of the Design Development Report (April, 2024)</u> sets out the construction, operation and maintenance requirements of T pylons including a technical appraisal for Chelmsford.</p> <p>Further discussion around assessments and mitigation will be discussed in appropriate</p>	<p>April 2025 and Statutory Consultation dated June 2024. Additional comments are provided within GCG's Adequacy of Consultation Milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025. Further comments will be provided within CCG's Local Impact Report.</p> <p>CCG has not received a copy of the draft Environmental Statement in relation to Great and Little Waltham and understands that this will not be provided until after the submission of the application for a Development Consent Order.</p> <p>As stated in CCG's Adequacy of Consultation Response milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025, CCG appreciate the information that has been shared by NG since the Statutory Consultation period. However, CCG has consistently requested additional information / amendments to the proposal in relation to the ES which has not been forthcoming. The lack of information makes it difficult for CCG to reach an informed position on various aspects of the project as the key evidence base informing the ES is still under development. This affects the ability of CCG to inform and have meaningful discussions in attempt to resolve outstanding issues relating to the ES. This includes, but is not limited to, full identification of the level of harm that may or may not be caused by the proposal in ES terms and the need for</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p>thematic group meetings and will be presented in the Environmental Statement.</p>	<p>mitigation and its effect on harm. This is particularly important in relation to Great Waltham and Little Waltham.</p> <p>In Great Waltham and Little Waltham, CCC consider that the proposal would harmfully impact upon the setting of the Grade I listed Langleys, Langleys Grade II Registered Park and Garden and would lead to significant adverse impacts on Great Waltham and Little Waltham Conservation Areas, together with other designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>CCC's preferred option is that alternative mitigation in the form of underground cabling should be used for this section.</p> <p>Alternatively, different alignment should be chosen with further consideration being given to relocating the route to the north of Great Waltham and Little Waltham.—</p> <p>Finally, upon exhausting the above options, regard should be given to the introduction of T pylons along this part of the route.</p> <p>There is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal would be beneficial in historic environment terms and that the identified harm created by the introduction of lower height pylons would outweigh the identified harm proposed by standard 50 metre height pylons.—</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>The impact of proposing full or lower height pylons has not been adequately assessed to come to a view on the impact on the historic environment. CCC understands that feedback has been given to the use of T pylons in the 2024 Design Development Report dated April 2024. This concludes at paragraph 3.2.14 that careful consideration is needed regarding the use of T pylons. No further mention is given in the Report regarding the acceptability of using T Pylons within the locality, and a detailed technical appraisal is missing.</p> <p>It is clear that an in-depth review and balancing exercise needs to be undertaken, and the two options needs to be appropriately weighted.</p> <p>Further review of the type, spacing and nature of the pylons is also required. Where harm is unavoidable, mitigation and heritage compensatory measures including funding should be delivered.</p> <p>CCC is seeking to work together with NG to understand and where possible resolve these concerns before the application is submitted for examination. It is clear that more meaningful and responsive engagement with CCC, residents and stakeholders, together with the submission of detailed technical appraisal responding to the above is needed to address these concerns.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>Project development process – Consultation</b>				
3.2.7	2022 non-statutory consultation	<p>Non-statutory consultation took place between 21 April 2022 – 16 June 2022. Details of this consultation are outlined in the <u>Consultation Strategy</u>, and responses to feedback received during consultation are included in the <u>Feedback Report</u>.</p> <p>The non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published <u>Consultation Strategy</u>.</p>	<p>CCC has provided NG with comments to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone. A full response will be provided as part of CCC's Adequacy of Consultation response.</p> <p>CCC acknowledges the non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Consultation Strategy</p> <p>CCC refers to its response to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025 and awaits sight of the Consultation Report to enable further consideration of the matter.</p>	Under discussion
3.2.8	2023 non-statutory consultation	<p>Non-statutory consultation took place between 27 June 2023 – 21 August 2023. Details of this consultation are outlined in the <u>Consultation Strategy</u>, and responses to feedback received during consultation are included in the <u>Feedback Report</u>.</p> <p>The non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published Consultation Strategy.</p>	<p>CCC has provided NG with comments to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone. A full response will be provided as part of CCC's Adequacy of Consultation response.</p> <p>CCC acknowledges the non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Consultation Strategy</p> <p>CCC refers to its response to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025 and awaits sight of the Consultation Report to enable further consideration of the matter.</p>	Under discussion
3.2.9	2024 statutory consultation	<p>Statutory Consultation took place from Wednesday 10 April 2024 to 26 July 2024 (the end date was extended from 18 June 2024 due</p>	<p>CCC has provided NG with comments to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone. A full response will be provided as part of</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p>to the general election.) Details of this consultation are outlined in the <u>Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)</u>. Responses to feedback received during statutory consultation will be made available at DCO submission within the Consultation Feedback Report.</p> <p>The statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published SoCC.</p>	<p>CCC's Adequacy of Consultation response.</p> <p>CCC acknowledges the statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Consultation Strategy</p> <p>CCC refers to its response to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025 and awaits sight of the Consultation Report to enable further consideration of the matter.</p>	
3.2.10	2025 targeted consultation	<p>Targeted consultations for Essex took place from 25 February 2025 – 27 March 2025. Details of these consultations are outlined in the <u>Targeted Consultation Strategy</u> and associated targeted consultation leaflets and environmental implications of change documents. Responses to feedback received during targeted consultation will be made available at DCO submission within the Consultation Feedback Report.</p> <p>The targeted consultations were undertaken in accordance with the published Targeted Consultation Strategy.</p> <p>The approach to targeted consultation was undertaken in accordance with Section 50 of the Planning Act 2008 and associated guidance: Planning Act 2008: Pre-application stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (April 2024).</p>	<p>CCC has provided NG with comments to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone. A full response will be provided as part of CCC's Adequacy of Consultation response.</p> <p>CCC acknowledges the Targeted Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Consultation Strategy</p> <p>CCC refers to its response to the Adequacy of Consultation milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025 and awaits sight of the Consultation Report to enable further consideration of the matter.</p> <p>CCC highlighted in its response to the targeted consultation and AoCM a number of areas where the consultation process, including the lack of feedback to the statutory consultation undertaken in summer 2024 and which informed the scope of the targeted consultation, was</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>considered harmful to the transparency and legitimacy of the process.</p> <p>CCG is aware that NG are seeking to undertake further changes to the proposal without consultation. It is understood this is because some changes are considered by NG to be of a minor nature such that they would have no material impact on the proposal.</p> <p>It is important that residents and stakeholders understand how their comments have informed the design review of the process.</p> <p>Although a change may appear to be of a minor nature to NG, a resident / stakeholder may take a differing view, and the significance of these changes may be perceived by them to be greater. For example, the movement of a pylon closer / further along the proposed alignment could materially affect a resident's perception of outlook and living conditions. Should the DCO be granted, residents/stakeholders residing near to the pylons would have to live with them in perpetuity. It is critical that residents and stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on all changes affecting them and for their concerns to be considered, before moving onto the next step of the process.</p> <p>CCG is concerned that a high amount of non-material changes could lead to a cumulative change in the nature of the</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>proposal; such that the proposal submitted for examination is materially different to the proposal presented at Statutory Consultation stage. Should this be the case, it is likely that additional Statutory Consultation may be required before the examination can commence. Officers have previously and repeatedly requested a list of non-material changes, but these have not been forthcoming.</p>	
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
3.2.11	Community Benefits	<p>In March 2025 the government announced guidance for delivering community benefit packages for communities hosting new, onshore transmission infrastructure projects. This guidance is clear that community benefit matters should be separate from, and not a material consideration in, the planning process. Outside of the DCO process, National Grid will work with stakeholders to understand the opportunity and delivery of this funding, in line with guidance.</p>	<p>CCC's full response is set out in its response to the Targeted Consultation dated 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and Statutory Consultation dated June 2024. Additional comments are provided within CCC's Adequacy of Consultation Milestone dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2025. Further comments will be provided within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p> <p>In CCCs response to the Targeted Consultations (08/04/2025) CCC stated Following the publication of the Community Funds for Transmission Infrastructure (March 2025) by the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero, which applies to projects that have not yet commenced construction, it is expected that the proposal provides community funding in accordance with the guidance and that this is funded separately to the delivery fund.</p>	Under discussion

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
			It is understood that the community funds outlined within the above guidance document are separate from and not a material consideration for planning authorities, yet it is expected that National Grid will have regard to this guidance and will explain how they intend to respond to it as part of their supporting information to the DCO application. It is already commonplace for other large-scale infrastructure to deliver community funds.	

### ~~3.31.1 Ecology and Biodiversity~~

~~Table 3.3 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Ecology and Biodiversity~~

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del>EIA Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</del>				
<del>3.3.1</del>	<del>Policy and legislation</del>	<del>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Ecology and Biodiversity assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context)</b> and <b>Section 8.2 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the ES.  <del>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</del></del>	<del>CCC/EPS have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review, but based on the PEIR content, this is likely to be agreed. A full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>
<del>EIA Approach and Methods</del>				
<del>3.3.2</del>	<del>Study area</del>	<del>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del>	<del>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping</del>	<del>Agreed</del>

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
3.3.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 8.4 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the ES.	<p><del>Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del></p> <p>CCC/EPS have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review, but based on the PEIR, but it is expected that sufficient desktop data has been collected.</p> <p>Cannot comment on the sufficiency of survey data since that information has not yet been shared.</p> <p>A full response will be given within GGC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
3.3.4	Assessment Methodology	<p><del>The assessment methodology was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del></p>	<p><del>The assessment methodology was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del></p>	Agreed
3.3.5	Survey Methodology	<p>National Grid issued a technical note in May 2024 outlining survey methods and the scope of surveys for species outside the remit of Natural England for agreement / comment.</p> <p>All methodologies for surveying licensable species, including water voles have been agreed with Natural England.</p> <p>Further detail on habitat suitability assessment and any survey limitations will be provided within the water vole technical report, an appendix to the biodiversity chapter.</p>	<p>CCC/EPS refer to the PEIR and Tech Note comments issued previously. The intended survey methods have been broadly acceptable, but final analysis will depend on the actual survey methods that were executed. Presumably this will be detailed in Chapter 8 of the ES, which has not yet been issued.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GGC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
3.3.6	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Ecology and Biodiversity assessment are summarised in <b>Section 8.4 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the ES. The key	CCC/EPS consider that the key parameters and assumptions associated with the Ecology and Biodiversity assessment are not explicitly	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.	summarised in the PEIR, and have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.3.7	Baseline conditions and receptors	The baseline conditions and receptors for Ecology and Biodiversity are presented in <b>Section 8.5 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the ES. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	CCC/EPs have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review but based on the PEIR are content this is agreed with respect to the determination of receptors. Cannot comment on baseline condition coverage and survey adequacy. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.3.8	Embedded mitigation	Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Ecology and Biodiversity effects, are set out in <b>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the ES. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC/EPs have reviewed and commented on the Outline CoCP, Outline LEMP, and the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Strategy. CCC have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review and are not comfortable with confirming the adequacy of mitigation measures without having had sight of the ecology survey data and of any impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
3.3.9	Standard mitigation	<p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Ecology and Biodiversity effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES</b> and set out in the Outline CoCP (<b>document reference 7.2</b>).</p> <p>The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>National Grid issued the 'Summary of Proposed Protected Species Mitigation' document on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2025.</p>	<p>be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p> <p>CCC/EPS have reviewed the Outline CoCP, Outline LEMP, and the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Strategy.</p> <p>CCC have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review. We are not comfortable with confirming the adequacy of mitigation measures without having had sight of the ecology survey data and of any impact assessments.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
3.3.10	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 8.6 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the <b>ES</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	<p>CCC/EPS have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review. We cannot comment on the adequacy of additional mitigation measures without having had sight of the ecology survey data and of any impact assessments.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</b>				
<p>Latest version of ES required for consideration. Under discussion. Have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review. Cannot comment on the assessment of likely impacts and effects as have not have sight of them. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report. Under discussion.</p>				
3.3.11	Construction effects	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 (Ecology</b></p>	<p>CCC/EPS cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p><del>and Biodiversity) of the ES. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</del></p>	<p><del>review and have had no sight of any survey-based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of Chapter 8 of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del></p>	
3.3.12	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p><del>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the ES. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</del></p>	<p><del>Have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review. Cannot comment on the on the assessment of likely impacts and effects as have not have sight of them. Further comments will be made upon receipt of Chapter 8 of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del></p>	Under discussion
3.3.13	Residual effects	<p><del>The residual effects are presented in Section 8.7 of Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity) of the ES. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</del></p>	<p><del>Latest version of ES required for consideration. Under discussion Have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review. Cannot comment on the on the assessment of likely impacts and effects as have not have sight of them. Further comments will be made upon receipt of Chapter 8 of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del></p>	Under discussion
	Specific Cholmsford Related Issues?		<p><del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review and have had no sight of any survey-based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will</del></p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			be given within CCC's Local Impact Report. Under discussion.	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.3.13	Outline CoCP	<p>The Outline CoCP includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the ES and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>CCC's response to the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of the draft oGOCP stated 'The CoCP and LEMP need to be fully consistent and not provide contractors with conflicting prescriptions.</p> <p>The Outline CoCP and Outline LEMP need to effectively cross-reference the other document if the other document is the more comprehensive of the two documents on any particular ecological mitigation aspect.'</p> <p>CCC/EPS cannot comment whether the Outline CoCP includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in Chapter 8 of the ES as we have not received that document.</p>	Under discussion
3.3.14	Outline LEMP	<p>The Outline LEMP includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 8 (Ecology and Biodiversity)</b> of the ES and is appropriate.</p> <p>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline LEMP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline LEMP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline LEMP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>CCC's response to the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of the draft oGOCP stated 'The CoCP and Outline LEMP need to be fully consistent and not provide contractors with conflicting prescriptions.</p> <p>The Outline CoCP and Outline LEMP need to effectively cross-reference the other document if the other document is the more comprehensive of the two documents on any particular ecological mitigation aspect.'</p> <p>CCC/EPS cannot comment whether the Outline LEMP includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures</p>	Under discussion

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
			<del>specified in Chapter 8 of the ES as we have not received that document.</del>	
<del>Other matters as required</del>				
<del>3.3.15</del>	<del>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</del>	<del>National Grid issued the 'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Strategy' document on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2025. Comments received from Essex Place Services (EPS) on the 'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Strategy' document — 6<sup>th</sup> February 2025. These comments will be taken on board for the BNG assessment.  National Grid will deliver at least 10 % BNG with wider environmental and societal benefits on its construction projects. Offsite BNG will be delivered through collaboration with partners and purchased from commercially registered providers.</del>	<del>Comments received from EPS on the 'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Strategy' document — 6<sup>th</sup> February 2025. CCC/EPS have no new comments. A full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>
<del>3.3.15</del>	<del>Draft Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA)</del>	<del>National Grid issued the draft AIA in March 2025.</del>		<del>Under discussion</del>

### ~~3.41.1~~ **Air Quality**

~~Table 3.4~~ ~~Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Air Quality~~

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del>EIA — Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</del>				
<del>3.4.1</del>	<del>Policy and legislation</del>	<del>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Air Quality assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key</b></del>	<del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 2 and Chapter 7 of the ES to review.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Legislation and Planning Policy Context</b>) and <b>Section 7.2 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	<p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.4.2	Study area	<p>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	Agreed
3.4.3	Data sources	<p>Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 7.4 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES.</p>	<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
3.4.4	Assessment methodology	<p>The methodology for assessing Air Quality was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>The methodology for assessing Air Quality was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	Agreed
3.4.5	Key parameters and assumptions	<p>Key parameters and assumptions associated with Air Quality are summarised in <b>Section 7.4 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</p>	<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.4.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Air Quality are presented in <b>Section 7.5 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES. The baseline conditions</p>	<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	

### ~~EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures~~

3.4.7	Embedded mitigation	Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Air Quality effects, are set out in <b>Section 7.6 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.4.8	Standard mitigation	Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 7.6 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES and set out in the Outline CoCP ( <b>document reference 7.2</b> ). The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.4.9	Additional mitigation	The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 7.6 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

### ~~EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects~~

~~CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review and have had no sight of any survey based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report~~

3.4.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 7.7 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review.	Under discussion
--------	----------------------	--	---	------------------

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
		during construction presented is considered appropriate.	Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	
3.4.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 7.7 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.9.12	Residual effects	The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 7.7 of Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of the ES. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 7 of the ES to review and have had no sight of any survey-based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
	Specific Chelmsford Related Issues		CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 8 of the ES to review and have had no sight of any survey-based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report. Under discussion.	Under discussion
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.4.13	Outline CoCP	The Outline CoCP includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 7 (Air Quality)</b> of	A full review and further comments will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p>the ES and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p>	<p>The Outline Dust Management Plan is set out in accordance with IAQM guidance. As such, the proposed methodology for working in relation to dust is broadly acceptable. This document is generic in form and it should be noted that there are no location-specific assessments yet supplied for identifying and managing dust emissions at sensitive receptor locations.</p> <p>A full review and further comments will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.</p>	

**Other matters as required**

### 3.51.1 **Noise and Vibration**

**Table 3.5** ~~Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Noise and Vibration~~

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.5.1	Policy and legislation	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Noise and Vibration assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context)</b> and <b>Section 14.2 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	<p>CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 2 and Chapter 14 of the ES to review.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
<del>3.5.2</del>	<del>Study area</del>	<del>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del>	<del>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del>	<del>Agreed</del>
3.5.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 14.4 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<del>3.5.4</del>	<del>Assessment methodology</del>	<del>The methodology for assessing Noise and Vibration was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del>	<del>The methodology for assessing Noise and Vibration was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.</del>	<del>Agreed</del>
3.5.5	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with Noise and Vibration are summarised in <b>Section 14.4 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.5.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	The baseline conditions and receptors for Noise and Vibration are presented in <b>Section 14.5 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.5.7	Embedded mitigation	Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Noise and Vibration effects, are set out in <b>Section 14.6 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.5.8	Standard mitigation	Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 14.6 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES and set out in the Outline CoCP (document reference 7.2). The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.5.9	Additional mitigation	The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 14.6 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</b>				
CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review and have had no sight of any survey-based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report				
3.5.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 14.7 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
			be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	
3.5.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 14.7 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES</b> . The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.5.12	Residual effects	The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 14.7 of Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration) of the ES</b> . The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review and have had no sight of any survey-based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
	Specific Chelmsford Related Issues		CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 14 of the ES to review and have had no sight of any survey-based impact assessments. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report. Under discussion. Under discussion	Under discussion
<b><del>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</del></b>				
3.5.13	Outline CoCP	The Outline CoCP includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Chapter 14 ( <b>Noise and Vibration</b> ) of the ES and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.	No comments received on the structure of the Outline CoCP (1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> iterations) at the time of writing.	Under discussion

<b>ID</b>	<b>Matter</b>	<b>National Grid's Position</b>	<b>Chelmsford City Council's Position</b>	<b>Status</b>
		<p>Meeting held in on 9th October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p>	<p>The content of the Outline CoCP is still under discussion.</p> <p>A full review of the CoCP and further comments will be provided as part of GCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	

**Other matters as required**

To be confirmed

**3.61.1 Health and Wellbeing**

**Table 3.6** Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Health and Wellbeing

<b>ID</b>	<b>Matter</b>	<b>National Grid's Position</b>	<b>Chelmsford City Council's Position</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.6.1	Policy and legislation	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Health and Wellbeing assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) and Section 10.2 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES.</b></p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	<p>GCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 2 and Chapter 10 of the ES to review.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.6.2	Study area	The study area was agreed through the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024.	CCG had no comments on the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.6.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 10.4 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.6.4	Assessment methodology	A meeting was held on 24 September 2024 to agree the assessment methodology of the Health and Wellbeing ES chapter. The Methodology was also agreed through the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024. Chelmsford City Council requested that reference to WHIASU guidance and vulnerable groups checklist is included within the assessment. National Grid confirmed that the ES chapter will use WHIASU guidance to identify vulnerable groups.	A meeting was held on 24 September 2024 to agree the assessment methodology of the Health and Wellbeing ES chapter. The Methodology was also agreed through the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024. CCG requested that reference to WHIASU guidance and vulnerable groups checklist is included within the assessment which was agreed by National Grid. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
3.6.5	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with Health and Wellbeing are summarised in <b>Section 10.4 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the ES. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.6.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	The baseline conditions and receptors for Health and Wellbeing are presented in <b>Section 10.5 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the ES. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.6.7	Embedded mitigation	Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Health and Wellbeing effects, are set out in <b>Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the ES. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.6.8	Standard mitigation	Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the ES and set out in the Outline CoCP (document reference 7.2). The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCG cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCG's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
3.6.9	Additional mitigation	The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 10.6 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

### ~~EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects~~

~~CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.~~

3.6.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 10.7 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.6.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 10.7 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.9.12	Residual effects	The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 10.7 of Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.	CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>Specific Chelmsford related issues</b>				
			CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.6.13	Outline CoCP	<p>The Outline CoCP includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing)</b> of the ES and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p>	A full review of the Outline CoCP and further comments will be provided as part of CGC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
To be confirmed				Under discussion

### 3.71.1 ~~Historic Environment~~

~~Table 3.7 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to the Historic Environment~~

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</del>				
<del>3.7.1</del>	<del>Policy and legislation</del>	<del>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Historic Environment assessment is presented in Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) and Section 11.2 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES. All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</del>	<del>Agreed</del>	<del>Agreed</del>
<del>EIA – Approach and Methods</del>				
<del>3.7.2</del>	<del>Study area</del>	<del>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate. The study area was also agreed through subsequent thematic group meetings where further comments were addressed.</del>	<del>The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate. The study area was also agreed through subsequent thematic group meetings where further comments were addressed.</del>	<del>Agreed</del>
<del>3.7.3</del>	<del>Data sources</del>	<del>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES. CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</del>	<del>CCC are still awaiting revisions following its statutory consultation response – to include built non-designated heritage assets, protected lanes and designed landscapes. To date this information has not been provided; CCC/EPs need an updated status on accuracy of Aerial Photo rectification. Information recently provided by EPS includes Palaeolithic potential to be</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>included in Palaeolithic/geoarchaeology background.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	
3.7.4	Assessment methodology	<p>The scoping opinion stated: <i>'The Applicant should make effort to discuss and agree relevant non-designated heritage assets for assessment and the detailed assessment methodology with relevant local planning authorities.'</i></p> <p>The assessment methodology has been discussed at a number of Historic Environment Thematic Group Meetings held between July 2022 and November 2024.</p> <p>CCC raised at statutory consultation that that <i>'Non-designated heritage assets have not been adequately considered in the assessment work to date.'</i></p> <p>It is considered that the assessment methodology has been agreed, with the exception of non-designated heritage assets, where the method is still under discussion.</p>	<p>The assessment methodology has been discussed at a number of Historic Environment Thematic Group Meetings held between July 2022 and November 2024.</p> <p>CCC raised at statutory consultation that that <i>'Non-designated heritage assets have not been adequately considered in the assessment work to date.'</i></p> <p>It is considered that the assessment methodology has been agreed, with the exception of non-designated heritage assets, where the method is still under discussion.</p> <p>With regard to the non-designated heritage assets a programme of geophysics and trial trenching is underway within the undergrounding sections of the route none of which are within Cholmsford District, however it would be expected that a programme of archaeological investigation will have occurred in advance of the submission of the application in areas disturbed by the overhead proposals, including the access route, so that the impact on heritage</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>assets is understood in these areas also (May 2025).</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	
3.7.5	Key parameters and assumptions	<p>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Historic Environment assessment are summarised in <b>Section 11.4 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>In March 2025, National Grid issued an updated version of the Historic Environment (HE) Viewpoints information.</p>	<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion. Further information awaited.
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.7.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Historic Environment are presented in <b>Section 11.5 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p>	<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration.</p> <p>The evidence base requires inclusion of built non-designated heritage assets, protected lanes and designed landscapes, as per public consultation response.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion. Further information awaited.

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<del>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</del>				
3.7.7	Embedded mitigation	<p><del>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Historic Environment effects, are set out in <b>Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</del></p> <p><del>Statutory response received from GCC – NG will consider this feedback as the assessment progresses and more detail will be provided in the ES.</del></p>	<p><del>CCC refers to its comments set out in the Statutory Consultation response and Targeted Consulted response.</del></p> <p><del>Statutory Consultation response stated: 'Mitigation generally should ensure that land take is sufficient to allow for a range of mitigation options, for instance landscaping – potentially from closing up gaps in hedges to large scale woodland planting where necessary. Where harm is unavoidable heritage compensatory measures should also be delivered, for instance repair of listed buildings and/or associated built and landscape features to offset harm to setting. This would be essential at Langleys, where there are a number of structures and features within the Registered Park and Garden, as well as the outbuildings and the house, which could have funded repairs to offset the acknowledged harm to the setting.'</del></p> <p><del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration.</del></p> <p><del>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCC's Local Impact Report.</del></p>	Under discussion
3.7.8	Standard mitigation	<p><del>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the <b>ES</b> and set out in</del></p>	<p><del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration.</del></p>	Under discussion. Further

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p>the Outline CoCP (document reference 7.2). The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	<p>The latest version of ES is required for consideration. Mitigation currently inadequate where significant effects identified. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>information awaited.</p>
3.7.9	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in Section 11.6 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration. The latest version of the ES is required for consideration. Mitigation currently inadequate where significant effects identified. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>Under discussion. Further information awaited.</p>

### ~~EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects~~

~~CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 10 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.~~

3.7.10	Construction effects	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment) of the ES. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate. CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>Statutory Consultation response stated: 'There is significant concern regarding the impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets at Little Waltham and Great Waltham, where the route passes between the two historic villages.' Concerns also raised regarding other locations and lack of mitigation.</p>	<p>Under discussion</p>
--------	----------------------	--	--	-------------------------

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	
3.7.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>Statutory Consultation response stated: 'There is significant concern regarding the impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets at Little Waltham and Great Waltham, where the route passes between the two historic villages.' Concerns also raised regarding other locations and lack of mitigation.</p> <p>Requests have been made for the area at the Walthams to be treated as a priority for further archaeological assessment once the undergrounding sections (regarded by National Grid as Priority areas) have been completed</p> <p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration.</p>	Under discussion
3.7.12	Residual effects	<p>The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 11.7 of Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>Specific Chelmsford related issues</b>				
3.7.13			<p>There is significant concern regarding the impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets at Little Waltham and Great Waltham, where the route passes between the two historic villages. Concerns also raised regarding the other locations and lack of mitigation. CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 11 of the ES for consideration. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
<b><del>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</del></b>				
3.7.14	Outline CoCP	<p>The Outline CoCP includes all relevant construction mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 11 (Historic Environment)</b> of the ES and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>A full review of the Outline CoCP and further comments will be provided as part of CCC's Local Impact Report.</p> <p>The response to the second iteration of the draft oCoCP stated 'The CoCP still does not acknowledge the potential impacts to built heritage during the construction phase and makes reference only to the how the project may affect the historic environment through disturbing known and unknown archaeology and the removal of historic landscape features.'</p> <p>CCC/EPS have submitted comments to National Grid and these are still under discussion.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
3.7.15	Written Scheme of Investigations (WSIs) for pre-consent geophysical surveys and archaeological trial trenching.	National Grid shared WSIs in March – June 2024 and December 2024. The scope and methodology of WSIs for geophysical surveys and archaeological trial trenching is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of impact anticipated.	CCC defers to EPS and further comments will be provided as part of CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.7.16	Draft Mitigation Strategy and Outline WSI	<p>The contents of the Draft Mitigation Strategy and Outline WSI is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of impact anticipated.</p> <p>National Grid issued the Draft Outline Mitigation Strategy and draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for post-consent stage of the project in April 2025.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	CCC/EPS advise that the first draft of the mitigation strategy and OWSI was submitted in Late April with comments provided in May. In general, the structure is fine, however, a lot more detail is still required. One major omission was the lack of outreach identified in the document.	Under discussion
3.7.17	Programme for completion of archaeological fieldwork	The programme for archaeological fieldwork is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of impact anticipated.	CCC defer to EPS and further comments will be provided as part of CCC's Local Impact Report	Under discussion

## 3.8 Landscape and Visual

Table 3.8 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Landscape and Visual

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.8.1	Policy and legislation	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Landscape and Visual assessment is presented in <b>Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context)</b> and <b>Section 13.2 Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the ES.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>CCC/EPS suggest that reference be made to Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) Para 4.3.4 in relation to compensation for significant negative impacts 'To consider the potential effects, including benefits, of a proposal for a project, the applicant must set out information on the likely significant environmental, social and economic effects of the development, and show how any likely significant negative effects would be avoided, reduced, mitigated or compensated for, following the mitigation hierarchy'.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.8.2	Study area	The study area for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.	The study area for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and the Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.	Agreed
3.8.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented	CCC/EPS remain unsatisfied with the number of viewpoint assessments	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p>within <b>Section 13.4 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the ES.</p> <p>National Grid issued an update on LVIA Viewpoints and Methodology in March 2025. CCC/EPS comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>proposed generally (Email November 2024).</p> <p>Whilst CCC/EPS welcome the inclusion of criteria against which landscape value will be assessed, they remain unhappy with aspects of the approach to Landscape Value assessment (Email 22.04.2025)</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	
3.8.4	Assessment methodology (including LVIA methodology and viewpoints)	<p>The outline methodology for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.</p> <p>A meeting was held on the 25 September 2024 to seek to agree the detailed methodology. A further meeting was held on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2024 to follow up any additional changes to the assessment.</p> <p>Viewpoints are still under discussion.</p> <p>At Statutory Consultation, CCC requested the inclusion of a Valued Landscape Assessment. National Grid propose to consider valued landscape qualities in the LVIA but do not propose to undertake a separate valued landscape assessment.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>Whilst CCC/EPS welcome the inclusion of criteria against which landscape value will be assessed, we remain unhappy with aspects of the approach to Landscape Value (Email 22.04.2025)</p> <p>CCC/EPS remain unsatisfied generally with the number of viewpoint assessments proposed.</p> <p>CCC/EPS also have reservations regarding the methodology for assessing the value of views as this appears skewed towards published data.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
3.8.5	Key parameters	<p>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Landscape and Visual assessment are summarised in <b>Section 13.4 of Chapter 13</b></p>	<p>The preliminary key parameters and assumptions are presented at 13.5 in relation to LVIA. It is understood 'This</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
	and assumptions	<del>(Landscape and Visual) of the ES. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</del>	<del>information is iterative and will be updated for the ES as the design evolves and relevant changes are accounted for in the assessment'. GCG/EPs reserve the right to comment further should the parameters and assumptions change.  Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCG's Local Impact Report.</del>	

~~EIA – Baseline Conditions~~

3-8.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	<del>The baseline conditions and receptors for Landscape and Visual are presented in Section 13.5 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.  GCG comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with GCG on this matter.</del>	<del>GCG/EPs remain unsatisfied generally with the number of viewpoint assessments proposed as previously outlined.  GCG/EPs welcome the inclusion of criteria against which landscape value will be assessed but remain unhappy with aspects of the approach to Landscape Value (Email 22.04.2025) and therefore the outcome in terms of the baseline.  GCG also have reservations regarding the methodology for assessing the value of views.  An approach to compensation not just mitigation needs to be identified to meet the EIA Regs and EN-1 requirements and to meet the test of 'as far as possible'. GCG have been calling for engagement on this issue since 2023.  Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCG's Local Impact Report.</del>	Under discussion
-------	-----------------------------------	--	---	------------------

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<del>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</del>				
3.8.7	Embedded mitigation	<p><del>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Landscape and Visual effects, are set out in Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</del></p> <p><del>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</del></p>	<p><del>EPS email 5th Nov 2024 – Landscape – adequacy of undergrounding, mitigation and lack of compensation are all still under discussion.</del></p> <p><del>CCC/EPS concerns regarding the setting of Grade II 'Langleys' Registered Park and Garden and both Great Waltham and Little Waltham Conservation Areas remain unresolved. Although the repositioning of 3no. pylons (TB136, TB142 and TB140) and the use of 'lower height pylons' for 7no locations (TB136 to TB142) is considered to have comparable overall effects, the use of alternative design has been requested.</del></p> <p><del>Alternative routing has been discussed. The Holford Rules are out of date on the issue of locally designated landscapes and do not capture the concept of valued landscapes. These haven't been reviewed since the 1990s. Since then, landscape characterisation has become the tool for understanding landscape and guidance on valued landscape assessment outside designated landscapes introduced.</del></p> <p><del>Even if 'policy statement EN-5 (which covers the development of new energy infrastructure) ... concludes that in most cases, the government expects that overhead lines will be appropriate and should be used as standard to reinforce the grid' it doesn't follow that there are no</del></p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>significant residual negative effects and that further undergrounding or compensation might be required. the PEIR states that significant landscape and visual impacts will occur along the length of the project.</p> <p>An approach to compensation is required. CCC have been calling for engagement on this issue since 2023.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	
3-8.8	Standard mitigation	<p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Landscape and Visual effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the ES and set out in the Outline CoCP (<b>document reference 7.2</b>). The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>CCC/EPS consider the standard mitigation measures do not wholly mitigate substantial significant temporary impacts caused by construction.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
3-8.9	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 13.6 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the ES. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>CCC/EPS consider the additional mitigation measures do not address significant residual negative impacts from pylons and the overhead cables. We do not agree that the mitigation hierarchy has been effectively applied as it does not include compensation for the significant residual negative impacts of the overhead lines and pylons.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>An approach to compensation is required, where and how it will be identified and described, and how the applicant will engage on this topic with the local authority. We do not consider the applicants have considered or met either the EIA Regs or EN-1 requirements in relation to compensation.</p> <p>It appears the likely significant negative landscape and visual effects of the project are generally not to be compensated for which is not acceptable.</p> <p>CCC suggest the test of 'as far as possible' has not been met in any reasonable way in relation to the likely significant permanent negative landscape and visual impacts along the length of the project described by the applicant within the PEIR.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	

**EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects**

Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.

3-8-10	Construction effects	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p>CCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with CCC on this matter.</p>	<p>The Statutory Consultation response for Cholmsford City Council (2024) identified: <i>The PEIR acknowledges that the proposals will have a significant negative landscape and visual impact at both construction and operational stages over the length of the Project. This is identified</i></p>	Under discussion
--------	----------------------	--	---	------------------

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p><i>as up to 1 Km from the Project line in many situations.</i></p> <p><i>GCC/EPs consider that based on the information supplied, that significant negative impacts could occur at a distance greater than 1 Km from the Project.</i></p> <p><i>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCC's Local Impact Report.</i></p>	
3.8.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p><i>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>GCC comments are noted, and NG will continue to engage with GCC on this matter.</i></p>	<p><i>The Statutory Consultation response for Chelmsford City Council (2024) identified: The PEIR acknowledges that the proposals will have a significant negative landscape and visual impact at both construction and operational stages over the length of the Project. This is identified as up to 1 Km from the Project line in many situations.</i></p> <p><i>GCC/EPs consider that based on the information supplied, that significant negative impacts could occur at a distance greater than 1 Km from the Project, including on intangible landscape assets at the operational stage.</i></p> <p><i>Where negative effects are judged not to be significant the experience of receptors is still likely to be negatively affected over a wide area, reducing aesthetic enjoyment, the sense of place, history and identity, and inspiration for learning. In order to reduce significant landscape and visual impacts at the operational stage</i></p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
			<p>over the length of the Project, more use of undergrounding is required to protect valued local landscapes, long-distant rights-of-way and rural amenity sites. Further comments have been provided within the Targeted Consultation response.</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	
3.9.12	Residual effects	<p>The residual effects are presented in Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual) of the ES. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
<b>Specific Cholmsford related issues</b>				
			<p>There is significant concern regarding the impacts on landscape and visual impact at Little Waltham and Great Waltham, where the route passes between the two historic villages. Concerns also raised regarding the other locations and lack of mitigation. Please see CCC Statutory and Targeted Consultation Responses. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.8.13	Outline CoCP	<p>The Outline CoCP includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</p>	<p>A full review of the Outline CoCP and further comments will be provided as part of CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		<p>of the ES and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p>		
3.8.14	Outline LEMP	<p>The Outline LEMP includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>Chapter 13 (Landscape and Visual)</b> of the ES and is appropriate.</p> <p>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline LEMP.</p> <p>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline LEMP.</p> <p>A further iteration of the Outline LEMP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</p> <p>Comments received from EPS will be taken on board and addressed in the next iteration of the Outline LEMP.</p>	<p>E-mail from EPS dated 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2024 with comments on the structure of the Outline LEMP. No further comments received on the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration to date.</p> <p>A full review of the Outline LEMP and further comments will be provided as part of CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
	Cumulative Impacts		<p>Likely Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impacts with VE, NFOW, EACN.</p> <p>To be confirmed-</p> <p>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion

### ~~3.91.1 Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism~~

~~Table 3.9 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism~~

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</del>				
<del>3.9.1</del>	<del>Policy and legislation</del>	<del>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism assessment is presented in Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) and Section 15.2 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism) of the ES.  All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</del>	<del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 2 and Chapter 15 of the ES to review.  Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>
<del>EIA – Approach and Methods</del>				
<del>3.9.2</del>	<del>Study area</del>	<del>The Scoping Opinion stated: "The Applicant should seek to agree the study area with the relevant local authorities". A meeting was held on 14th November 2024 to seek to agree this point in the Scoping Opinion. Technical Notes were shared in June 2023 and April 2024. Following the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> November, it was agreed that the study area for businesses would be expanded from 1 km to 3 km to take into account potential visual effects on businesses. A 3<sup>rd</sup> Technical Note is currently being prepared to seek to agree the study area and methodology.</del>	<del>During the Thematic Group meeting in November 2024, it was proposed that the study area for businesses was increased from 1 km to 3 km to account for visual effects on businesses.  Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
3.9.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 15.4 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES</b> .	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.9.4	Assessment methodology	<p>The Scoping Opinion stated <i>"The ES should detail the criteria used to identify businesses likely to be affected and the Applicant should seek to agree these with relevant local authorities"</i>.</p> <p>A meeting was held on 14th November 2024 to seek to agree this point in the Scoping Opinion. A 3<sup>rd</sup> Technical Note is currently being prepared to seek to agree the study area and methodology.</p> <p>CCC commented in July 2022 that the Project should consider sports pitches and courts as well as Hylands Estate as recreation and tourism assets. National Grid can confirm that these items will be considered within the assessment.</p>	<p>CCC commented in July 2022 that the Project should consider sports pitches and courts as well as Hylands Estate as recreation and tourism assets.</p> <p>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</p>	Under discussion
3.9.5	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism assessment are summarised in <b>Section 15.4 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.9.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	The baseline conditions and receptors for Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism are presented in <b>Section 15.5 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the ES. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.9.7	Embedded mitigation	Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism effects, are set out in <b>Section 15.6 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the ES. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.9.8	Standard mitigation	Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 15.6 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the ES and set out in the Outline CoCP ( <b>document reference 7.2</b> ). The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.9.9	Additional mitigation	The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 15.6 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the ES. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.		
<b>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</b>				
CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.				
3.9.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 15.7 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.9.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 15.7 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.9.12	Residual effects	The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 15.7 of Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism)</b> of the ES. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>Specific Cholmsford related issues</b>				
			CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 15 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</del>				
<del>3.9.13</del>	<del>Outline CoCP</del>	<del>The Outline CoCP includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in Chapter 15 (Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism) of the ES, and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</del> <del>Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.</del> <del>Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.</del> <del>A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</del>	<del>The content of the Outline CoCP is still under discussion.</del> <del>A full review of the Outline CoCP and further comments will be provided as part of CGC's Local Impact Report.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>
<del>Other matters as required</del>				
<del>To be confirmed</del>				

### ~~3.10 Cumulative Effects~~

~~Table 3.10 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Cumulative Effects~~

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del>EIA Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</del>				
<del>3.10.1</del>	<del>Policy and legislation</del>	<del>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Cumulative Effects assessment is presented in Chapter 2 (Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context) and Section 17.2 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES.</del>	<del>CGC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 2 and Chapter 17 of the ES to review.</del> <del>Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CGC's Local Impact Report.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
		All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.		
<del>EIA Approach and Methods</del>				
3.10.2	Study area	The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	GCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review/ confirm. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.10.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within <b>Section 17.4 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the ES.	GCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.10.4	Assessment methodology	The methodology for assessing Cumulative Effects was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	GCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review/ confirm. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3.10.5	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Cumulative Effects assessment are summarised in <b>Section 17.4 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the ES. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.	GCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within GCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3-10.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	The baseline conditions and receptors for Cumulative Effects are presented in <b>Section 17.5 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3-10.7	Embedded mitigation	Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Cumulative Effects, are set out in <b>Section 17.6 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3-10.8	Standard mitigation	Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Cumulative Effects during construction are summarised in <b>Section 17.6 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES</b> and set out in the Outline CoCP ( <b>document reference 7.2</b> ). The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion
3-10.9	Additional mitigation	The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in <b>Section 17.6 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the <b>ES</b> . Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Cholmsford City Council's Position	Status
<b><del>EIA – Assessment of Likely Impacts and Effects</del></b>				
<del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>				
3.10.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in <b>Section 17.7 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	<del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	Under discussion
3.10.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in <b>Section 17.7 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the ES. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.	<del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	Under discussion
3.10.12	Residual effects	The residual effects are presented in <b>Section 17.7 of Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects)</b> of the ES. The summary of residual effects arising as a result of the Project is considered appropriate.	<del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	Under discussion
<b><del>Specific Cholmsford related issues</del></b>				
			<del>CCC cannot comment as we have not received Chapter 17 of the ES to review. Further comments will be made upon receipt of the ES and a full response will be given within CCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	Under discussion

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del><b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b></del>				
<del>3.10.13</del>	<del>Outline CoCP</del>	<del>The Outline CoCP includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) of the ES and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.  Meeting held in October 2024 to agree on the structure for the Outline CoCP.  Meeting held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the Outline CoCP.  A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback in writing.</del>	<del>The content of the Outline CoCP is still under discussion.  A full review of the CoCP and further comments will be provided as part of GCC's Local Impact Report.</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>
<del><b>Other matters as required</b></del>				<del>Under discussion</del>

### ~~3.11 Development Consent Order~~

~~Table 3.11 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under discussion in relation to Development Consent Order~~

<del>ID</del>	<del>Matter</del>	<del>National Grid's Position</del>	<del>Cholmsford City Council's Position</del>	<del>Status</del>
<del><b>DCO General</b></del>				
<del>3.11.1</del>	<del>DCO Requirements – procedure and discharge</del>		<del>Details awaited</del>	<del>Under discussion</del>
<del>3.11.2</del>	<del>DCO Requirements</del>			

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Chelmsford City Council's Position	Status
	—specific requirements			
	<del>Other matters as required</del>			
			Details awaited	Under discussion

### 3.12 — Other Matters

## ~~4.1. Confirmation of Agreement~~

~~Both parties agree that this SoCG is a draft document and as such has not been signed the parties. The final version of the SoCG will be signed by both parties in due course upon agreement.~~

~~The above SoCG is agreed between National Grid and Chelmsford City Council on the date specified below.~~

~~Signed for and on behalf of National Grid: \_\_\_\_\_~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

~~Date: \_\_\_\_\_~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

~~Signed for and on behalf of Chelmsford City Council:~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

~~Date: \_\_\_\_\_~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

# Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Reference
<del>AIL</del>	<del>Abnormal Indivisible Leads</del>
<del>AIS</del>	<del>Air Insulated Switchgear</del>
<del>AOD</del>	<del>Above Ordnance Datum</del>
<del>AONB</del>	<del>Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</del>
<del>BNG</del>	<del>Biodiversity Net Gain</del>
<del>CCC</del>	<del>Chelmsford City Council</del>
<del>CoCP</del>	<del>Code of Construction Practice</del>
<del>CSE</del>	<del>Cable Sealing End</del>
<del>CTMP</del>	<del>Construction Traffic Management Plan</del>
<del>DCO</del>	<del>Development Consent Order</del>
<del>EACN</del>	<del>East Anglia Connection Node</del>
<del>EHO</del>	<del>Environmental Health Officer</del>
<del>EIA</del>	<del>Environmental Impact Assessment</del>
<del>EPS</del>	<del>Essex Place Services</del>
<del>ES</del>	<del>Environmental Statement</del>
<del>GI</del>	<del>Ground Investigation</del>
<del>GW</del>	<del>Gigawatt</del>
<del>LLFA</del>	<del>Lead Local Flood Authority</del>
<del>L VIA</del>	<del>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</del>
<del>LIR</del>	<del>Local Impact Report</del>
<del>MIA</del>	<del>Mineral Infrastructure Impact Assessment</del>
<del>MRA</del>	<del>Minerals Resource Assessment</del>
<del>NCR</del>	<del>National Cycle Route</del>
<del>NETS</del>	<del>National Electricity Transmission System</del>
<del>NG</del>	<del>National Grid</del>
<del>NPSs</del>	<del>National Policy Statements</del>
<del>PEIR</del>	<del>Preliminary Environmental Information Report</del>
<del>PRoW</del>	<del>Public Right of Way</del>
<del>SoCG</del>	<del>Statement of Common Ground</del>
<del>SoCC</del>	<del>Statement of Community Consultation</del>
<del>SPZ</del>	<del>Source Protection Zone</del>
<del>WFD</del>	<del>Water Framework Directive</del>
<del>WHASU</del>	<del>Wales Health Impact Assessment Support Unit</del>

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Full Reference</b>
<del>WIA</del>	<del>Waste Infrastructure Impact Assessment</del>
<del>WSI</del>	<del>Written Scheme of Investigation</del>
<del>ZoI</del>	<del>Zone of Influence</del>
<del>ZTV</del>	<del>Zone of Theoretical Visibility</del>

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

Registered in England and Wales  
No. 4031152  
[nationalgrid.com](http://nationalgrid.com)