

Our Ref: [REDACTED]
 Your Ref: EN020027



Date: 12th May 2026

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils' Comments on Any Further Information or Submissions Received by Deadline 3

1.				
Table Item	Service Area and/or Topic	Referenced Paragraph or Item	BMSDC's Comments	References
a.	Historic Environment	Document: 8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074] HE1.10, response to part f) (p.243)	<p>The applicant says: 'Where circumstances may lead to a longitudinal or lateral change in position, the Project has a robust internal governance and assurance process to ensure compliance with the DCO, to ensure the change does not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects, and to secure mitigation where relevant.'</p> <p>We would request further details of the internal governance and assurance process and if/how changes in pylon position within the LoD will be communicated to the relevant local authorities.</p>	
b.	Historic Environment	Document: 8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074] HE1.10, response to part e) (p.243)	<p>Whilst we understand the assessment is meant to cover the worst case scenario, we remain concerned that GG34 only provides commitments with regards to two listed buildings along the whole route of the project. We would request further details as to why the two assets included in GG34 were selected</p>	



			when none of the twelve listed buildings in Section B which have been assessed to experience a Mid level of less than substantial harm to their significance arising from the operational phase have been included in GG34.	
c.	Ecology	oCoCP (REP3-025) and oLEMP (REP3-030)	Comments regarding the construction phase mitigation/compensation for roosting bats and habitat reinstatement methods have been made elsewhere and are relevant to the oCoCP (e.g. Commitment Reference B10) and oLEMP (e.g. Section 6.1 Protected Species Mitigation – Bats).	
d.	Ecology	Other	If there is agreement for the creation of (and remit for) a Norwich to Tilbury Ecology Working Group, then the CoCP and LEMP should be amended to include it. The CoCP and LEMP seem to be appropriate places to formalise the level of involvement of an EWG.	

