

AENC-NG-CNS-REP-0128

# Norwich to Tilbury

## Volume 5: Reports and Statements

Document: 5.9.7 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Tendring  
District Council - Clean Version

Final Issue C

May 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020027

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

**nationalgrid**

# Revision History

Version	Date	Submitted at
A	29 August 2025	DCO Application
B	26 February 2026	Deadline 1
C	12 May 2026	Deadline 4

# Contents

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Overview	3
1.2	Summary of Matters Under Discussion	4
1.3	Project Description	16
1.4	Format and structure of this document	17
<b>2.</b>	<b>Record of Key Engagement</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1	Introduction	18
2.2	Summary of Key Engagement	18
<b>3.</b>	<b>Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion</b>	<b>28</b>
3.1	Overview	28
3.2	Project Development, Description and Design	29
3.3	Ecology and Biodiversity	38
3.4	Green Infrastructure	54
3.5	Air Quality	61
3.6	Noise and Vibration	68
3.7	Health and Wellbeing	83
3.8	Historic Environment	96
3.9	Landscape and Visual	108
3.10	Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism	117
3.11	Cumulative Effects	129
3.12	Development Consent Order	142
<b>4.</b>	<b>Confirmation of Agreement</b>	<b>143</b>

---

Table 2.1	Summary of Key Engagement between the Applicant and Tendring District Council	18
Table 3.1	Agreement Status for Matters Presented in Section 3	28
Table 3.2	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Project Development, Description and Design Matters	29
Table 3.3	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Ecology and Biodiversity	38
Table 3.5	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Air Quality	61
Table 3.6	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Noise and Vibration	68
Table 3.7	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Health and Wellbeing	83
Table 3.8	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to the Historic Environment	96
Table 3.9	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Landscape and Visual	108
Table 3.10	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism	117
Table 3.11	Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Cumulative Effects	129



# 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 the 'Applicant' 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 Tendring District Council (TDC). Tendring District 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 for Deadline 4. It is intended to be a live and working document which will be updated as the Project progresses and shared with TDC 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 TDC. The applicable matters considered within this SoCG apply to TDC'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

TDC 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 TDC but may be subject to change during the examination. A final position will be recorded in the final SoCG to be submitted close to the examination.

## 1.2 Summary of Matters Under Discussion

1.2.1 As requested by the Examining Authority, the below table provides an ‘at a glance’ summary of matters which are under discussion, together with a deadline by which such matters are expected to be resolved.

SoCG ID	Summary of matter under discussion	Deadline for resolution
<b>Project development, description and design</b>		
3.2.1 – Needs case	TDC accepts that network reinforcement is needed to meet growing electricity demand and generation in East Anglia, but maintains an in-principle objection to overhead powerlines and supports an integrated offshore solution to reduce impacts on communities and the environment.  Norwich to Tilbury is being proposed because the existing network in East Anglia does not have sufficient capacity to manage the expected increase in offshore wind farms needing to connect to reach the Government’s targeted of reaching net zero by 2050. The Applicant’s position on the needs case is detailed in <b>Section 3.2 of Applicant’s Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>	This matter is unlikely to be agreed as the needs case for the project will not change
3.2.2 – Project timing	TDC does not believe the Applicant has provided new evidence to refute the conclusion of the Hiorns Report that the project is not needed by 2030. The Applicant is legally obliged to provide capacity to the offshore windfarms contracted to connect the network in 2030, as formally agreed in contracts with energy generators by NESO. This position is	This matter is unlikely to be agreed as the Applicant is legally obliged to meet the timings as agreed with the offshore wind farms and NESO.

SoCG ID	Summary of matter under discussion	Deadline for resolution
	provided in <b>Section 3.2 of Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>	
3.2.4 – Predominantly overhead line route	<p>TDC's preferred strategic option remains an integrated offshore technology, and that localised design responses involving undergrounding and/or alternate pylon design should not be discounted by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant has proposed an alignment in line with policy statement EN-5 that meets the capacity requirements of the needs case. This position is provided in <b>Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b></p>	This matter is unlikely to be agreed as the Applicant does not propose changing the technology to offshore or underground
3.2.7 – 3.2.10 Consultation	<p>TDC raised concerns around transparency and availability of information at the 2025 targeted consultations.</p> <p>The Applicant undertook consultations in accordance with the respective consultation strategies and SoCC, and responses to feedback are contained within the <b>Consultation Feedback Report [APP-066]</b></p>	This matter is unlikely to be agreed as the Applicant cannot change how historic consultations were carried out
<b>Ecology and Biodiversity</b>		
3.3.11 - Construction effects	<p>TDC have concerns regarding level of bat survey and construction effects upon bats.</p> <p>The Applicant is working with Natural England to produce a draft project wide bat licence. A letter of support is expected to be issued by Natural England supporting the contents of the draft Project-wide licence during the Examination.</p>	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.3.13 - Outline CoCP	<p>TDC remains unconvinced that the Outline CoCP provides adequate guarantees of ECoW competence or capacity.</p> <p>The Applicant maintains that this role will not be undertaken by one individual, but by multiple ecologists with a range of relevant experience and any protected species licences necessary for the specific task to be undertaken. Further details on the number and type of ECoWs required across the Project will be included within the Final Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (post-DCO consent).</p>	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.3.14 – Outline LEMP	<p>TDC seeks clarification on tree assessment for bat hibernation. Natural England (the statutory responsible body for bats) has approved the method to classify potential roost features which are in line with standard guidelines.</p>	Resolution likely by Deadline 7

<b>SoCG ID</b>	<b>Summary of matter under discussion</b>	<b>Deadline for resolution</b>
3.3.15 – Biodiversity Net Gain – onsite and assessment	<p>While TDC welcomes the commitment to at least 10% BNG, they encourage the applicant to adopt a 7 higher target noting Essex Local Nature Partnership.</p> <p>The <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b> sets out the Applicants approach to BNG</p>	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.3.16 – Biodiversity Net Gain - offsite	TDC seeking further clarification around Offsite BNG provision. The Applicant maintains that offsite BNG will be secured by a legal agreement and delivered through collaboration with partners and purchased from commercially registered providers.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.3.18 – Data sources (bats)	TDC require further bat roost surveys prior to DCO consent. The Applicant is not proposing further surveys pre-consent, and this approach has been agreed with Natural England.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.3.19 – Survey methodology (bats)		
3.3.20 – Baseline conditions and receptors (bats)		
3.3.21 – Standard mitigation		
<b>Green Infrastructure</b>		
3.4.2 – Standard mitigation	TDC to review the Applicant’s updated position in the SoCG that relates to Green Infrastructure.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7 - subject to ECC comment/position
3.4.3 – Additional mitigation	<p>TDC state that GI delivery should be explicitly aligned with the Essex GI Strategy and Essex GI Standards and reflect the priorities identified in the Essex LNRS.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider Local Nature Recovery Strategy areas as part of the offsite BNG selection process where sites are available and appropriate to project circumstances.</p>	Resolution likely by Deadline 7 - subject to ECC comment/position
3.4.3a – Additional mitigation	<p>TDC recommends that discussions be held to secure off-site biodiversity compensation within Essex. TDC also suggests where habitats are removed, they should be reinstated with enhanced havitats using locally important native species.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy as part of the off-site BNG</p>	Resolution likely by Deadline 7- subject to ECC comment/position
3.4.3b – additional mitigation		

SoCG ID	Summary of matter under discussion	Deadline for resolution
	selection process, where sites are available, and appropriate to the Project.	
3.4.4 – Outline LEMP	The Applicant has committed to a 30-year monitoring and maintenance period at Environmental Areas in line with the commitments made within the <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b> . Detail on habitat management and monitoring for the Environmental Areas will be set out in the final Landscape and Ecological Management Plan post consent.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7 - subject to ECC comment/position
3.4.5 – Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	TDC to review the Applicant’s updated position in the SoCG that relates to Green infrastructure and its long-term governance and monitoring arrangements.	
<b>Landscape and Visual (GI)</b>		
3.4.6 – Embedded mitigation (Landscape and visual)	TDC requests that GI proposals be aligned with the Essex LNRS priorities and local landscape strategies. The Applicant will continue to liaise with TDC in relation to this matter.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7 subject to ECC comment/position
3.4.7 – Additional mitigation (Landscape and visual)	Discussion ongoing regarding compensation measures and offsite BNG provision. Full details of the off-site solution would be provided to the Local Planning Authorities post-consent	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination, as this is a post-consent matter.
3.4.8 – Outline LEMP (Landscape and visual)	The Applicant requests further information regarding TDC comments relating to a change in the OLEMP terminology from ‘enhanced mitigation’ to ‘landscape compensation’. The Applicant has reviewed the published versions of <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [APP-321, AS-046, REP2-018 and REP3-030]</b> and cannot find any reference to ‘enhanced mitigation’.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
<b>Air Quality</b>		
3.5.7 – Embedded mitigation	TDC requests that the embedded measures are fully incorporated into the Outline CoCP (secured by DCO Requirement 4) and the Outline Dust Management Plan. The Applicant states that the Outline CoCP will be developed by the Main Works Contractor and would reflect refinements from the finalised version of the Dust Management Plan which will be submitted to TDC for approval prior to commencement of development, as a post-consent matter.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination, as this is a post-consent matter.

<b>SoCG ID</b>	<b>Summary of matter under discussion</b>	<b>Deadline for resolution</b>
3.5.11 – Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>Disagreement between parties that the maintenance effects of traffic is appropriate, and request that construction phase mitigation remains in place during operation.</p> <p>The Applicant maintains that there would be a very small number of vehicles associated with operation and maintenance; and the therefore the operation mitigations in place are appropriate.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.5.12 – Outline CoCP	<p>TDC is generally content that all relevant mitigation measures are included in the Outline CoCP however notes that several air-quality controls rely on future contractor-led, site-specific Dust Management Plans and monitoring plans, meaning TDC or ECC (or the future unitary authority) will need to review these carefully at discharge stage.</p> <p>The Applicant notes this, and maintains that this matter would be secured through the DCO and addressed post-consent.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination, as this is a post-consent matter.
<b>Noise and Vibration</b>		
3.6.5b – Key parameters and assumptions	<p>TDC agree that parameters and assumptions are generally acceptable, but note limitations on third party data, and request verification before final design.</p> <p>This would be a post-consent matter.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination, as this is a post-consent matter.
3.6.6 – Baseline conditions and receptors	TDC agree that the baseline conditions are generally acceptable and proportionate, but note limitations on third party data and request pre-construction noise surveys. This would be a post-consent matter.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination, as this is a post-consent matter.
3.6.11 – Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>TDC position is that the ES uses correct methodology, appropriate standards, and baseline conditions representative of Tendring.</p> <p>The approach was agreed by Tendring DC's Environmental Health Officer in advance, and the level of detail is therefore proportionate. However TDC raise limitations regarding future design and post-consent delivery, and request assurance from the DCO wording.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination, as this is a post-consent matter.
3.6.12 – Outline CoCP	TDC raise limitations to oCoCP and request that the final CoCP contains further detail. This is a post-consent matter.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination, as this is a post-consent matter.
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		
3.7.5 – Key parameters and assumptions	TDC agree that key parameters and assumptions are appropriate, but note that there is a lack of data regarding mental health. The Applicant confirms	Resolution likely by Deadline

<b>SoCG ID</b>	<b>Summary of matter under discussion</b>	<b>Deadline for resolution</b>
	that mental wellbeing indicators are provided at Tendring-wide level.	
3.7.7 – Embedded mitigation	TDC considers that the establishment of a clear and robust Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Framework should be examined.  The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.7.8 – Standard mitigation	TDCs position is that the standard mitigation proposed is broadly appropriate and in line with accepted UK best practice, but they are not fully adequate for the specific sensitivities in Tendring.  The Applicant considers that standard mitigation measures proposed are appropriate.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.7.9 – Additional mitigation	TDC maintains that additional mitigation measures are required because of the fundamental disagreement in ID 3.7.8 regarding adequacy of standard mitigation measures.  The Applicant disagrees and considers additional mitigation measures to be appropriate.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.7.11 – Operational (and maintenance) effects	Ongoing discussion regarding community benefits and compensation.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.7.12 – Outline CoCP	TDC maintains that additional mitigation measures are required because of the fundamental disagreement in ID 3.7.8 regarding adequacy of standard mitigation measures.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
<b>Historic Environment</b>		
3.8.6 – Data sources (Archaeology) survey data	TDC (Archaeology) notes the fieldwork proposed prior to application has not been completed and the impact of this to inform the assessment is under review.  The Applicant maintains that sufficient data has been collected to inform assessment, but notes that survey work is ongoing with results likely in August 2026.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.8.7 – Assessment methodology (built heritage)	TDC maintain that the methodology is incorrect.  The Applicant maintains that methodology has been discussed throughout all phases of the application, including Scoping, and at various workshops between 2022 and 2024.  Fundamental disagreement is maintained.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.

SoCG ID	Summary of matter under discussion	Deadline for resolution
3.8.10 – Key parameters and assumptions (archaeology)	TDC maintain that until the completion of survey data, they cannot agree with the parameters and assumptions. The Applicant maintains that key parameters and assumptions are appropriate.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.8.13 – Embedded mitigation	The Applicant will continue to liaise with TDC on this matter.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.8.14b – Standard mitigation (built heritage)	TDC request a hotline method of contact during construction. The Applicant states that the oCoCP sets out the methods of contact during construction.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.8.16 – Additional mitigation	This matter will remain under discussion until the outline AMS WSI is finalised.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.8.19 – Outline CoCP	TDC are concerned that the Outline CoCP does not acknowledge the potential impacts to built heritage during the construction phase. The Applicant maintains that all relevant construction mitigation measures are appropriate.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.8.22 – Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline WSI	The Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation [APP-328] is currently being updated following receipt of comments in Local Impact Reports and Written Representations, this will be shared with stakeholders for further comment/approval and the updated version will be submitted at Deadline 5.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
<b>Landscape and Visual</b>		
3.9.1 – Policy and legislation	TDC is concerned that the evaluation of valued landscapes is flawed, and the judgement on significance. TDC to review <b>8.8.2 Applicant’s Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b> for the Applicant’s position on landscape mitigation and compensation.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.9.3 – Data sources	TDC is concerned about gaps in viewpoint distribution and with the approach to landscape value and value of the view. The Applicant maintains that sufficient desktop and survey data (excluding viewpoints) has been collected to inform the assessment.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.9.4 – Assessment methodology	TDC is concerned about gaps in viewpoint coverage and also retain concerns that without a separate valued landscape assessment the project	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.

SoCG ID	Summary of matter under discussion	Deadline for resolution
(including LVI methodology)	cannot be judged fairly against policy in (EN-1) 5.10.12.  The Applicant considers the approach taken to be in line with the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and the <b>6.19 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> .	
3.9.5 – Key parameters and assumptions	TDC not sure what is meant by the terms key parameters and assumptions.  The Applicant maintains that the key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.9.6 – Baseline conditions and receptors	TDC are concerned with the Visual Receptors and Groupings that are based only partially on shared landscape characteristics and a similarity in views.  The Applicant considers the baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.9.7 – Embedded mitigation	TDC have concerns around adequacy of undergrounding, mitigation and lack of adequate compensation.  The Applicant considers the embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.9.8 – Standard mitigation	TDC has concerns that the standard mitigation measures do not wholly mitigate substantial significant temporary impacts caused by construction.  The Applicant considers the standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.9.9 – Additional mitigation	TDC has concerns that the additional mitigation measures do not address significant residual negative impacts from pylons and the overhead cables.  The Applicant considers the additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.9.10 – Construction effects	TDC is concerned that the potential tree and hedgerow loss has not been meaningfully quantified in relation to landscape and visual.  The Applicant maintains that the assessment of effects during construction is considered appropriate.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.9.11 – Operational (and	TDC request the consideration of further re-routing and undergrounding to reduce significant landscape and visual effects.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.

<b>SoCG ID</b>	<b>Summary of matter under discussion</b>	<b>Deadline for resolution</b>
maintenance) effects	The Applicant confirms that the approach to the LVIA follows professional guidance and was discussed with stakeholders. It is considered that the judgements made as part of the assessments remain fair and reasonable.	
3.9.12 – Outline CoCP	TDC to review the updated <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> and <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b> .	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.9.13 – Outline LEMP	TDC retain concerns in relation to definition, scope and scale of term 'compensation'. TDC recommends that compensation measures be clearly distinguished from mitigation and BNG obligations.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.9.14 – Cumulative effects	TDC is concerned regarding cumulative adverse landscape and visual effects at construction and operational phases. The Applicant undertakes monthly reviews of planning registers, and where this review identifies the potential for new or different significant effects or changes to the conclusions presented in the Environmental Statement then these would be published into Examination as updates to the relevant inter-project cumulative effects documents (as appropriate).	Resolution likely by Deadline 7

### **Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism**

3.10.5 – Key parameters and assumptions	TDC is concerned about the lack of reference to data on employment and skills, and requests that skills are considered separately to community benefits and that regional skills analysis is undertaken.  The Applicant proposes to prepare and submit an Employment and Skills Plan into the Examination at Deadline 5. The Applicant also confirms continued engagement to deliver long-lasting community benefits.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.10.6 – Baseline conditions and receptors	TDC consider the baseline to be generally acceptable but state that it would benefit from more local nuance.  The Applicant maintains that the baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.10.7 – Embedded mitigation	TDC has concerns that the mitigation relies on avoidance rather than design and does not reflect the district's higher vulnerability.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.

SoCG ID	Summary of matter under discussion	Deadline for resolution
	<p>The Applicant considers the embedded mitigation to be appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	
3.10.8 – Standard mitigation	<p>TDC note that while the standard mitigation may be appropriate for a baseline framework, it is not locally tailored to Tendring.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the standard mitigation to be appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.10.9 – Additional mitigation	<p>TDC has concerns that the additional mitigation measures fail to properly take into account potential for road network disruptions, road closures/addition HGV traffic on local roads and potential impacts on local business, tourism, hospitality etc.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the additional mitigation to be appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects and is committed to having ongoing communication with affected businesses.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.10.10 – Construction effects	<p>TDC has concerns that the assessment underplays the practical and economics risk to small tourism and recreation businesses in Tendring.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges TDC’s comment on the effects on small tourism and recreation businesses in Tendring. Given the rolling nature of the linear works, the construction activities in any particular area are likely to be short-term in nature.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.10.11 – Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>TDC disagrees with the findings of operation (and maintenance) assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) to be appropriate.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.10.12 – Outline CoCP	<p>TDC has concerns that the construction related mitigation measures are non-specific by design and location.</p> <p>The Applicant maintains that all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified are appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project. The CoCP will be further developed post-consent to provide site-specific construction management plans.</p>	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.

<b>SoCG ID</b>	<b>Summary of matter under discussion</b>	<b>Deadline for resolution</b>
<b>Cumulative Effects</b>		
3.11.3 – Data sources	TDC need more time to thoroughly consider desktop and survey data.	Resolution likely by Deadline 7
3.11.5a – Key parameters and assumptions	TDC do not agree with the key parameters and assumptions associated with the cumulative effects assessment. TDC has concerns that the inter-project assessment underrepresents the intensity of cumulative construction effects.  The Applicant maintains that the key parameters and assumptions are appropriate.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.11.5b – Key parameters and assumptions	TDC has concerns over the April 2025 cutoff date excluding other developments that would be relevant to the inter-project assessment.  The Applicant undertakes monthly reviews of planning registers, and where this review identifies the potential for new or different significant effects or changes to the conclusions presented in the Environmental Statement then these would be published into Examination as updates to the relevant inter-project cumulative effects documents (as appropriate).	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.11.6 – Baseline conditions and receptors	TDC does not agree with the conclusions of the inter-project assessment.  The Applicant reiterates that the inter-project assessment was undertaken by competent and professional experts. In addition, the Applicant undertakes monthly reviews of planning registers, and where this review identifies the potential for new or different significant effects or changes to the conclusions presented in the Environmental Statement then these would be published into Examination as updates to the relevant inter-project cumulative effects documents (as appropriate).	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.11.7 – Embedded mitigation 3.11.8 – Standard mitigation 3.11.9 – Additional mitigation	TDC does not agree that the embedded, standard and additional mitigation is adequate.  The Applicant considers the embedded mitigation to be appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.
3.11.10 – Construction effects	TDC has concerns that the inter-project assessment underrepresents the intensity of cumulative construction effects.	Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.

SoCG ID	Summary of matter under discussion	Deadline for resolution
	<p>The Applicant maintains that the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects during construction is considered appropriate and was undertaken by competent and professional experts.</p>	
<p>3.11.12 – Outline CoCP</p>	<p>TDC has concerns that no additional or enhanced mitigation measures for the inter-project cumulative construction effects are presented.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the mitigation to be appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	<p>Matter unlikely to be agreed during Examination.</p>
<p><b>Development Consent Order</b></p>		
<p>3.12.1 - DCO Wording</p>	<p>Discussions are ongoing in relation to detailed drafting points on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision-making and approval timescales;</li> <li>• Definition of ‘maintain’;</li> <li>• Definition of ‘provisional advance authorisation’;</li> <li>• Limits of deviation;</li> <li>• Application of permit schemes;</li> <li>• Discharge of water;</li> <li>• Traffic regulation;</li> <li>• Felling or lopping;</li> <li>• Safeguarding;</li> <li>• Service of notices;</li> <li>• Draft protective provisions; and</li> <li>• Certified documents.</li> </ul>	<p>Resolution likely by Deadline 7</p>

## 1.3 Project Description

- 1.3.1 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.
- 1.3.2 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).
- 1.3.3 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.
- 1.3.4 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.

## 1.4 Format and structure of this document

1.4.1 This SoCG is structured as follows:

- **Section 2** provides a summary of the key engagement undertaken to date with TDC
- **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 The Applicant has engaged with TDC 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 the Applicant’s engagement with stakeholders is provided in the Consultation Report and the Environmental Statement.

### 2.2 Summary of Key Engagement

2.2.1 Table 2.1 provides an overview of the key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and TDC.

2.2.2 It is agreed that the below is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between the Applicant and TDC in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

Table 2.1 Summary of Key Engagement between the Applicant and Tendring District Council

Date	Format	Topic/Description
<b>General</b>		
September 2022	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
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 meetings.
November 2023	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
December 2023	Email Correspondence	The Applicant 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	The Applicant issued the SoCC to all host authorities for statutory consultation.
May 2024	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
May 2024	Meeting	East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) discussion.
September 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the draft Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) to all host authorities for comment.
October 2024	Meeting	The Applicant held a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on draft versions of the Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP.
November 2024	Meeting	Meeting to discuss approach to targeted consultation.
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	The Applicant shared the 2nd iteration draft versions of the Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP.
January 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the 2nd iteration draft versions of the Outline CoCP and Outline LEMP to all host authorities for comment.
January 2025	Meeting	The Applicant held a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on the 2nd iteration draft versions of the Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
March 2025	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
March 2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the Applicant's approach to routing and siting.
May 2025	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
May 2025	Technical Note	The Applicant shared the long list of other developments.
June 2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss duty to further the purposes of the National Landscape.
June 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued draft DCO, explanatory memorandum and draft requirements.
July 2025	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
August 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued draft Heads of Terms for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and off-site tree provision.
August 2025	Meeting	Meeting to provide project and design update.
September 2025	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
October 2025	Meeting	Optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the Traffic, Transport and PRoW section of the Environmental Statement.
November 2025	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
January 2026	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
February 2026	Meeting	Meeting to progress Statement of Common Ground.
March 2026	Email	Email to agree approach for Statement of Common Ground deadline 4 submission.
March 2026	Meeting	All host authority workshop.
<b>Ecology and Biodiversity</b>		
July 2022	Email Correspondence	The Applicant 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 – The Applicant presented on the Biodiversity Assessment Methodology and Arboriculture Assessment Methodology and sought feedback from stakeholders.
September 2023	Meeting	The Applicant discussed the potential off-site scheme/initiatives for BNG.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
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	The Applicant 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.
October 2024	Meeting	The Applicant hosted a meeting to discuss comments from stakeholders on draft versions of the Outline LEMP and CoCP.
January 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the Protected Species Proposed Mitigation Measures to stakeholders including TDC.
January 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the BNG Strategy to stakeholders including TDC.
January 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared the 2 <sup>nd</sup> iteration of the Outline LEMP
May 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared a new appendix to the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) – Appendix D, Outline Landscape Proposals.
May 2025	Meeting	The Applicant hosted a meeting to discuss comments from the updated proposed mitigation for species outside the remit of Natural England.
September 2025	Meeting	Optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the ecology section of the Environmental Statement.
<b>Air Quality</b>		
September 2022	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the proposed methodology and scope of the Air Quality assessment for review and comment.
<b>Noise and vibration</b>		
September 2022	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the proposed methodology and scope of the Noise and Vibration assessment for review and comment.
July 2023	Technical Note	The Applicant issued a technical note to agree the approach to undertaking operational noise impact assessment of the proposed EACN Substation.
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>		
September 2022	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the Health and Wellbeing Assessment Methodology to all host authorities.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
September 2023	Technical Note	The Applicant issued a Health and Wellbeing technical note on the proposed approach to the EIA Assessment, including guidance, study area, scope, and assessment methodology.
September 2024	Meeting	The Applicant 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	The Applicant issued a refreshed Health and Wellbeing technical note on the proposed approach to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including guidance, study area, scope, and assessment methodology.
September 2025	Meeting	Optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the Health and Wellbeing section of the Environmental Statement

### **Historic Environment**

July 2022	Email Correspondence	The Applicant 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	The Applicant 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	The Applicant 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	The Applicant held a meeting with all host authorities to discuss landscape and heritage viewpoints.
June 2023	Technical Note	The Applicant 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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
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	The Applicant shared the updated viewpoints (including ZTV) for feedback from all host authorities, Natural England and Historic England.
March 2024	Technical Note	The Applicant shared the Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment for review and comment.
May 2024	Meeting	Optional Statutory Consultation Thematic Group call.
June 2024	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
August 2024	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
October 2024	Meeting	Historic Environment Thematic Group Meeting – aim was to seek agreement on the Historic Environment Methodology with respect to study area and assessment approach.
October 2024	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
October 2024	Meeting	The Applicant shared the setting survey locations with stakeholders.
December 2024	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
January 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
February 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
February 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared the Heritage Viewpoints Documents with stakeholders.
February 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared the Draft Heritage Baseline Report with stakeholders.
February 2025	Meeting	Thematic group meeting to further discussions regarding the Historic Environment Viewpoints.
February 2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the Draft Heritage Baseline Report.
March 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued updated the Historic Environment Viewpoints information to stakeholders including TDC.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
April 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued the Draft Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Draft Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for post-consent stage of the project.
April 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
May 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
June 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
June 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared trench plans for Site 009, Area 34.
June 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared updated trench plans for Site 009, Area 34.
June 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant share an Archaeological fieldwork summary for comment.
July 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
August 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
September 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
October 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
October 2025	Meeting	Optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the heritage section of the Environmental Statement (Covering Essex North).
October 2025	Email	The Applicant shared the Trial Trench Plans for review and approval for site 009.
November 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
November 2025	Email	The Applicant shapefile for the phase 2 survey along with the priority area survey.
December 2025	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
December 2025	Email	The Applicant shared the WSI for the Phase 2 geophysical survey.
January 2026	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
January 2026	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the heritage aspects of the Statement of Common Ground.
January 2026	Meeting	Meeting to discuss matters relating to built heritage in the Statement of Common Ground.
January 2026	Meeting	Meeting to discuss matters relating to Archaeology in the Statements of Common Ground being covered by EPS.
February 2026	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
February 2026	Meeting	The Applicant shared the Supplementary Environmental Information submitted to PINS on the geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching completed to date with the Archaeology Working Group Stakeholders.
March 2026	Meeting	Archaeology Working Group Meeting.
<b>Landscape and Visual</b>		
July 2022	Meeting	Landscape and Visual Thematic Group Meeting. The Applicant shared the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology and Arboricultural Assessment Methodology for review.
January 2023	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued plans showing proposed viewpoint locations for review and comment to all host authorities.
February 2023	Meeting	Thematic Group meeting – proposed viewpoint locations – Essex.
April 2023	Meeting	The Applicant 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	Meeting	EIA viewpoints meeting – Essex.
May 2023 – March 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant 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	The Applicant issued wirelines and photomontages and proposed the approach to Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) mapping for comment.
January 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared the updated landscape viewpoints (and the ZTV) and sought feedback from all host authorities.
March 2024	Meeting	The Applicant responded to feedback received on viewpoints.
May 2024	Meeting	Optional Statutory Consultation Thematic Group call.
May 2024	Meeting	EACN (Statutory Consultation) Thematic Group Meeting.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
September 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant 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	The Applicant 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	The Applicant shared the shapefiles for the landscape viewpoints and order limits following the Landscape Thematic Group Meeting.
September 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared the draft Outline LEMP and Sample Mitigation Drawings ahead of the draft Outline LEMP and Outline CoCP discussion.
September 2024	Meeting	Landscape Thematic Group Meeting to discuss viewpoints – Essex North.
October 2024	Meeting	Focus meeting to discuss the National Landscape.
October 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared the Draft mitigation drawings with stakeholders.
October 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared the National Landscape Setting Study with stakeholders.
October 2024	Email Correspondence	The Applicant shared updated view point information data following from the landscape thematic workshops.
November 2024	Meeting	Thematic group meeting to discuss viewpoints and methodology – Essex North.
March 2025	Email Correspondence	The Applicant issued an update on LVIA Viewpoints and Methodology.
September 2025	Meeting	Optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the Landscape section of the Environmental Statement (covering Essex North).
October 2025	Meeting	Meeting to discuss Tree and Hedgerow removal in Tendring following initial meeting with the Landscape team in September 2025.
October 2025	Meeting	Follow up optional thematic group meeting to discuss feedback on the Landscape section of the Environmental Statement (covering Essex North).
January 2026	Meeting	Joint meeting attended by LPA's who are represented by EPS for Landscape to discuss the Statement of Common Ground.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Topic/Description</b>
March 2026	Meeting	Joint meeting attended by LPA's who are represented by EPS for Landscape to discuss the Statement of Common Ground.
March 2026	Email Correspondence	The Applicant sent an e-mail to seek further clarification and detail in relation to the requests for additional landscape and visual measures in TDC's Local Impact Report.
<b>Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism</b>		
August 2023	Meeting	The Applicant held a Socio-economic, Recreation and Tourism Thematic Group Meeting to discuss the study area and methodology for assessing businesses.
April 2024	Technical Note	The Applicant 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.
November 2024	Meeting	The Applicant 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.

# 3. Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion

## 3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 This chapter details the matters relevant to TDC 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 TDC. Descriptions of the different levels are summarised in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Agreement Status for Matters Presented in Section 3

Status	Description
Not Agreed	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.
Under Discussion	Indicates where issues are the subject of active on-going discussion.
Agreed	Indicates where an issue has been agreed or resolved satisfactorily to the agreement of both parties.

- 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 Table 3.11 provide 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

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>Strategic options/needs case</b>				
3.2.1	Needs case	<p>The Applicant welcomes TDC's acceptance of the need for network reinforcement. 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.</p> <p>Norwich to Tilbury is listed as a key project in Appendix 2 of the NESO Clean Power 2030 Report.</p> <p>For the Applicant's position on needs case, please refer to Section 3.2 'Needs Case and Timing' in <b>Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed</p>	<p>TDC would refer to it's Relevant Representation submission (27 November 2025), section 4.1 – Need Case and Alternatives. TDC accepts that network reinforcement is needed to accommodate the expected growth in demand for electricity and the additional contracted / planned electricity generation in the East Anglia region. However, despite the acceptance of the need, TDC's in-principle objection continues to be for an integrated offshore solution that avoids the use of overhead powerlines due to their impact on communities and the environment.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
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. The Applicant is legally obliged (under the 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>For the Applicant's position on project timing, please refer to Section 3.2 'Needs Case and Timing' in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed.</p>	<p>TDC would refer to its Relevant Representation submission (27 November 2025), section 4.1 Need Case and Alternatives. TDC does not believe that NGET has provided any new evidence or sensitivity testing to refute the conclusion of the Hiorns report that the Norwich to Tilbury project is not needed by 2030. While TDC has had regard to the TEC Register, TDC considers it essential that in determining what future expansion is needed, more transparency is required about the assumptions on the status of the contracted connections and what future generation connections are actually likely to be ready to connect to the transmission network by 2030. The applicant must not restrict the justification on future network expansion solely based on the ESO contracted position. Further engagement would be welcomed on this matter.</p>	Under discussion
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>TDC would refer to its Relevant Representation submission (27 November 2025), section 4.2 – In this section TDC sets out its clear objection to NGET's chosen location of the EACN near Ardleigh/Little Bromley and the associated underground cable corridors and new pylon route.</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>Updated (7.17 and 7.19 2023) <b>Strategic Options and Backcheck Review [APP-355, APP-357]</b> published at each consultation compare the environmental, technical, socioeconomic and financial implications for alternative routes, including offshore alternatives.</p> <p>For the Applicant's position on the onshore route, please refer to Section 3.3 'Alternatives – Offshore Alternatives' in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	<p>TDC argues that NGET's site-selection process is flawed, insufficiently transparent, and overly driven by customer convenience, rather than environmental, landscape, agricultural, or community considerations.</p> <p>TDC contends that alternative sites further west (e.g., RAF Boxted, nearer the A12) were dismissed without proper evidence, even though they would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• avoid large areas of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) farmland,</li> <li>• reduce pylon length by ~10km,</li> <li>• lessen landscape, heritage, and residential impacts,</li> <li>• better align with the prevailing route corridor, and</li> <li>• sit closer to major infrastructure, reducing construction impact.</li> </ul> <p>TDC systematically challenges NGET's technical arguments on constraints, cable routing, corridor widths, construction complexity, future flexibility, and deliverability, stating that these issues are either shared by the chosen location, overstated, or unproven.</p> <p>The section also highlights serious concerns about the arc-shaped pylon route north of Ardleigh, which breaks the Horlock Rules on linearity and brings</p>	


ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.2.4	Predominantly overhead line route	<p>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.</p> <p>Updated <b>(7.17 and 7.19 2023) Strategic Options and Backcheck Review [APP-355, APP-357]</b> documents published at each consultation compare the environmental, technical, socioeconomic and financial implications for alternative routes, including underground alternatives.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For the Applicant's position on the predominantly overhead line route, please refer to Section 3.4 'Technology Choice – Overhead Line and Underground</p>	<p>pylons unacceptably close to settlements and sensitive landscapes.</p> <p>Overall, TDC argues the current EACN location causes disproportionate, avoidable, and long-term harm to communities and the environment in north-west Tendring, and that National Grid has not justified rejecting better-performing alternatives.</p> <p>See above, in addition, TDC's preferred strategic option remains that of securing an integrated offshore technology that minimises onshore transmission infrastructure and does not include overhead lines (OHL's) and pylons along its entire length and through and around settled communities in TDC. An integrated offshore solution would deliver the best outcome in the interests of safeguarding the amenities of communities and the environment.</p> <p>Localised design responses involving undergrounding and /or alternate pylon design/routing as part of the application of the mitigation hierarchy, should not be discounted by NGET. TDC considers that such an approach would not be contrary to national policy statements and would actually be consistent with Holford Rule 7, where it states projects</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>Cables' in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed.</p>	<p>should be routed to minimise as far as possible effects on development.</p>	
3.2.5	Siting selection process	<p>At each consultation period, the Applicant has published a suite of documents which detail how the design has been developed (based on environmental and engineering assessments, and stakeholder feedback) in addition to showing the method used to evaluate our strategic choices and how we review and backcheck these methods, and how we have considered stakeholder feedback. Key documents include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>7.18 Errata 2022 - Corridor and Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study Appendices (Final Issue A) [REP1-068]</b></li> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report - Appendix B: 2022 non-statutory consultation (Final Issue A) [APP-068]</b></li> <li>• <b>7.19 2023 Strategic Options Backcheck and Review [APP-357]</b></li> <li>• <b>7.20 2023 Design Development Report for the Project (Final Issue A) [APP-358]</b></li> <li>• <b>5.1 Consultation Report - Appendix C: 2023 non-statutory consultation (Final Issue A)[APP-069]</b></li> <li>• <b>7.17 Strategic Options Backcheck and Review (Final Issue A) [APP-355]</b></li> <li>• <b>7.21 2024 Design Development Report for the Project (Final Issue A) [APP-359]</b></li> </ul>	<p>TDC believes that all the benefits and disadvantages, including any cost benefits or disadvantages of any and all alternatives should be properly and transparently considered, and then carefully weighed against the benefits and disadvantages of National Grid's preferred approach.</p> <p>This crucial exercise, despite the scale of this project and the considerable magnitude of the harmful impacts of the National Grid's preferred route, appears to remain outstanding. Or if it has been undertaken, the evidence and full detail appears to remain unavailable to the wider public and all the interested parties and communities that will be greatly affected by this project.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>Project development process - Design</b>				
3.2.6	East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) substation	<p>The Applicant has previously considered a number of alternative sites for the EACN substation during the initial siting work as set out in the CPRSS and 2023 and 2024 DDRs. The decision making about siting considers the potential effects within the context of relevant policy, notably NPS EN-1, EN-5 and the Electricity Act 1989. We have kept our preliminary decisions under review and continue to consider the EACN substation as proposed to be the preferred location on the basis that an alternative further west presents greater uncertainty on factors including deliverability and increased construction risk and is not compatible with our duties. For the Applicant's position on the EACN substation, please refer to Section 3.6 'Alternatives – East Anglia Connection Nose Substation Siting and Connection routing at Ardleigh' in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	<p>See TDC's Relevant Representation submission (27 November 2025), section 4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The choice of the EACN site east of Ardleigh contradicts this prevailing route. The environmental, landscape, and community impacts of locating the EACN here are severe. With the current proposed onshore substation locations for the Five Estuaries and North Falls windfarms, as well as the Tarchon Interconnector and National Grid's Norwich to Tilbury EACN all in one area, the projects are functionally interdependent, and the in-combination and cumulative effects will be extremely damaging.</li> <li>TDC strongly recommends considering alternative sites along the A12 corridor, which are better aligned with the existing pylon route. This would eliminate the need for a considerable number of new pylons and overhead lines between Ardleigh and Little Bromley, newly engineered and wide haul routes in rural locations close to small settlements, and yet more new and harmful pylons and overhead lines north and northwest of Ardleigh. It may also</li> </ul>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			prevent the underground cable section curving south of the Dedham Vale National Landscape.	
<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 Consultation Strategy, and responses to feedback received during consultation are included in the Feedback Report.</p> <p>The non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published Consultation Strategy.</p>	Refer to TDC's adequacy of Consultation Milestone response dated 6 May 2025.	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 Consultation Strategy, and responses to feedback received during consultation are included in the Feedback Report.</p> <p>The non-statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published Consultation Strategy.</p>	Refer to TDC's adequacy of Consultation Milestone response dated 6 May 2025.	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 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 Feedback Report.</p> <p>The statutory consultation was undertaken in accordance with the published SoCC.</p>	Refer to TDC's adequacy of Consultation Milestone response dated 6 May 2025.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.2.10	2025 targeted consultation	<p>Targeted consultations for Essex took place from 25 February - 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 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>In the 2025 consultation response, TDC raised concerns around transparency and availability of information which raised doubts over the legitimacy of this and previous public consultation exercises.</p>	Under discussion
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
3.2.11	Community Benefits	<p>The Applicant is preparing a community funds package in line with the 'Guidance: Community funds for transmission infrastructure' (DESNZ, 2025). In line with this guidance, the community funds will be delivered outside the development consent process, as they are not a material consideration in the decision on the proposed Project nor a matter to be secured as part of the Development Consent Order. Later in spring 2026, the Applicant will begin consulting on how the community funds should be used for Norwich to Tilbury, subject to the Project receiving consent. Throughout that consultation, we will engage with local communities and elected representatives to understand local priorities and where community funds could deliver long-lasting benefits.</p>	<p>TDC strongly encourage National Grid to positively respond to the issue of social value and community benefits as set out in our response to the statutory consultation in 2024, particularly having regard to the Governments recently published Community Funds for Transmission Infrastructure.</p> <p>TDC considers the N2T project will have extensive residual impacts that adversely affect the local economy and environment, as well as the health and wellbeing of communities in TDC and Essex, especially along or close to the project route, and</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>which cannot be sufficiently mitigated or compensated through the planning regime. Also, the national benefits will not offset the harm at a local level.</p> <p>TDC strongly encourage NGET to respond positively to the issue of social value and community benefits as set out in all our responses to statutory and non-statutory consultations in 2024 and 2025.</p> <p>In particular, it is imperative that significant benefits should be realised from N2T for education, skills, and employment for the district of Tendring during construction and operation, alone and cumulatively with other NSIPs, and not least because these projects will disproportionately affect the District of Tendring.</p> <p>There is still no tangible or legally binding offer on the table or in the DCO submission from NGET around education, skills, and employment packages that will benefit TDC or indeed the North Essex region, and there has been little progress from NGET on this matter.</p> <p>It is considered that this will be a key area of disagreement unless clarity is provided as soon as practically possible. Further discussion would be welcomed on this topic.</p>	

### 3.3 Ecology and Biodiversity

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

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.3.1	Policy and legislation	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Ecology and Biodiversity assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and Section 8.2 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B [AS-026]</b>.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance have been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	The ES has identified the relevant legislation, policy and guidance.	Agreed
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.3.2	Study area	<p>The study area was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	Agreed
3.3.3	Data sources	<p>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 8.4 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B [AS-026]</b>.</p> <p>Further survey information from the 2025 season was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2025, achieving coverage of 97% of the Order Limits.</p>	<p>TDCs position is that sufficient desktop data has been collected for the ES.</p> <p>EPS confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is considered agreed for all areas apart from in relation to bat survey data which requires further information and is noted in ID3.3.18.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.3.4	Assessment methodology	The methodology for assessing Ecology and Biodiversity was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.	The methodology for assessing Ecology and Biodiversity was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	Agreed
3.3.5	Survey Methodology	The Applicant 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.  Please see ID3.3.19 in respect to additional information on bat survey methodology.	The survey methods used are largely accepted.	Agreed
3.3.6	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Ecology and Biodiversity assessment are summarised in Section 8.4 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> , and are considered appropriate.  The Applicant has committed to a 5-year aftercare period for all replacement tree and hedgerow planting (excluding the Environmental Areas), which is considered sufficient to ensure successful plant establishment and is standard for DCO projects of this scale such as The National Grid (Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement) Order 2024 and The National Grid (Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project) Development Consent Order 2024. <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP3-030]</b> states the planting will be undertaken by suitably experienced contactors in line with British Standards and follow general best practice principles outlined in Section 9.2 of <b>7.4 Outline</b>	The Key Parameters of Assessment and Assumptions stated in section 8.4.28 of the ES are acknowledged. The assumption regarding habitat reinstatement, " <i>Reinstatement: Habitat removed during construction would be reinstated (with the exception of planting restrictions associated with operational requirements as identified within the Outline LEMP (document reference 7.4))</i> ", is considered tenuous to apply for all situations along the construction corridor, given the minimal 5-year post completion time limit for habitat reinstatement. A mutually agreed replacement planting failure percentage should be factored into the compensation requirement.	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP3-030].</b> Please see the Applicant's response to written question DCO1.A30 in <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions (Final Issue A) [REP3-074]</b></p> <p>The Applicant has also committed to a 30-year aftercare period at Environmental Areas in line with the commitments made within the <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b>.</p>		
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.3.7	Baseline conditions and receptors	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Ecology and Biodiversity are presented in Section 8.5 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>In January 2025, the Applicant issued a technical note to all host authorities outlining the protected species proposed mitigation measures for agreement/comment.</p> <p>In May 2025, the Applicant held a further meeting to discuss comments from an updated proposed mitigation for species outside the remit of Natural England.</p> <p>Further survey information from the 2025 season was submitted to Planning Inspectorate in November 2025, achieving coverage of 97% of the Order Limits.</p>	<p>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). This missing information in the dataset is anticipated to be provided in November 2025; TDC's position is pending.</p> <p>TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is considered agreed for all areas apart from in relation to baseline conditions and receptors for bats which is discussed further at ID3.3.20.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<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 Section 8.6 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> . Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	The embedded mitigation measures set out in Section 8.6 of the ES are acknowledged and appreciated. TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is considered agreed.	Agreed
3.3.9	Standard mitigation	Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Ecology and Biodiversity effects during construction are summarised in Section 8.6 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> and set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> . The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	The standard mitigation measures summarised in the ES section 8.6 and stated in the OCoCP are largely appropriate and anticipated as adequate if effectively implemented. TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is considered agreed for all areas apart from in relation to standard mitigation for bats which can be found in ID3.3.21.	Agreed
3.3.10	Additional mitigation	The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in Section 8.6 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> . Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.	See above comments regarding habitat reinstatement (ID 3.3.6) and protected species derogation licensing (ID 3.3.9). TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is considered agreed.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</b>				
3.3.11	Construction effects	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 8.7 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Further survey information from the 2025 season was submitted to Planning Inspectorate in November 2025, achieving coverage of 97% of the Order Limits <b>[AS-028 to AS-048]</b>.</p> <p>The approach to bat roost surveys has been agreed with Natural England (the statutory responsible body for bats), as detailed in the agreed matter 3.3.7 in <b>5.9.13 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Natural England (Final Issue B) [REP1-034]</b> 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. The Applicant has been working closely with Natural England to produce a draft project wide bat licence. A letter of support is expected to be issued by Natural England supporting the contents of the draft Project-wide licence during the Examination.</p>	<p>The assessment of bat-related impacts lacks transparency because it only evaluates long-term effects, without presenting predicted short- or medium-term impacts. The reliance solely on Ground-Level Tree Assessments (GLTAs) limits confidence in the accuracy of the roosting-bat impact assessment, which must be robust before any lawful planning decision is made.</p> <p>Within the surveyed 87.5% of the Order Limits, 287 Potential Roost Features for multiple bats (PRFM) trees and 1,773 Further Assessment Required (FAR) trees were identified as detailed within <b>6.8.A9 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.9 - Bat Roost Report [APP-171]</b>, while an estimated 314 PRFM/FAR trees fall within the un-surveyed 12.5% and it is unclear what percentage of the un-surveyed 12.5% falls within the TDC area. The ES does not make clear how many significant bat roosts may be lost, what the highest value roosts at risk may be, or how impacts might differ among Essex bat species.</p> <p>The ES acknowledges that without mitigation, the loss or disturbance of bat</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>roosts could have permanent medium to large negative effects, especially if maternity roosts are lost. Despite this, the residual impact assessment assumes that all roost losses—regardless of their significance—would result in only negligible cumulative effects, simply because compensation (e.g., two bat boxes per roost lost) would be provided under a derogation licence. This assumption is not considered credible given earlier concerns (referenced in ID 3.3.9).</p> <p>Overall, the approach appears to be seeking consent before surveys are complete—yet no such DLL system exists or has been approved for roosting bats, making the method unsupported and inappropriate.</p> <p>TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is still under discussion.</p>	
3.3.12	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 8.7 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B [AS-026]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is considered appropriate.</p> <p>TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is considered agreed.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.3.13	Outline CoCP	<p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B [AS-026]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Full details of the Environmental Clerk of Works' (ECoW) qualifications / experience will be provided within the final CoCP approved by the relevant local planning authorities. This is secured within Requirement 4(1) of the <b>3.1 Draft DCO (Final Issue C) [REP3-004]</b> Construction Management Plans, which states: <i>'No stage of the authorised development may commence until, for that stage, the following plans as relevant to that stage have been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority (in consultation with Natural England in the case of the landscape and ecological management plan) or other discharging authority as may be appropriate to the relevant plan concerned. The relevant plans are- a) code of construction practice (which must be substantially in accordance with the outline code of construction practice...'</i></p> <p>As stated within the management plans, the ECoW will be supported by a range of species specialists as required, including a bat licenced surveyor.</p>	<p>Given the critical importance of the ECoW oversight and influence throughout the construction stage of the project, TDC would welcome a commitment as to the minimum qualifications/experience levels of the ECoWs to be used for specific tasks. TDC 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.</p> <p>B10 - Potential Roost Features (PRFs) should be identified by a Natural England bat survey class licensed (level 2+ if endoscopy required) ecologist or ECoW. This is advised to clarify who should be accepted as a "competent" person for PRF classification.</p>	Under Discussion
3.3.14	Outline LEMP	<p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP2-030]</b> includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 -</b></p>	<p>Regarding paragraph 6.1.8 (pages 39 and 40) of the OLEMP, TDC seeks clarification on how trees are assessed for bat hibernation potential, particularly</p>	Under Discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B [AS-026]</b> and is appropriate.</p> <p>Natural England (the statutory responsible body for bats) has approved the method to classify potential roost features which are in line with standard guidelines, as detailed in the agreed matter 3.3.7 in <b>5.9.13 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Natural England (Clean) (Final Issue B) [REP1-034]</b>. 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 reasonable and not realistic to apply appropriate and effective mitigation while ensuring project feasibility.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>why fewer trees are classified as having hibernation suitability compared with the number of PRF-I and PRF-M features. TDC also asks for transparency on the criteria that exclude certain Potential Roost Features from being considered suitable for hibernation.</p>	
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
3.3.15	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) –	The Applicant will deliver at least 10 % BNG with wider environmental and societal benefits on its construction	TDC welcomes the commitment to deliver at least 10% BNG but encourages NGET to adopt a higher BNG target, noting that the Essex Local	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
	Onsite and Assessment	<p>projects. The Applicant shared the Project's Biodiversity Net Gain strategy with stakeholders in January 2025.</p> <p>The <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b> and section 3.13 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b> set out the Project's approach to BNG.</p> <p>BNG is being offered for this Project on a voluntary basis since there is no mandatory requirement for BNG for NSIPs granted development consent under the Planning Act 2008. DEFRA propose introducing BNG for NSIPs where the application is accepted post May 2026. 10% is not seen as a specific target or cap and the Applicant will seek opportunities to deliver more than 10% where viable.</p>	<p>Nature Partnership—including local planning authorities—is moving toward shared, measurable targets of 20% BNG. Recent viability work (<i>Viability Assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain in Essex, February 2025</i>) shows that 20% BNG is both achievable and viable, aligns with the NPPF's emphasis on measurable biodiversity gains, and exceeds the Environment Act 2021 minimum standard of 10%.</p>	
3.3.16	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - Offsite	<p>As detailed in ID 3.3.15, the <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b> and Section 3.13 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b> set out the Project's approach to BNG.</p> <p>On site measures will be secured through <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean)(Revision D)REP3-028]</b>and Requirement 4 of <b>3.1 Draft DCO (Final Issue C) [REP3.025]]</b>, with off-site measures, where there is an onsite deficit, secured by legal agreement. Natural England is in agreement with the approach taken by the Project which is reflected in <b>5.9.13 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Natural England (Clean) (Final Issue B) [REP1-034]</b>.</p> <p>Offsite BNG will be delivered through collaboration with partners and commercially registered providers. Off-site BNG sites will be selected based on a range of factors including proximity to the Project, geographical location, habitat type, habitat condition, cost and timings amongst</p>	<p>TDC also stresses that BNG delivery should be spatially aligned with the Essex LNRS to ensure habitat creation contributes to strategic ecological networks and designated priority areas. Off-site BNG should be co-developed with stakeholders and LNRS delivery partners to ensure long-term ecological value.</p> <p>Further clarity is requested on how LNRS mapping and priority habitats have influenced BNG site selection and design. Transparent BNG accounting is needed to separate mitigation, enhancement, and compensation and avoid double-counting.</p> <p>Finally, TDC emphasises that where mandatory BNG planning applications are submitted these must include a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan,</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>others, including the local nature recovery strategies (LNRSs). The Applicant will consider Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) areas as part of the off-site BNG selection process, where sites are available, and appropriate to project circumstances.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared Heads of Terms regarding a unilateral undertaking to be given by National Grid to the Local Planning Authorities along the Project route under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ('s.106 UU'), relating to obligations designed to secure at least 10% BNG as part of the Project. The UU will set out the terms for robust monitoring/reporting/assessments and mechanisms for delivery</p> <p>The BNG principle around 'additionality' has been applied to the Project to ensure no double counting of mitigation.</p> <p>TDC's comments regarding mandatory BNG planning applications are noted.</p>	<p>approved in writing by the local planning authority, to ensure all agreed BNG outcomes are delivered and maintained over a 30-year period.</p> <p>EPS confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that this matter is still under discussion, and that further clarification is sought around Offsite BNG.</p>	
3.3.17	Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA)	<p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment is based on the methodology outlined in Appendix J of <b>6.19 Scoping Report - including appendices B to K (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and is considered appropriate for this stage of the Project, as is the level of detail within <b>6.13. A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report [APP-236]</b> (Figure A13.6.1 of this document superseded by <b>[REP1-065]</b>) The Applicant issued the draft AIA to TDC in March 2025.</p> <p>Information on Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) is included in <b>2.16 Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed and or Managed Plans Section A – H (Final Issue A)</b></p>	<p>There are concerns about the scope, accuracy, and level of detail presented in the AIA, particularly regarding trees protected by TPOs. To support a robust and transparent assessment, several issues require clarification and correction.</p> <p>TDC seeks clear evidence of the measures proposed to safeguard TPO protected trees. Not all such trees appear to have been accurately or consistently annotated; for instance, some TPO trees on the southern side of</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>[APP-048 to APP-055] which has been developed using information provided by relevant Local Planning Authorities. With no TPO information provided by TDC (initially requested on 4 April 2025), the Applicant digitised TPO records based on the readily available Tendring Map Access Portal<sup>1</sup>. The TPO trees along Wick Lane are shown in Section C Sheet 18 of <b>2.16 Trees and Hedgerows to be Removed and or Managed Plans - Section C [APP-050]</b>. If the spatial positioning of TPO 20/00001/TPO is incorrect, the Applicant requests that TDC please provide accurate information as GIS shapefiles. Appendix J of <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions [REP3-074]</b> contains information on the impacts to TPO 20/00001/TPO.</p> <p>Commitment LV05 in <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP3-030]</b> states that relevant protective principles would be applied to trees within the Order Limits and detailed within an Arboricultural Method Statement which would be prepared by the Main Works Contractor(s) following detailed design and submitted to the Council for approval. Measures have been applied to all trees potentially impacted by the Project; no specific measures have been applied to TPO trees.</p> <p>Trees that were assessed as being of High or Moderate value (categorised using BS 5837:2012<sup>2</sup>) and in line with the methodology in <b>6.19 Scoping Report - Appendix A -</b></p>	<p>Wick Lane, Ardleigh (covered by 20/00001/TPO) do not appear in Figure A13.6.1 of the AIA, despite others under the same order being shown. Additionally, many trees—whether listed individually or as groups—lack identification numbers, making it difficult to cross-reference and verify data. A consistent numbering system is needed to ensure transparency.</p> <p>TDC comment May 2026: This matter is unlikely to be agreed because of significant errors and inaccuracies around TPOs which lead to poor route choices and decisions which the Applicant already indicated they will not change.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Tendring District Council (n.d.) Tendring Map Access Portal

<sup>2</sup> British Standards Institution (2012) BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations.

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Part 1 to 8 and Appendices B - K (Final Issue A) [APP-288 – APP-296]</b> have been allocated reference numbers.</p>		
3.3.17a	Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA)	<p>The AIA is based on the alignment presented within the development consent application. In the event the Limits of Deviation presented in section 4.5 of <b>6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description (Final Issue A) [APP-130]</b> alters the alignment during detailed design, the impacts to trees may also be altered and are therefore currently reported as being 'potentially affected'. Overall impacts to trees will be assessed and reported following detailed design. This is explained further in <b>6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description [APP-130]</b>. The limitations and assumptions in <b>6.13. A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report AIA (Final Issue A) [APP-236]</b> (Figure A13.6.1 of this document superseded by <b>[REP1-065]</b>) confirm when the desk study of TPOs was completed (May 2025). Any information on newly served TPOs would not change the mitigation measures proposed, but would be considered during detailed design.</p>	<p>Further explanation is also required for trees described as "potentially affected," which are currently marked only with orange dots without supporting information. Recent TPO designations made by TDC in areas such as Dead Lane, Wick Lane, Little Bromley Road, and Home Farm Lane must also be fully acknowledged and assessed, with further designations anticipated.</p> <p>TDC comment May 2026: This matter is unlikely to be agreed because of significant errors and inaccuracies around TPOs which lead to poor route choices and decisions which the Applicant already indicated they will not change.</p>	Not agreed
3.3.17b	Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA)	<p>Hedgerows within the Order Limits have been assessed in accordance with The Hedgerows Regulations 1997, as set out in <b>6.8. A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 8.3 - Hedgerows Regulations Report (Final Issue A) [APP-161]</b>. This assessment identifies hedgerows that qualify as 'important' under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 based on ecological criteria. The findings have informed the routeing and design process to avoid important hedgerows wherever practicable, with any</p>	<p>Hedgerows, which fall under The Hedgerow Regulations 1997, must be properly assessed for their ecological and landscape importance, and proposals should be adapted accordingly. The AIA itself acknowledges that the assessment is "preliminary" due to the absence of detailed design, making it difficult to quantify potential</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>required removals limited to the minimum necessary working width. <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> further considers the ecological value of hedgerows and secures mitigation through <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>, including reinstatement. This ensures that hedgerow losses are minimised and that reinstated sections contribute positively to local habitat connectivity. The 'preliminary' approach taken is typical of a Project of this scale and nature.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the retention and management of vegetation (including veteran trees) below overhead lines where reasonably practicable. Section 13.4.14 of <b>6.13. A6 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.6 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment AIA (Final Issue A) [APP-236]</b> (Figure A13.6.1 of this document superseded by <b>[REP1-065]</b>) states that details of tree protection would be provided within an Arboricultural Method Statement. The Method Statement and Tree Protection Plans will be updated and made relevant for each construction stage and agreed with the Local Planning Authority and referenced in GG31 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. This aligns with Schedule 3 Requirement 8 of the <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order (Final Issue C) [REP3-004]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes any further clarification from TDC on aspects of the documentation it deems to be deficient.</p>	<p>removals or evaluate likely impacts with confidence. It is also unclear whether the retention or pollarding of mature (and historic) oaks beneath overhead lines has been explored as a means of reducing unnecessary loss.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of the proposed tree and hedgerow removals is expected to be severe, with compensatory planting requiring decades to re-establish lost amenity value and biodiversity. TDC is deeply concerned that substantial areas of the proposed development—including the project route, haul roads, and maintenance and access corridors—appear to be guided by evidence within the AIA and associated documents that is demonstrably inaccurate or incomplete. These deficiencies raise serious questions about the reliability of the project's evidence base and whether it can be fully trusted as evidence to guide locational consideration as to the least harmful project route. Further detail on these matters will be set out in TDC's LIR.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.3.18	Data sources (bats)	<p>Matters raised in <b>TDC's Local Impact Report [REP1-192]</b> have been responded to in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 8.4 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity (Final Issue A) [APP-158]</b>.</p> <p>Further survey information from the 2025 season was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2025, achieving coverage of 97% of the Order Limits. This further survey information is presented within <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b>.</p>	<p>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). This missing information in the dataset is anticipated to be provided in November 2025; TDC's position is pending.</p>	Under discussion
3.3.19	Survey Methodology (Bats)	<p>As detailed in ID 3.3.11, the 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. This is confirmed in the agreed matter 3.3.7 in 5.9.13 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Natural England (Clean) (Final Issue B) [REP1-034]. 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. The Applicant has been working closely with Natural England to produce a draft project wide bat licence, and a letter of support is expected to be issued by Natural England supporting the contents of the draft Project-wide licence during the Examination. The Applicant does not propose to conduct any additional bat surveys prior to detailed design, and therefore the Applicant considers this matter to be not agreed.</p>	<p>ECC consultants (that TDC is relying on) have informed us they have been provided with extremely limited amount of ecological survey information to review, which is preventing any meaningful assessment and comment. Discussions around this are ongoing. Whilst bat roost climbing inspections for every PRF-M and FAR tree at risk of impact is perhaps not a practical expectation, TDC supports ECC in that we believe further survey efforts 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-</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.3.20	Baseline conditions and receptors (Bats)	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Ecology and Biodiversity are presented in Section 8.5 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>As detailed in ID 3.3.11, the 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. This is confirmed in the agreed matter 3.3.7 in <b>5.9.13 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Natural England (Clean) (Final Issue B) [REP1-034]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed</p>	<p>minor bat roosting and will be lost to the project. This would lead to a better supported estimation of impact and the design of a more confidently proportionate mitigation/compensation scheme.</p> <p>TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that the baseline conditions and receptors for roosting bats requires further information and review.</p>	Under Discussion
3.3.21	Standard mitigation (Bats)	<p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Ecology and Biodiversity effects during construction are summarised in Section 8.6 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> and set out in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice. (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is</p>	<p>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. TDC supports ECC and considers that the widespread lack of effective post mitigation licence</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>As detailed in ID 3.3.11, the 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. This is confirmed in the agreed matter 3.3.7 in <b>5.9.13 Draft Statement of Common Ground - Natural England (Clean) (Final Issue B) [REP1-034]</b>. 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. The Applicant has been working closely with Natural England to produce a draft project wide bat licence, and a letter of support is expected to be issued by Natural England supporting the contents of the draft Project-wide licence during the Examination. Details of post-mitigation monitoring will be included within the Natural England licence where it is required to maintain Favourable Conservation Status.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed.</p>	<p>monitoring does not allow for reliable 'reasonable anticipation' of success in situations where derogation licensing is covering non-minor impacts. This is particularly relevant to the concerns stated for ID3.3.11.</p> <p>TDC confirmed in meeting regarding the Statement of Common Ground in January 2026 that the standard mitigation for bats requires further information and review.</p>	

### 3.4 Green Infrastructure

Table 3.4 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Green Infrastructure

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>Ecology and Biodiversity Matters</b>				
3.4.1	Data sources (Ecology Matters)	<p>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 8.4 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b>. In ID 3.3.3, TDC agrees that sufficient desktop data has been collected for the ES</p> <p>The Applicant will consider the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy as part of the off-site BNG selection process, where sites are available, and appropriate to the Project. This off-site selection process would take into consideration the potential for wider habitat connectivity and enhancement across the three counties, as well as specific areas of importance to biodiversity. Full details of the off-site solution would be provided to the Local Planning Authorities post-consent. Further details on Local Nature Recovery Strategies are included in the Applicant's response to BIO 1.38 in <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions (Final Issue A)</b>.</p>	In respect of Green Infrastructure matters from Essex County Council (on behalf of TDC): The Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) mapping should be incorporated into the desktop study to inform the identification of existing habitats and to guide the selection of appropriate locations for mitigation and compensation measures. It provides a spatial framework for identifying opportunities to enhance biodiversity and deliver nature recovery across Essex. Including LNRS mapping ensures alignment with national policy objectives and supports coordinated, cross-boundary environmental planning that reflects local priorities and ecological networks.	Not agreed
3.4.2	Standard mitigation	<p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential Ecology and Biodiversity effects during construction are summarised in Section 8.6 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> and set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final</b></p>	In respect of Green Infrastructure: TDC welcomes the inclusion of embedded and standard mitigation measures within the Outline LEMP and OCoCP. However, TDC would encourage NGET to further integrate GI principles within	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>In ID 3.3.9 TDC states that the standard mitigation measures summarised in Section 8.6 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> and stated in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> are largely appropriate and anticipated as adequate if effectively implemented.</p> <p><b>5.6 Planning Statement [APP-085]</b> confirms at paragraph 7.3.476 that the Project is able to demonstrate it has applied the mitigation hierarchy to avoid adverse impacts on open space (including Green Infrastructure) and therefore no further mitigation or compensation is required to fulfil paragraph 5.11.25 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 (2024).</p>	<p>the mitigation hierarchy, ensuring that ecological, hydrological, and landscape functions are delivered in an integrated manner. GI should be designed to provide multifunctional benefits, such as flood mitigation, biodiversity enhancement, and community wellbeing (PRoW) are maximised across the route where possible.</p> <p>TDC would recommend that GI corridors be aligned with existing ecological networks and PRoW to enhance connectivity and accessibility, particularly in areas of landscape sensitivity and community use.</p>	
3.4.3	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in Section 8.6 of <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p><b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b> confirms that the Applicant will consider Local Nature Recovery Strategy areas as part of the offsite BNG selection process where sites are available and appropriate to project circumstances. The Applicant also aims to deliver biodiversity legacy ideally in reach of the</p>	<p>In respect of Green Infrastructure: GI delivery should be explicitly aligned with the Essex GI Strategy and Essex GI Standards and reflect the priorities identified in the Essex LNRS, ensuring that mitigation and enhancement measures contribute to wider landscape-scale recovery.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>three counties crossed by the Project (Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex).</p> <p>The Applicant takes NPS policy as the starting point when appraising the applicability of requests for additional benefits such as Green Infrastructure (and other environmental net gains).</p> <p>The request to deliver as specified in the NPS is not a strict obligation on the Applicant to deliver individually but possibly holistically where opportunities arise.</p> <p>Biodiversity additional measures are agreed in ID 3.3.10.</p>		
3.4.3a	Additional Mitigation		Where habitats such as hedgerows and trees are removed, they should be reinstated with enhanced hedgerow habitats using locally important native species and local seed stock, in consultation with wildlife groups across Essex.	
3.4.3b	Additional Mitigation	<p>The Applicant will consider the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy as part of the off-site BNG selection process, where sites are available, and appropriate to the Project. This off-site selection process would take into consideration the potential for wider habitat connectivity and enhancement across the three counties, as well as specific areas of importance to biodiversity. Full details of the off-site solution would be provided to the Local Planning Authorities post-consent. Further details on Local Nature Recovery Strategies are included in the Applicants response to BIO 1.38 in <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions (Final Issue A) [REP3-032]</b></p>	TDC recommends that discussions be held to secure off-site biodiversity compensation within Essex, with a preference for delivery within strategic habitat opportunity areas identified in the Essex LNRS. To ensure long-term ecological benefits, TDC also encourages the establishment of stewardship agreements with local wildlife groups such as Essex Wildlife Trust, ECC and Place Services.	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.4.4	Outline LEMP	<p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP3-030]</b> includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.8 Environmental Statement Chapter 8 - Ecology and Biodiversity Revision B - Clean Version [AS-026]</b> and a monitoring period of 5 years, in line with other consented NSIP projects such as The National Grid (Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement) Order 2024 and The National Grid (Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project) Development Consent Order 2024..</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a 30-year monitoring and maintenance period at Environmental Areas in line with the commitments made within the <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b>. Detail on habitat management and monitoring for the Environmental Areas will be set out in the final Landscape and Ecological Management post consent.</p> <p>TDC's comments are noted, and the Applicant will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>	<p>In respect of Green Infrastructure from Essex County Council: ECC requests clarity on the governance and long-term monitoring arrangements for BNG delivery. ECC recommends that the Outline LEMP include a robust monitoring framework with adaptive management provisions and opportunities for stakeholder engagement to ensure the longevity and effectiveness of BNG measures.</p> <p>While HMMP and LEMP are standalone documents ECC recommend that the BNG delivery be cross referenced within the Outline LEMP and supported by a clear monitoring framework, including adaptive management provisions and community engagement.</p> <p>ECC recommends extending the monitoring period for landscape (GI) delivery to 10 years, in line with best practice demonstrated by other NSIPs (e.g. Five Estuaries and North Falls Offshore Wind Farms), and a 30-year management period for BNG/GI associated with EACN and substation landscape plans. The proposed 10-year monitoring period could be structured into two phases: an initial 5-year period of high-frequency establishment monitoring, followed by a subsequent 5-year period of lower-frequency development monitoring</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.4.5	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	<p>The Applicant will deliver at least 10 % BNG with wider environmental and societal benefits on its construction projects. <b>7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Final Issue A) [APP-299]</b> sets out the approach to BNG. Offsite BNG will be delivered where there is an onsite deficit, through collaboration with partners and purchased from commercially registered providers.</p> <p>TDC comments are noted, and the Applicant will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>	<p>Regarding Green Infrastructure (GI) and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), TDC requests clearer governance and long-term monitoring arrangements. TDC further proposes extending monitoring periods to ensure the longevity of landscape and BNG outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 years of monitoring for GI (mirroring best practice in other NSIPs).</li> <li>• A 30-year management period for BNG and GI associated with the EACN and substation areas.</li> <li>• NGET suggest structuring the 10-year monitoring into an initial 5-year high-frequency phase followed by 5 years of lower-frequency monitoring.</li> </ul>	Under discussion
<b>Landscape and Visual</b>				
3.4.6	Embedded mitigation (Landscape and Visual)	<p>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 <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>TDC comments are noted, and the Applicant will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>	<p>In respect of GI: TDC recommends that Green Infrastructure be used as a key component of landscape mitigation, particularly in areas of high visual sensitivity and community use. TDC also supports the use of planting and habitat creation to soften visual impacts and enhance landscape character, and requests that GI proposals be aligned with the Essex LNRS priorities and local landscape strategies.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.4.7	Additional mitigation (Landscape and Visual)	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in Section 13.6 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>Section 2.5 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b> sets out the Applicant's approach to the mitigation hierarchy for the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on landscape mitigation and compensation is also set out in Section 3.10 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy as part of the off-site BNG selection process, where sites are available, and appropriate to the Project. This off-site selection process would take into consideration the potential for wider habitat connectivity and enhancement across the three counties, as well as specific areas of importance to biodiversity. Full details of the off-site solution would be provided to the Local Planning Authorities post-consent. Further details on Local Nature Recovery Strategies are included in the Applicants response to BIO 1.38 in <b>8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions (Final Issue A) [REP3-032]</b></p> <p>TDC's comments are noted, and the Applicant will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>	<p>In respect of GI: TDC notes that significant residual landscape and visual impacts remain. TDC also recommends that NGED explore a range of compensation measures to offset the impacts of the proposal and deliver net environmental gain. These should include the enhancement of existing GI assets, investment in community-led landscape initiatives, and the creation of new accessible, high-quality GI open spaces, not only in Tendring but across Essex. Such measures would contribute to improved environmental outcomes and support the wider objectives of nature recovery and community wellbeing. Discussions have taken place with Place Services, Essex Wildlife Trust, the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Officer, and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) Coordinator to explore opportunities for securing potential compensation measures and financial contribution within Essex. TDC also recommends securing off-site compensation within Essex, ideally in LNRS strategic habitat opportunity areas, and establishing long-term stewardship agreements with wildlife groups across Essex such as Essex Wildlife Trust, and TDC and other Local Authorities.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.4.8	Outline LEMP (Landscape and Visual)	<p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP3-030]</b> includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b> and is appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant requests further information regarding their comments relating to a change in the OLEMP terminology from 'enhanced mitigation' to 'landscape compensation'. The Applicant has reviewed the published versions of <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [APP-321, AS-046, REP2-018 and REP3-030]</b> and cannot find any reference to 'enhanced mitigation'.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out its position on the requirement for landscape compensation in paragraphs 3.10.21 to 3.10.31 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The OLEMP sets out indicative planting plans for the Environmental Areas. These Environmental Areas provide landscape and visual mitigation for the permanent asset, which also delivers ecological value and therefore included within the BNG metric. There is no distinction to be made between the two (landscape mitigation and BNG) and there is no double counting issue at the Environmental Areas.</p>	<p>In respect of GI: TDC notes that changes in the OLEMP terminology from "enhanced mitigation" to "landscape compensation" require clarification to ensure these are not repurposed mitigation measures, risking double-counting.</p> <p>TDC recommends that compensation measures be clearly distinguished from mitigation and BNG obligations, with geo-located planting plans and habitat creation evidence.</p> <p>TDC recommend that additional mitigation and compensation measures be considered in consultation with ECC Place Services, Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy and Essex Wildlife Trust and other wildlife organisations, including enhanced planting schemes in key locations, and landscape-scale GI interventions.</p>	Under discussion

## 3.5 Air Quality

Table 3.5 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Air Quality

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District 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 Air Quality assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and Section 7.2 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b>.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	TDC agree that relevant policies, legislation and guidance have been considered in the Air Quality assessment	Agreed
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.5.2	Study area	The study area was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.	The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	Agreed
3.5.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 7.4 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> .	TDC agrees that that the desk based data collected in the ES is appropriate, comprehensive, and sufficient to inform the air quality assessment for Tendring District and the wider study area	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.5.4	Assessment methodology	The methodology for assessing Air Quality was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.	The methodology for assessing Air Quality was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	Agreed
3.5.5	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with Air Quality are summarised in Section 7.4 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> . The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.	TDC agree that key parameters and assumptions associated with Air Quality are acceptable because it uses established national and local datasets, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defra background maps, AQMA datasets, and Local Authority monitoring data (including Tendring's)</li> <li>• Environment Agency industrial installation register</li> <li>• OS mapping for receptor identification</li> <li>• MAGIC and APIS for designated ecological sites</li> </ul>	Agreed

#### EIA – Baseline Conditions

3.5.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	The baseline conditions and receptors for Air Quality are presented in Section 7.5 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> . The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	TDC agrees that the relevant part of the ES uses appropriate datasets, accurate local monitoring information, and well-designed receptor framework that reflects Tendring's rural character and air quality profile. Therefore, the baseline conditions and receptors presented in Section 7.5 are considered appropriate for the District of Tendring.	Agree
-------	-----------------------------------	--	---	-------

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.5.7	Embedded mitigation	<p>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Air Quality effects, are set out in Section 7.6 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation that is relevant to air quality on this Project is route alignment and the inclusion of an almost continuous haul road. The alignment of both is enforced through the Order Limits not the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>.</p> <p><b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> and <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix D - Outline Dust Management Plan (Final Issue A) [APP-304]</b> have been prepared to reflect the mitigation measures identified through the construction dust assessment undertaken in <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> and <b>6.7. A3 Environmental Statement Appendix 7.3 - Air Quality Assessment Results (Final Issue A) [APP-150]</b>. Site-specific controls, tailored monitoring at high-risk locations and responses to fugitive dust releases including unforeseen activities would be refined in finalised versions of the Code of Construction Practice and Dust Management Plan.</p> <p>Each of these plans would be developed by the Main Works Contractor(s) and responsibility for any</p>	<p>TDC agree that baseline pollutant levels (Nitrogen Dioxide; Particulate Matter up to 10 micrometres and Fine Particulate Matter up to 2.5 micrometres) are below national standards, and no AQMAs exist within 2 km of the Order Limits. TDC also acknowledge, as per the relevant policies and guidance on Air Quality mitigation, that mitigation needs to control modest, short-term construction related emissions.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed measures including haul road usage, receptor sensitive dust controls, and strict plant emission standards — is considered proportionate to the low baseline sensitivity evidenced for Tendring.</p> <p>TDC requests that proposed the embedded measures are fully incorporated into the Outline CoCP (secured by DCO Requirement 4) and the Outline Dust Management Plan, to be updated by the relevant contractors at the times specified and to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures are enforceable by TDC</li> <li>• Additional site specific controls can be applied where local receptors (e.g., Ardleigh, Little Bromley and areas in between in particular Bentley Road</li> </ul>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>monitoring undertaken would sit with the Main Works Contractor(s). The final versions of these plans would be submitted to Local Authorities for approval in accordance with Requirement 4 of <b>3.1 Draft DCO (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-004]</b> prior to commencement of development.</p>	<p>and other small hamlets) require additional tailored protection</p>	
3.5.8	Standard mitigation	<p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in Section 7.6 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> and set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	<p>TDC agrees that section 7.7 of the ES demonstrates that with standard mitigation in place (to be secured via the DCO):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust impacts become not significant, including at the most severely impacted sites/areas.</li> <li>• Traffic related NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> effects remain negligible.</li> <li>• Generator/NRMM emissions are not significant.</li> </ul> <p>The standard mitigation measures appear to be fully aligned with recognised national guidance and are secured through enforceable DCO requirements. TDC holds no evidence that would call into question the adequacy or effectiveness of these measures.</p>	Agreed
3.5.9	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in Section 7.6 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	<p>The submitted evidence concludes that with standard and additional mitigation in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust effects are not significant, including at the most severely impacted receptors</li> </ul>	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic and plant related emissions remain negligible</li> <li>Sensitive receptors (residential and ecological) in Tendring are adequately protected</li> </ul> <p>TDC holds no counter evidence to suggest that the additional mitigation put forward, together with the embedded imitation, will not be suitable to control air-quality impacts associated with the project, subject to all these measures being appropriately secured in the DCO in an appropriate, adequate and enforceable manner.</p>	

### EIA – Assessment Conclusions

3.5.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 7.7 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> . The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	TDC holds no evidence that suggests that the assessment of effects during construction is not proportionate, evidence based, or reflective of the district's rural receptor pattern and absence of AQMAs therefore we agree that the assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	Agreed
3.5.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 7.7 of <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> . The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.	TDC notes that the assessment is very high-level and also notes that operational activities generally generate very low emission potential. This inherently means that conclusions rely on assumptions that maintenance traffic remains minimal and	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>Emissions related to maintenance and operational traffic are not quantified as this assessment was screened out in the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and was agreed within the <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> .</p> <p>There would be very small numbers of vehicles associated with operation and maintenance of the Project.</p> <p>The use of emergency combustion plant is considered to have a negligible impact on air quality as it is likely to be used only temporarily in emergency scenarios.</p> <p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> commitment relevant to emissions (GG19) from plant and generators currently governs construction activities only. Implementing the CoCP is the responsibility of the Main Works Contractor who would have resources to do this across the Project area.</p> <p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 16.7 (Residual Effects) of <b>6.16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16 - Traffic and Transport (Final Issue A) [APP-271]</b>. Construction traffic to be generated by the Proposed Project and its routeing has been assessed and is not expected to result in any significant effects on the surrounding highway, following the measures identified within the <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028]</b>. A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be developed. It will be approved by TDC as relevant planning authority in consultation with Essex County Council (as highway</p>	<p>that non-routine activities (e.g., emergency plant operation) are rare.</p> <p>Moreover, the ES appears to assume no material changes to local traffic flows, which is perhaps slightly optimistic given the emerging growth agenda for the region and the significant increase in housing numbers to be delivered over the next 30-40 years for the region. The ES also does not specifically quantify maintenance traffic emissions.</p> <p>The assessment depends on construction phase mitigation (e.g., plant selection, generator standards) remaining in place for any operational plant, and it is important that this requirement is secured via the DCO and CoCP.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>authority) post consent under Requirement 4 of Schedule 3 of the <b>3.1 Draft DCO (Clean)(Final Issue C) [REP3-004]</b></p>		
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.5.12	Outline CoCP	<p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>As noted by the council there is scope in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> for agreeing location specific mitigation measures once construction activities and locations are further developed through detailed design.</p> <p>The implementation of these measures would be secured through the DCO, as it will require compliance with the final CoCP which would be approved by relevant Local Planning Authorities prior to the commencement of construction.</p> <p>High risk locations and monitoring locations would be determined following industry best practice Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) construction dust guidance and IAQM construction site monitoring guidance.</p> <p>Implementing the CoCP is the responsibility of the Main Works Contractor who would have resources to do this across the Project area.</p>	<p>TDC is generally content that all relevant mitigation measures are included in the Outline CoCP however notes that several air-quality controls rely on future contractor-led, site-specific Dust Management Plans and monitoring plans, meaning TDC or ECC (or the future unitary authority) will need to review these carefully at discharge stage.</p> <p>Some measures depend on professional judgement (e.g., determining high-risk locations, setting monitoring locations), which introduces variability in implementation.</p> <p>Whilst the Outline CoCP is comprehensive, its success hinges on robust supervision and enforcement, which will require resources and costs – and it is unclear how such monitoring/supervision will be funded, especially as the project corridor in the Tendring area is windy and long and construction activities are dispersed in a rural area in the north western part of the district and across sensitive rural receptors.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
Other matters as required				

### 3.6 Noise and Vibration

Table 3.6 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Noise and Vibration

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<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 Noise and Vibration assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and Section 14.2 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b>.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	TDC agrees that all relevant legislation, policy and guidance have been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.	Agreed
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.6.2	Study area	<p>The study area was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.6.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 14.4 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> .	Position agreed.	Agreed
3.6.4	Assessment methodology	Assessment approach agreed with TDC – the full assessment will be presented in the ES.	In July 2023, a technical note was shared with the Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) from Essex County Council and TDC to agree on the approach to undertake an operational noise impact assessment of the proposed EACN Substation within Tendring District together with using background noise monitoring data gathered for another project in the vicinity. Essex County Council deferred authority to TDC, who agreed that the proposed approach was acceptable.	Agreed
3.6.5 a	Key parameters and assumptions	Key parameters and assumptions associated with Noise and Vibration are summarised in Section 14.4 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [AP-256]</b> . The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.  The background sound level survey locations undertaken by the Five Estuaries project are appropriate for EACN and include the nearest noise sensitive receptors to the site. Additionally, the use of this data was agreed by TDC through consultation of the tripartite agreement for the management of cumulative noise. The assessment reflects the low background sound levels in the area and limits are set relative to national planning policy and guidance, both individually	Most key parameters and assumptions in Section 14.4 are broadly appropriate and align with recognised UK acoustic and vibration assessment practice, though there are some areas where the assumptions rely on worst-case generalisations or third-party data that would benefit from later confirmation during detailed design.  The EACN background sound levels appear to rely on Five Estuaries 2022 surveys, which were not undertaken specifically for this project. Although geographically relevant, the ES does not	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>for the EACN, and cumulatively. The assessment is therefore adequately robust.</p> <p>The Applicant considers this matter to be agreed.</p>	<p>demonstrate explicitly how representative those exact points are of the EACN NSRs.</p>	
3.6.5 b	<p>Key parameters and assumptions</p>	<p>With regards to haul roads, the noise assessment considered the lower threshold from the BS 5228 'ABC' method. Baseline survey data is therefore not required, as this would only serve to increase the threshold in higher noise level areas. This is not such an area, and the lower threshold is therefore applicable.</p> <p>The assessment is based on currently available information. However, the contractor is committed to undertake additional detailed noise and vibration assessments based on their specific methodologies by commitment NV05 of the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> and the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix F - Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan (Final Issue A) [APP-306]</b>.</p> <p>Additionally, the contractor(s) are committed to employing best practicable means to reduce the effects of construction noise and vibration by commitment NV01 of the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> also includes a number of other related commitments.</p>	<p>There appears to be no confirmatory monitoring reported for rural receptors near haul routes in the TDC area, especially those anticipated to experience very large noise increases during construction (e.g. Bentley Road).</p> <p>Chapter 14 also assumes that third-party data are accurate. Using such assumptions (and not definite) may be acceptable at the EIA stage, however given the sheer increase in noise levels in the areas along Bentley Road and the new haul route south of Shot Road, these assumptions should be supported by mandatory verification before final design.</p> <p>Assumptions regarding mitigation are generally accepted, however, because some hotspots (e.g., Bentley Road) show major adverse impacts even with Best Practicable Means (BPM), explicit early design commitments are essential.</p>	Under Discussion
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.6.6	<p>Baseline conditions and receptors</p>	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Noise and Vibration are presented in Section 14.5 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and</b></p>	<p>Generally acceptable and proportionate, however, there are limitations, especially regarding the reliance on thirdparty</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256].</b> The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Please see response above for ID3.6.5 where appropriate.</p>	<p>baseline noise measurements at the proposed EACN site and the absence of project specific vibration baseline data – these limitations can reduce confidence in the assessment and data that is being relied upon.</p> <p>Baseline data for a key location like the EACN appears to originate from Autumn 2022 noise surveys undertaken for the <i>Five Estuaries</i> Offshore Wind Farm ES, and not from a dedicated Norwich to Tilbury survey – confirmation is required here or preconstruction baseline monitoring should be required. TDC is not convinced that the EACN baseline data is representative of the site's actual location.</p> <p>It appears rural receptors near what will become very busy and noisy haul roads (e.g., Bentley Road) lack project specific baseline monitoring.</p> <p>TDC also request confirmatory pre-construction noise surveys at EACN and all other hotspots/severely affected areas (to be agreed by LPA), and detailed pre-condition vibration surveys for structures at risk (e.g., listed cottages) and all other buildings/ structures that will experience perceptible or more than perceptible construction vibration.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.6.7	Embedded mitigation	<p>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Noise and Vibration effects, are set out in Section 14.6 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Please see response above for ID3.6.5 where appropriate.</p> <p>With regards to “<i>Although the ES commits to things like plant selection, screening and enclosures there is little to no early indication of likely acoustic performance targets (e.g., maximum rating level relative to background) – this introduces great uncertainty for the LPA and affected communities and residents and should be addressed</i>”, <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> provides a firm indication of the impact of noise from the proposed EACN, both individually, and cumulatively. The assessment provides a worst-case assessment based on the Applicant’s specification noise levels (i.e. the highest noise levels that can be produced), together with mitigation in the form of standard enclosures. The predicted noise levels indicate that operational noise levels would be below acceptable limits, both individually and cumulative. In practice, given these reasonable worst-case assumptions, noise levels from the operation of the EACN would be expected to be lower than predicted. National Grid is committed to ensuring that</p>	<p>Generally acceptable, appropriate, and aligned with recognised good practice for a project of this scale, however, there are areas where further detail or commitments could strengthen assurance — especially regarding the practical implementation of noise reducing design at locations such as the EACN and early road surface improvements near known hotspots such as Bentley Road and the new haul route west of Little Bromley.</p> <p>Although the ES commits to things like plant selection, screening and enclosures there is little to no early indication of likely acoustic performance targets (e.g., maximum rating level relative to background) – this introduces great uncertainty for the LPA and affected communities and residents and should be addressed.</p> <p>It is unclear what specific embedded measures for construction traffic noise are proposed along Primary Access Roads (PAR) such as Bentley Road, where significant adverse impacts are predicted, and this clarity and details are needed asap so that affected communities and residents living on these PAR can begin to forward plan and consider the details.</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.6.8	Standard mitigation	<p>appropriate noise and vibration mitigation measures are included in the EACN by commitments NV21 and NV22 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The commitments in the CoCP are therefore deemed to be appropriate.</p> <p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in Section 14.6 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> and set out in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Please see response above for ID3.6.5 to ID3.6.7.</p> <p>In general, there appears to be a misunderstanding regarding the interpretation of best practicable means (BPM). Best practicable means are all encompassing and include the whole range of possible options available to the contractor to reduce the effects of construction noise and vibration, and are not merely “good practice measures” (although they are included). The contractors are therefore committed to employing the mitigation measures that they can practicably employ to reduce the effects of noise and vibration. Where there is discretionary wording such as “where practicable”, “where feasible”, “as far as reasonably practicable”, this is to indicate that in some instances mitigation measures may not be practicable. For example, other non-acoustic constraints may limit certain mitigation measures (for example, a noise</p>	<p>TDCs position is that the standard mitigation proposed is broadly appropriate and in line with accepted UK best practice, but they are not fully adequate for the specific sensitivities in Tendring, particularly around Ardleigh and Little Bromley. The local context in the most severely affected areas in Tendring (i.e Ardleigh and Little Bromley, and the rural areas around it and in between the two settlements) are not “typical”, instead, as repeatedly set out, these areas consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substandard, narrow rural roads</li> <li>• Residential clusters close to haul routes</li> <li>• Very high predicted construction traffic noise at some receptors (notably Bentley Road), which is currently a quiet rural area with low baseline noise conditions, and</li> <li>• Close proximity of properties to works areas</li> </ul> <p>Standard measures alone are far from sufficient to avoid significant or highly disruptive construction noise and vibration</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>screen cannot block an access or a road, even if it would be acoustically beneficial to do so).</p> <p>Therefore, the strong commitment to employing BPM, together with undertaken detailed assessments should be given the appropriate high weight and not dismissed.</p>	<p>impacts for affected communities and residents.</p> <p>The 'standard' measures are set out in the documents and need not be repeated here; however these are merely standard good practice controls, not specific to Tendring and the measures proposed for these areas are not adequate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction traffic impacts in Tendring are unusually high, for the most part the highest and most impactful across the entire project route.</li> <li>• Standard BPM proposed (such as screening, quieter plant, limiting revs, etc.) does not address traffic noise, because HGV pass-bys cannot be enclosed or acoustically screened.</li> <li>• Vibration from HGVs depends more on road condition, speed, and proximity to dwellings — and less on plant selection although the size of the HGV and the nature of the load it carries are also factors.</li> <li>• Therefore, traffic related noise and vibration impact in these areas cannot be adequately mitigated through standard measures alone and much more mitigation is needed and remains outstanding.</li> <li>• NGET chosen locations for its EACN, its permanent and temporary haul routes,</li> </ul>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>its pylons and other paraphernalia are without exception characterised by extremely quiet rural baseline conditions. Background night-time levels are typically in the low 20s dB, as confirmed in Chapter 14. Standard mitigation is designed to reduce noise <i>at source</i>, but not to ensure absolute noise levels remain compatible with very low rural baselines. This means even “mitigated” construction noise can remain highly intrusive, character-changing and sleep-disturbing (as proposed e.g. babies and toddlers who tend to go to bed around 6:30-7pm) but also young children, adolescents and adults if works extend beyond core hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are regular receptors very close to works and haul routes, in some instances within 20m of compounds, haul routes or cable trenching. In such locations, standard measures like “use quieter plant” or “minimise drop heights” deliver only modest reductions (typically 5–10 dB).</li> <li>• But predicted unmitigated levels can exceed those reductions by an order of magnitude and result in very significant impacts on residential amenity.</li> <li>• Many measures in the OCoCP rely on highly discretionary wording such as</li> </ul>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>“where practicable”, “where feasible”, “as far as reasonably practicable”, “located away from sensitive receptors”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not only are these phrases ambiguous, but also, in constrained areas like Ardleigh and Little Bromley, these qualifiers reduce certainty for affected communities and residents that the mitigation will genuinely protect nearby residents, and in any event, the use of such phrases are unenforceable and will make any DCO condition that is predicated on such phrases ineffective, unenforceable and imprecise, and therefore failing the NPPF tests for planning conditions.</li> <li>• The Outline NVMP largely sets out process, not outcome, E.g – there are no receptor-specific noise limits; there are no commitments on maximum HGV flows at specific receptors, and no requirement for active monitoring where impacts are predicted to be major (to name but a few).</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the Standard Measures as set out are inadequate for the affected areas of the District of Tendring because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tendring has some of the highest predicted construction noise and vibration impacts on the entire route.</li> </ul>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.6.9	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in Section 14.6 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Please see response above for ID3.6.5 to ID3.6.8, particular around the interpretation of best practicable means (BPM) in 3.5.8.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The environment is exceptionally quiet, meaning impacts are more noticeable.</li> <li>• Rural roads are already poorly suited to large HGV flows.</li> <li>• Several receptors are extremely close to the works.</li> </ul> <p>It is up to the project designers and promoters (and not TDC) to propose additional, workable, legally enforceable, efficient and precise measures to ensure residential amenity is protected, measures such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional Traffic specific controls</li> <li>• Enhances noise controls</li> <li>• Enhanced vibration controls</li> <li>• Enhanced community protections</li> </ul>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>TDC questions this conclusion for the reasons set out in 3.5.8 and because the standard measures set out are inadequate for the affected areas. It therefore logically follows that TDC will disagree that additional mitigation is not required. According to the ES the only major effect identified is construction traffic noise on Bentley Road (Jasmine Cottage) where even with traffic management, a large adverse effect remains. But this is categorised as a traffic mitigation issue, not one requiring further acoustic mitigation beyond BPM, because the ES concludes that road proximity physically limits what noise mitigation is possible. TDC questions this unsatisfactory conclusion because there are at least 6 properties along Bentley Road set a similar distance back from the roadside edge than Jasmine Cottage. Vibration exceedances near Little Bromley/ Little Bentley for several heritage structures are identified in the ES, but these are treated via site-specific BPM, monitoring, and pre-/ post-condition surveys, and the measures do not actually address the noise and vibration disturbances that the affected residents will experience.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</b>				
3.6.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 14.7 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> . The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	<p>The construction phase Noise &amp; Vibration assessment is considered appropriate for the Tendring area because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It uses the correct standards and conservative thresholds.</li> <li>• It applies Tendring specific baseline data.</li> <li>• It identifies the correct receptors.</li> <li>• It transparently reports significant effects where unavoidable.</li> <li>• It justifies why further mitigation is impracticable in those locations.</li> <li>• It provides residual effect outcomes.</li> <li>• It (correctly) does not claim that the worst of the impacts can be mitigated away.</li> </ul>	Agreed
3.6.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 14.7 of <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p><b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> provides a firm indication of the impact of noise from the proposed EACN, both individually, and cumulatively. The assessment provides a worst-case assessment based on National Grid specification noise levels (i.e. the highest noise levels that can be produced), together with</p>	<p>The ES uses correct methodology, appropriate standards, and baseline conditions representative of Tendring. The approach was agreed by Tendring DC's Environmental Health Officer in advance, and the level of detail is therefore proportionate.</p> <p>There are however limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational assessments depend heavily on future detailed design work — therefore, the ES does not fully</li> </ul>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>mitigation in the form of standard enclosures. The predicted noise levels indicate that operational noise levels would be below acceptable limits, both individually and cumulatively. In practice, given these reasonable worst-case assumptions, noise levels from the operation of the EACN would be expected to be lower than predicted. The Applicant is committed to ensuring that appropriate noise and vibration mitigation measures are included in the EACN by commitments NV21 and NV22 of the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The commitments in the CoCP are therefore deemed to be appropriate.</p> <p>The background sound level survey locations undertaken by the Five Estuaries project are appropriate for the EACN and include the nearest noise sensitive receptors to the site. Additionally, the use of these data was agreed by TDC through consultation of the tripartite agreement for the management of cumulative noise. In any event, the assessment reflects the low background sound levels in the area and limits are set relative to national planning policy and guidance, both individually for the EACN and cumulatively. The assessment is therefore adequately robust.</p> <p>An assessment of noise and vibration impacts during maintenance is provided in the <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b>. With regards to the EACN no significant effects are anticipated.</p>	<p>guarantee that impacts will remain minimal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reliance on external baseline surveys (e.g. Five Estuaries) should be noted as a data limitation.</li> <li>• Maintenance impacts could be more significant (than the ES suggests) in low background rural Tendring (which has been repeatedly highlighted as an overriding characteristic of the area making a concentration of infrastructure of this nature entirely inappropriate for the area).</li> <li>• TDC expects robust further assessment at detailed design, especially given extremely low rural background levels.</li> <li>• Relevant DCO wording must ensure that future design cannot increase noise beyond the assessed limits.</li> <li>• Updated on-site baseline noise monitoring should be required before finalising mitigation and should inform final mitigation required.</li> <li>• Maintenance activities should be controlled through legally enforceable and precise noise limits, including at night.</li> </ul>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.6.12	Outline CoCP	<p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project. The final CoCP would be approved by the relevant local planning authorities as detailed in Requirement 4(1) of the <b>3.1 Draft DCO (Final Issue C) [REP3-004]</b> Construction Management Plans, which states: <i>'No stage of the authorised development may commence until, for that stage, the following plans as relevant to that stage have been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority (in consultation with Natural England in the case of the landscape and ecological management plan) or other discharging authority as may be appropriate to the relevant plan concerned. The relevant plans are- a) code of construction practice (which must be substantially in accordance with the outline code of construction practice...'</i></p> <p>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix E Community Engagement and Public Information (Final Issue A) [APP-305] sets out the communications channels and approach to community engagement during the construction of the Project. It explains the approach to engaging with local communities, what resources will be available and how people can contact the community relations team, in addition to the complaints procedure.</p>	<p>Whilst TDC endorsed the methodology set out in the relevant chapter of the ES, a significant number of detailed assessments must be completed before works begin. For example, the Outline CoCP is not the final document. It requires the Main Works Contractor to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carry out detailed construction noise and vibration assessments</li> <li>• Identify any location-specific issues (e.g., Little Bromley, Great Bromley, Ardleigh properties near haul roads)</li> <li>• Produce a Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP)</li> <li>• Apply additional mitigation where significant effects could occur</li> </ul> <p>This means Tendring-specific risks—particularly the extremely low rural background levels—should be re-assessed with greater precision before works start, leaving affected locals with continued uncertainty.</p> <p>The final OCoCP should include strong requirements for community liaison. For a rural area such as this and with low background noise, communication from NGET and contractors will be key and</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>Further assessments are required and will be undertaken at the appropriate time by the appropriate stakeholder (contractors).</p> <p>Night-time background sound levels have no bearing on the assessment of construction noise. However, it is acknowledged and agreed that noise levels are generally low in the area, particular away from main transport routes, and this is reflected appropriated in the assessments and will be reflected in the detailed assessments undertaken by the contractor.</p> <p>It is also agreed that although significant adverse effects are not expected (with the exception potentially of Jasmine Cottage), construction noise will still be audible and some vibration may be perceptible. However, this is a normal and unavoidable consequence of development. The principle is to reduce such effects as far as practicable, and the management principles put in place ensure that this would be the case.</p>	<p>should include requirements such as (list not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advance notices of “noisy periods”</li> <li>• A clear, accessible, and user-friendly public complaints process must be established and maintained, ensuring that all information is easy to find, simple to understand, and straightforward for the public to use</li> <li>• Site fencing and screening where feasible</li> </ul> <p>There are further limitations to mitigation and managing construction impacts for example TDC needs to reinforce that background LA90 levels in the areas between Little Bromley, Ardleigh, Lawford and Great Bromley are as low as 21–25 dB at night.</p> <p>In such quiet environments, even well-mitigated works can be noticeably intrusive to receptors.</p> <p>While the ES concludes impacts are “not significant” with mitigation, TDC argues that residual impacts may still be locally disruptive, even if not “significant” under EIA thresholds and additional mitigation will in all likelihood be required.</p>	
Other matters as required				

## 3.7 Health and Wellbeing

Table 3.7 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Health and Wellbeing

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.7.1	Policy and legislation	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Health and Wellbeing assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and Section 10.2 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b>.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	TDC agrees that all relevant legislation, policy and guidance have been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment	Agreed
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.7.2	Study area	The study area was agreed through the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024.	technical note to date. It is therefore assumed that the study area is agreed.	Agreed
3.7.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 10.4 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> .	ES presents sufficient and proportionate desktop data for TDC to inform the Health and Wellbeing assessment, however it is entirely desk-based, and there are no site/area specific health surveys, which given the sheer scale of the project and the wide-ranging impacts, could result in a distortion of the understanding of health and wellbeing impacts, it is nevertheless acknowledged that the approach followed is considered acceptable within EIA practice.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.7.4	Assessment methodology	<p>The Methodology was agreed through the Health and Wellbeing Refreshed Approach – Technical Note issued in October 2024.</p> <p>A meeting was held on 24 September 2024 to agree the assessment methodology of the Health and Wellbeing ES chapter.</p>		Agreed
3.7.5	Key parameters and assumptions	<p>The Applicant's position in relation to consultation and engagement with affected Tendring communities is set out in ID 3.2.7 to 3.2.10 of this SoCG.</p> <p>Key parameters and assumptions associated with Health and Wellbeing are summarised in Section 10.4 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Baseline data for health and wellbeing has been collated and presented in <b>6.10. A1 Environment Statement Appendix 10.1 – Health and Wellbeing Baseline Statistics (Final Issue A) [APP-193]</b>. This includes data for both physical and mental health and wellbeing that is publicly available at an appropriate geographic level. Data for mental wellbeing indicators is provided at Tendring-wide level for personal well-being data and for hospital stays for self-harm; data relating to self-reported general health (of which mental wellbeing can be component) is reported at ward level for the Ardleigh and Little Bromley, and Lawford, Manningtree and Mistley wards. Baseline data gathered is considered to be appropriate and proportionate to the nature of the Project and study area.</p>	<p>Whilst the key parameter and assumptions presented are considered appropriate, TDC needs to reinforce again that there were no direct engagement surveys from NGET with affected Tendring communities (especially the settled communities in and around Ardleigh and Little Bromley) on health perceptions insofar as this particular NSIP proposal is concerned.</p> <p>There are also no bespoke mental-health baseline data despite Tendring's known vulnerabilities, this lack of data could again result in a distortion of assumptions.</p>	Under Discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		We note in response to ID3.7.6 below that TDC agree that the baseline conditions and receptors presented broadly reflect Tendring's demographic and other characteristics.		
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.7.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	The baseline conditions and receptors for Health and Wellbeing are presented in Section 10.5 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> . The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	The baseline conditions and receptors presented and in a TDC context broadly reflect Tendring's known demographic, socio-economic, health and environmental characteristics and appear to accurately capture Tendring's specific vulnerabilities, including deprivation, health inequalities, mental wellbeing indicators, and population structure.	Agreed
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.7.7	Embedded mitigation	<p>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Health and Wellbeing effects, are set out in Section 10.6 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>No significant health and wellbeing impacts have been identified in the assessment undertaken in <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Health and Wellbeing [APP-192]</b> and as such there is no requirement for monitoring measures. However, the Applicant recognises that uncertainty while the Project is</p>	<p>The ES concludes that no additional mitigation is required beyond embedded measures and proposes no health and wellbeing monitoring. However, given the scale and duration of construction and the specific socioeconomic vulnerabilities within affected Tendring communities, TDC recommends that this issue is fully explored during the examination. In particular, TDC considers that the establishment of a clear and robust Health and Wellbeing Monitoring Framework should be examined.</p> <p>Such a framework should incorporate Tendring specific baseline data on active</p>	Under Discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.7.8	Standard mitigation	<p>developed may cause anxiety. The Project team will continue to engage with people potentially affected during progress of the Project, through regular communication including letters, phone calls and meetings, where necessary. This would enable concerns to be raised and discussed at an early opportunity and provide a regular point of contact to respond to queries and concerns. As detailed in ID 3.6.12, <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix E Community Engagement and Public Information (Final Issue A) [APP-305]</b> sets out the communications channels and approach to community engagement during the construction of the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed</p> <p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in Section 10.6 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> and set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>See response to ID3.7.7 above in relation to the identification of no significant health and wellbeing effects as they relate to health and wellbeing and the Project's approach to ongoing engagement.</p> <p>See responses to matters relating to the Noise and Vibration assessment, for example ID3.6.8 of this document which refers to standard mitigation.</p>	<p>travel, access to green space, amenity satisfaction, and mental wellbeing; set out clear indicators, reporting intervals, and responsibilities; and be codeveloped with local communities and affected Parish Councils to ensure it is meaningful, locally relevant, and trusted.</p> <p>The standard mitigation measures as set out are not fully adequate for Tendring's context unless they are strengthened in areas such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of high sensitivity rural and vulnerable communities;</li> <li>• Management of cumulative amenity effects;</li> <li>• Ensuring ongoing, transparent, locally specific engagement and monitoring;</li> <li>• Tendring has particular vulnerabilities, including higher deprivation and fuel poverty levels;</li> </ul>	Under Discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.7.9	Additional mitigation	The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in Section 10.6 of <b>6.10 Environmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower life satisfaction and poorer mental health indicators;</li> <li>• High proportions of older and disabled residents; and</li> <li>• Predominantly rural communities with very low baseline noise and high amenity reliance;</li> </ul> <p>Also, because of the very low rural baseline noise levels in Tendring, even “minor” impacts can feel highly intrusive; standard noise BPM alone may not be enough. TDC recommends additional commitments such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted health and wellbeing monitoring and not least because of higher baseline vulnerability. Additional targeted psychological wellbeing mitigation beyond just communication.</li> <li>• NGET to address the issue of no specific commitments in addressing communities near Bentley Road which will be subjected to the highest levels of noise, vibration, disturbances and amenity impacts across the entire project.</li> <li>• NGET to address the absence of no Tendring specific indicators for tracking cumulative amenity stress.</li> </ul>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192].</b> Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Updated position (February 2026):</p> <p>See response to ID3.7.7 above in relation to the lack of significant effects as they relate to health and wellbeing and the Project's approach to ongoing engagement</p> <p>See responses to matters relating to the Noise and Vibration assessment, for example ID3.6.8 of this document which refers to standard mitigation.</p>	<p>considered adequate for TDC and its affected residents and communities (also see position statement on ID3.6.8 directly above).</p> <p>Given the scale, duration, and intensity of the construction programme, and the well-evidenced socioeconomic and health vulnerabilities within Tendring, the decision in Section 10.6 to identify no additional mitigation is not proportionate and does not fully address the potential health and wellbeing effects identified in the baseline.</p> <p>Construction impacts in Tendring include some of the most acute along the route, for example, noise and traffic impacts (Chapter 14 of ES) identifies a large magnitude adverse noise impact along Bentley Road (PAR 30), with several receptors experiencing a significant effect before mitigation — and only partial improvement afterwards.</p> <p>Even after applying BPM, the Health and Wellbeing chapter concludes that only a negligible effect remains, but this is based on population-level significance rather than the lived experience of the most severely affected communities, properties and households such as those living in and around Little Bromley and Ardleigh.</p> <p>Finally, the ES repeatedly notes that mental health impacts may arise from:</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to visual amenity</li> <li>• Noise and disturbance</li> <li>• Loss of control, uncertainty, and perceptions of EMF risk</li> </ul> <p>Despite this, the applicant proposes no additional mental health focused measures, relying solely on generic communication and complaints procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not adequate for Tendring, which the baseline identifies as having:</li> <li>• Persistent mental health inequalities</li> <li>• Lower life satisfaction</li> <li>• Higher stress and anxiety related indicators</li> <li>• Long (4 year) construction period),and Little or no mental health monitoring proposed/suggested</li> </ul>	
<b>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</b>				
3.7.10a	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 10.7 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> .The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	In principle, the assessment of construction phase effects in Section 10.7 is appropriate at a strategic, EIA level for Tendring District.	Agreed
3.7.10b	Construction effects	TDC's comments relate to ward sensitivity and how this has been assessed. A variety of ward-level data has been combined to assign sensitivity for individual wards within the Order Limits along the Project route and this is considered to be appropriate geography and	Whilst the assessment adopts a policy compliant methodology, it does not adequately reflect the localised, cumulative and prolonged adverse effects that will be experienced by specific communities within	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>proportionate approach for a Project of this scale and nature (i.e. a long, linear route). The methodology also considers impacts on both the general population and draws out where particular impacts may be more relevant to vulnerable population groups, such as children or older people. It is important to note that <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> presents a population-level assessment rather than identifying impacts explicitly on individuals; this approach is referenced in paragraph 10.4.28 of the chapter and explained where relevant throughout the chapter in relation to specific assessments (for example in relation to impacts on access to work and training in paragraph 10.7.80). The Chapter does however acknowledge that there are instances where individuals may experience different degrees of impact (for example in relation to visual amenity where some individuals may experience heightened levels of stress or anxiety than others for various reasons).</p>	<p>Tendring, particularly in Ardleigh and Little Bromley and along key primary access routes, around the EACN and along and close to the cable corridor and the pylons arch around the north of Ardleigh and back (respectively). The over reliance on ward level sensitivity masks the intensity of impacts at settlement and receptor level, and the assessment underestimates the mental health and wellbeing effects associated with sustained (in-combination) construction activity, traffic intrusion, visual change and (what a very significant percentage of affected local communities will see as a) loss of control over one's local environment, the settlement where you live and the place you call home. This ES chapter conveniently uses 'low ward-level sensitivity' as an average measure of demographic vulnerability across a whole ward. Insofar as the Health and Wellbeing assessment is concerned, it does not reflect who/which areas/sub-wards/sub-communities are severely exposed to construction impacts, how often, or how intensely. In the most severely affected part of Tendring, particularly Ardleigh and Little Bromley, the ES uses a low ward-level sensitivity classification to downplay health effects across the board, and even where impacts are concentrated on specific roads where</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.7.10c	Construction effects	<p>Impacts associated with visual change have been considered in relation to health and wellbeing for both the construction and operational phase of the Project, noting that visual amenity plays a crucial role in shaping individuals' perceptions of their surroundings, influencing mental wellbeing, stress levels, and overall quality of life. <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> notes that residents living in closest proximity to construction activities, particularly where construction of the overhead line infrastructure itself is taking place (and therefore where effects are of a more permanent duration) may be more vulnerable to change, particularly during the short-term and are therefore identified as</p>	<p>many residents will experience continuous disruption for several years.</p> <p>In the context of the Health and Wellbeing assessment, the ES relies on a low ward-level sensitivity classification as an <i>averaged measure of demographic vulnerability</i> across an entire ward. However, this approach is fundamentally inadequate in the circumstances of this project and results in a systematic under-assessment of health and wellbeing impacts on the communities most directly affected. It also fails to engage with the cumulative aspect and the uncertainty introduced for the residents of the most severely affected communities in respect of 'what will follow... (see Cumulative Impacts)'</p> <p>While the ES applies ward-level sensitivity as a proxy for population vulnerability, it fails to engage in any meaningful or holistic assessment of exposure, particularly in relation to the disproportionate concentration of electricity infrastructure within relatively small rural communities. This includes the cumulative health and wellbeing effects of permanent and temporary haul routes, construction traffic, pylon installation, trenching works, land severance, and prolonged disturbance to</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>being of high sensitivity. It is also noted that impacts are likely to be experienced differentially by members of local communities according to factors such as where they live, or their outlook. Finally, the chapter does note that, there are likely to be individuals in every ward intersecting with the Order Limits who experience some degree of impact on their mental health and wellbeing (for example anxiety or stress) due to the operational phase of the Project.</p> <p><b>6.13. A4 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.4 - Residential Visual Amenity Assessment - Part 1 and Part 2 (Final Issue A) [APP-233 and APP-234]</b> has been prepared.</p> <p>This finds no instances where effects on residential visual amenity would be so great that they would affect living conditions and render those properties as unattractive places to live.</p> <p>In relation to construction impacts, whilst it is understood that these may impact communities for varying durations depending on location and nature of activity, a suite of mitigation measures (e.g. in relation to noise, air quality and traffic and transport) are set out in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice [REP3-025]</b> and <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028]</b>.</p> <p>In relation to points made regarding the dominance of the proposed infrastructure being wholly out of proportion to the size, character and resilience of the communities affected, these matters are covered in relation to the siting selection process for the Project [ID3.2.5 of this document].</p>	<p>agricultural land that underpins the local rural economy.</p> <p>In areas such as Ardleigh and Little Bromley, the scale, permanence and physical dominance of the proposed infrastructure is wholly out of proportion to the size, character and resilience of the communities affected.</p> <p>The project will introduce a fundamental and permanent transformation of landscape, land use and sense of place, yet the Health and Wellbeing assessment does not grapple with the psychological and community level consequences of this change, including stress, anxiety, loss of control, and reduced wellbeing arising from sustained proximity to largescale infrastructure.</p> <p>Crucially, the ES uses a low ward level sensitivity designation to discount impacts, despite acknowledging significant and concentrated effects elsewhere in the ES at receptor level in these high impact areas (for example in relation to construction traffic noise, visual effects and access disruption for Ardleigh and Little Bromley and surrounding areas). This represents a methodological flaw, whereby averaged demographic data is inappropriately relied upon to downplay severe impacts that are in highly localised and disproportionately affecting communities such as Ardleigh and</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>Points relating to consultation and engagement with residents and stakeholders are covered in our response to ID3.2.7 to 3.2.10 of this document.</p> <p>Finally, in relation to cumulative impacts, <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b> contains an assessment of inter- and intra-project cumulative effects. For health and wellbeing, the chapter notes that, although no significant effects on health and wellbeing have been identified in relation to the relationship between the Project and other developments (inter-project effects), adverse effects on mental health and wellbeing may be particularly relevant as a result of the scale of other development (for example significant residential or infrastructure development) and associated perceived effects on neighbourhood quality / sense of place / uncertainty during the construction phases.</p>	<p>Little Bromley, if this DCO goes ahead these impacts will be unavoidable and experienced repeatedly by the same households and communities over a prolonged construction period, especially when the cumulative effects are taking into account.</p> <p>The assessment therefore prioritises statistical abstraction over lived experience, in fact, the assessment shows no interest whatsoever to engage at human level lived experience. It does not reflect the reality that a ward assessed as having “low sensitivity” on average may nonetheless contain communities that are acutely sensitive due to sustained exposure, limited capacity to adapt or react, rural isolation, and dependence on a small number of transport routes and land-based economic activities.</p> <p>As a result, and until these gaps in the assessment are addressed, the ES conveniently and unjustifiably downplays the health and wellbeing impacts on the most severely affected communities. This approach is not consistent with a proportionate or precautionary assessment of health effects and does not provide the ExA with a sound basis on which to understand the true scale of harm likely to arise during construction and thereafter.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.7.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 10.7 of <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p>TDC's comments relating to visual amenity have been referenced in response to ID3.7.10 above.</p> <p><b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> includes an assessment of impacts on mental health and wellbeing during the construction period, which considers the level of control people feel they have over their physical environment; findings from consultation have highlighted the stress and anxiety experienced by people as a result of potential impacts of the Project on their local area (notably visual impacts).</p> <p>Impacts experienced by recreational users are assessed in <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>.</p> <p>As highlighted in relation to earlier responses, the Applicant is committed to providing a coordinated local and regional approach to community benefits. 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).</p>	<p>The ES identifies significant adverse effects on landscape character during operation and maintenance within the draft Order Limits in Tendring and the surrounding area, extending approximately 0.5–1 km from the project. Significant adverse effects on views and visual amenity are also predicted during operation and maintenance, extending approximately 1–2 km from the project. The ES argues that these effects are likely to be experienced by residents, road users, and recreational users living in these impact zones or using this area.</p> <p>The ES acknowledges that responses to visual and landscape impacts are subjective and that a proportion of the local population may be affected due to changes to the setting of homes, businesses, and culturally or ecologically important community assets. Further assessment presented in the ES should also draw on the qualitative mental health and wellbeing approach set out 3.3.10 above and in the refreshed Health and Wellbeing Assessment Technical Note.</p> <p>During statutory consultation, Tendring District Council highlighted the need to offset significant adverse impacts through meaningful, deliverable community benefits for affected communities. This could include support for community energy</p>	Under Discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>schemes, local training and skills investment, and targeted measures in areas of higher deprivation. At present, limited proposals have been put forward by NGET, and TDC and ECC will continue discussions to better understand the scope of any community benefit offer.</p> <p>There is also an opportunity to secure accessible green spaces that support health and wellbeing while enhancing biodiversity and local nature recovery.</p>	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.7.12	Outline CoCP	<p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Chapter 10 (Health and Wellbeing) of the <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>TDC makes reference to Section 5.1.11 and Table 5.1 of the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Final Issue A) [APP-300]</b> however this section and relevant table do not contain any specific health and wellbeing mitigation measures. It is suggested that the correct reference is to Table 6.1; whilst paragraph 6.1.12 of the, third revision of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice ( [REP3-025]</b> states there are specific health and wellbeing mitigation measures included in the table, this is not, in fact, the case.</p>	<p>See comments under 3.7.8 and 3.7.9 above.</p> <p>In addition, Table 5.1 of the Outline CoCP should include a specific section covering health and wellbeing management during both the construction and operational phases, in line with the refreshed health and wellbeing assessment approach. Although this requirement is referenced in Section 5.1.11 of the Outline CoCP, it is not currently reflected as a dedicated management section within Table 5.1.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		Clarification is sought as to the exact nature of TDC's comment in this regard.		
Other matters as required				

### 3.8 Historic Environment

Table 3.8 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to the Historic Environment

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.8.1	Policy and legislation (Archaeology)	The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Historic Environment assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and Section 11.2 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> . All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.	The ES Chapter 11.2 contain all relevant legislation, policy and guidance.	Agreed
3.8.2	Policy and legislation (Built Heritage)	The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Historic Environment assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> .	TDC (Built Heritage) advises that based on a further review of the identification and assessment of the value of NDHA buildings in Document: 6.11.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.1 Historic Environment Baseline Report <b>[APP-209]</b> we are able to agree this matter.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the LPA's request for further clarity in relation to non-designated heritage assets. All non-designated heritage assets were assessed to determine their value in accordance with the <b>6.19 Scoping Report - Appendix A - Part 1 to 8 and Appendices (Final Issue A) [APP-288 – APP-296]</b>, <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> and the methodology set out in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>. Those assets assessed to have a low or negligible value and located outside the Order Limits did not have a settings assessment undertaken. As they would not experience physical impacts there is no potential for significant effects as a result of change to setting for assets of these values. While some harm would still be possible, given their value and nature of potential impacts this would be at the very lowest end of the harm scale. In NPS (EN-1) instructions regarding the Applicant's assessment paragraph 5.9.9 'The Applicant should undertake an assessment of any likely significant heritage impacts of the proposed development as part of the EIA, and describe these along with how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied in the ES' and in several places refers to detail being proportionate to the importance/significance of the heritage asset. The Project therefore considers that it has appropriately complied with relevant policy in the NPS (EN-1) regarding assessment of impacts to non-designated heritage assets.</p>		

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.8.3	Study area	<p>The study area was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>The study area was also agreed through subsequent thematic group meetings where further comments were addressed.</p>	<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 also agreed through subsequent thematic group meetings where further comments were addressed.</p>	Agreed
3.8.4	Data sources (Built Heritage)	<p>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 11.4 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>.</p> <p>Non-designated historic buildings were identified in addition to those included in the HER and Local Lists. This was primarily through historic mapping. The methodology for desk-based research and walkover included identification of any previously unknown heritage assets, including historic buildings. The Historic Environment Baseline Report (<b>6.11. A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.1 - Historic Environment Baseline Report (Final Issue A) [APP-209]</b> (Figures A11.1.1 and A11.1.2 of this document superseded by [REP1-063] and [REP1-064] respectively)) is organised geographically and by period and includes baseline information on non-designated historic buildings. All assessed heritage assets were referred to in text either by their NHLE number in the case of designated assets, or a Project ID number for non-designated assets. The baseline report and assessment tables are not</p>	<p>There has been sufficient desktop data collected; however the fieldwork proposed prior to application has not been completed and the impact of this to inform the assessment is under review.</p> <p>TDC (Built Heritage) confirm that this matter is agreed.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		structured by asset type as some heritage assets can contain both above-ground built elements and archaeological remains.		
3.8.5	Data sources (archaeology) - Desktop	Sufficient desktop data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 11.4 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> .	TDC (Archaeology) has reviewed the relevant documentation and confirms that sufficient desktop data has been collected (agreement confirmed during meeting January 2026).	Agreed
3.8.6	Data sources (archaeology) – survey data	Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 11.4 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> . As of January 2026, when the Supplementary Environmental Information was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, approximately 3000 trial trenches and 1440 ha of geophysical survey had been completed. The phase 2 stage of the geophysical survey and trial trenching will continue in 2026, and all the results of this work will be shared with the Local Planning Authority Archaeological Advisors for approval as discussed at monthly meetings and set out in <b>7.5 Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Final Issue A) [APP-328]</b> . The vast majority of the priority geophysical survey and trial trenching are complete and included in the Supplementary Environmental Information. The fieldwork undertaken to date comprises a more comprehensive approach to evaluation than most other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects have completed by the time of their DCO application.	TDC (Archaeology) 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.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.8.7	Assessment methodology (Built Heritage)	<p>The <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> states: <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>This was discussed at a number of Historic Environment Thematic Group Meetings held between July 2022 and October 2024.</p> <p>The Applicant’s assessment has carefully considered both designated and non-designated heritage assets, ensuring that their setting and significance are appropriately evaluated. As part of the engagement process, the Applicant reviewed and updated the information in line with relevant guidelines, addressing any remaining uncertainties. The updated assessments were included in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11- Historic Environment (Final Issue A) [APP-208]</b> at DCO submission.</p> <p>Historic Environment Viewpoints feedback has been taken into account for the assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant’s position regarding non-designated heritage assets is as outlined in ID 3.8.2 (Policy and Legislation) above.</p> <p>No significant cumulative effects were identified for any designated or non-designated heritage assets located within Tendring as set out in paragraphs 17.5.49 to 17.5.52 of <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 – Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed</p>	Methodology not agreed, and all assets affected not identified (see ECC /TDC LIR for more details).	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tending District Council's Position	Status
3.8.8	Assessment methodology (Archaeology)	The methodology for assessing Historic Environment was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.	TDC is in agreement with this matter.	Agreed
3.8.9	Key parameters and assumptions (Built Heritage)	Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Historic Environment assessment are summarised in Section 11.4 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> . The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.  In March 2025, the Applicant issued an updated version of the Historic Environment (HE) Viewpoints information.	TDC (Built Heritage) is in agreement with the matter following review of the ES.	Agreed
3.8.10	Key parameters and assumptions (Archaeology)	Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Historic Environment assessment are summarised in Section 11.4 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> . The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.  Please see ID 3.8.6 regarding archaeological evaluation.	TDC (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 <i>"The information obtained to date provides sufficient detail to characterise the likely nature and extent of any currently unrecorded remains."</i>	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.8.11	Baseline conditions and receptors (Built heritage)	The baseline conditions and receptors for Historic Environment are presented in Section 11.5 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> . The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.	TDC (Built Heritage) is in agreement with this matter.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>Further detail relevant to this section are outlined in section 3.8.4 (Data Sources).</p> <p>TDC/EPs comments are noted, and the Applicant will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>		
3.8.12	Baseline conditions and receptors (Archaeology)	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Historic Environment are presented in Section 11.5 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>February 2025, the Applicant issued a draft Historic Baseline Report including Annex C and Annex D for agreement/comment and held a meeting on the topic.</p>	TDC (Archaeology) agreed this matter during call in January 2026.	Agreed
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.8.13	Embedded mitigation	<p>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Historic Environment effects, are set out in Section 11.6 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>	TDC agrees that through sensitive routing impacts on known/identified heritage assets can be reduced however the impact on unknown archaeological remains can only be better understood through further intrusive archaeological evaluation. This is most relevant in areas of underground cable where there will be an impact on archaeological remains.	Under discussion
3.8.14 a	Standard mitigation (Built heritage)	<p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in Section 11.6 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b> and set out in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction</b></p>	This matter is agreed with regards to commitment H06.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025].</b> The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Regarding commitment H06, the term 'appropriate' in this context refers to the reinstatement of landscape features (such as hedgerows, fences, walls, and earthworks) in a manner that is sensitive to the local character, setting, and historic significance of the area. The general approach and reinstatement plans can be found in Section 9 of <b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP3-030]</b>. Specifically, this means:</p> <p>Replacement features will be of a similar type, scale, and material to those lost, wherever possible, reflecting the character and function of the original feature</p> <p>Design and siting will be informed by local landscape character assessments, historic environment records, and where relevant, consultation with Local Planning Authorities and heritage specialists</p> <p>Species selection for replanting (e.g., hedgerows) will seek to match historic or locally appropriate species mixes, and construction/restoration of walls or banks will use traditional techniques and materials where feasible</p> <p>If retention of a feature is not possible, the replacement or reinstatement will be designed to ensure that the heritage, ecological, and landscape value is maintained, or where possible, enhanced. The Applicant proposes this matter is agreed.</p>		

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.8.14 b	Standard mitigation (Built heritage)	<p>Regarding H07, <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> did not identify any heritage assets in Colchester, Braintree, Brentwood, Basildon or Thurrock that would be impacted by the Project. The vibration assessment identified one historic structure in Tendring, the grade II listed Little Bromley War Memorial (1493299), which has potential to be impacted. As this is not a residence, the current approach in H07 and the associated NV04 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> is considered to be appropriate.</p> <p><b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix E Community Engagement and Public Information (Final Issue A) [APP-305]</b> sets out the communications channels and approach to community engagement during the construction of the Project, in addition to the complaints procedure. A free project hotline will be available for members of the public to use to contact the project team with any queries or complaints. In addition, a dedicated team at Fisher German will manage engagement around land and property affected by the Project and will be contactable via a freephone telephone number, email and post.</p>	<p>Whilst we understand that the anticipated effects of construction vibration on designated heritage assets are limited to the Grade II listed Little Bromley War Memorial (1493299) in Tendring District (which is not a dwelling) we would still recommend expansion of H07, to create a hotline or method of contact for building owners who are concerned about the effects of construction vibration on their buildings as works are undertaken to allay fears and allow the monitoring of effects.</p>	Under discussion
3.8.15	Standard mitigation (Archaeology)	<p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential effects during construction are summarised in Section 11.6 of <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p>	<p>Aligned with ECC (Archaeology) TDC also considers further actions are required within the OCEMP to ensure potential effects are considered. This will be expanded upon in the forthcoming Local Impact report. TDC (Archaeology) agreed this matter during call held January 2026.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.8.16	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in Section 11.6 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>This matter will remain under discussion until the outline AMS WSI is finalised.</p>	<p>The requirement for additional mitigation for archaeology is agreed. The effectiveness of this will depend on the methodologies proposed in the Outline AMS-WSI and so agreement on this document is key to achieving successful mitigation.</p> <p>TDC noted during call in January 2026 that this matter is not relevant for Built Heritage.</p>	Under discussion
<b>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</b>				
3.8.17	Construction effects	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 11.7 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>TDC (Built Heritage) are in agreement with this matter.</p> <p>Following review of the ES, TDC (Archaeology) confirmed agreement on this matter during call in January 2026.</p>	Agreed
3.8.18	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 11.7 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>TDC (Built Heritage) are in agreement with this matter.</p> <p>Following review of the ES, TDC (Archaeology) confirmed agreement on this matter during call in January 2026.</p>	Agreed
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.8.19	Outline CoCP	<p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant construction mitigation measures specified in <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-</b></p>	<p>Concern that the Outline CoCP does not acknowledge the potential impacts to built heritage during the construction phase (also see section 3.8.17 above) and makes reference only to the how the project may affect the historic environment through disturbing known and unknown</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>068]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>A meetings to discuss the Outline CoCP were held on 9th October 2024, 29th January 2025 and March 2025. A further iteration of the Outline CoCP was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Historic Environment effects, are set out in Section 11.6 of <b>6.11 Environmental Statement Chapter 11 - Historic Environment - Clean Version (Final Issue B) [AS-068]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to matters raised within their Local Impact Report can be found in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	<p>archaeology and the removal of historic landscape features.</p> <p>This section is currently under review (TDC Archaeology). Further comments will be included within the LIR which require action.</p> <p>For TDC (Built Heritage) See 3.8.14 Standard mitigation (Built Heritage) for current position.</p>	
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
3.8.20	<p>Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (WSIs) for pre-consent geophysical surveys and archaeological trial trenching.</p>	<p>The Applicant shared overarching WSIs in March – June 2024 and December 2024.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.8.21	Site specific Written Schemes of Investigation (WSIs) for pre-consent archaeological trial trenching.	<p>The scope and methodology of WSIs for archaeological trial trenching is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</p> <p>There are still addenda to site specific WSIs forthcoming that have yet to be issued.</p>	The scope and methodology of WSIs for archaeological trial trenching is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.	Agreed
3.8.22	Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline WSI.	<p>The contents of <b>7.5 Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Final Issue A) [APP-328]</b> is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</p>	The Outline AMS-WSI is currently not agreed, further comments will be provided in TDC's Local Impact report (with input from ECC Archaeology)	Under discussion
3.8.23	Programme for completion of archaeological fieldwork	<p>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.</p> <p>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 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'.</p> <p>The programme for archaeological fieldwork is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.</p>	The programme for archaeological fieldwork is considered appropriate and proportionate to the level of evaluation required.	Agreed

### 3.9 Landscape and Visual

Table 3.9 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Landscape and Visual

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.9.1	Policy and legislation	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and <b>Section 13.2 of 6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance have been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	<p>TDC agree with the overarching policy documents stated in the PEIR but would wish to also see reference and further action in relation to NPS EN-1. Section 4 Assessment, Para 4.1.5 Weighing Impacts and Benefits:</p> <p><i>'In considering any proposed development the Secretary of State should take into account...</i></p> <p><i>its potential adverse impacts, including on the environment, and including any long-term and cumulative adverse impacts, as well as any measures to avoid, reduce, mitigate or compensate for any adverse impacts, following the mitigation hierarchy'</i></p> <p>In previous correspondence including TDCs Statutory Consultation response and Relevant Representations, a significant number of localised Landscape and Visual Impacts and Issues have been identified. Local landscape designation no longer forms part of promoted government policy and therefore local value generally needs to be assessed in line with</p> <p>'TGN 02-21: Assessing landscape value</p>	Under Discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>outside national designations'</p> <p>Whilst valued landscape criteria have now been included in the landscape assessment, like ECC, TDC is also concerned that some of the evaluation is flawed (details will following in TDC LIR). In addition, as 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 (and in a TDC context) severely affected, particularly open landscapes that are so prevalent in the areas between Ardleigh and Little Bromley, but also National Landscape fringe areas. TDC also had concerns regarding whether a preliminary judgement on significance had been determined without going through the stage of identifying susceptibility and magnitude of effects. TDC are content that all stages of the LVIA process have been executed although not necessarily with all aspects of the approach.</p>	

### EIA – Approach and Methods

3.9.2	Study area	<p>The study area for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and the <b>6.19 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate and through subsequent thematic workshops.</p>	<p>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. TDC feel there are opportunities outside the</p>	Agreed
-------	------------	---	--	--------

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.9.3	Data sources	Sufficient desktop and survey data (excluding viewpoints) has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 13.4 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b> . The Applicant notes that TDC queried the accuracy of baseline tree data/ vegetation loss. The Applicant has provided a response to this concern in Appendix AD, page 569, of <b>8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representations (Final Issue A) [REP1-132]</b> .	<p>study area, that could be taken to demonstrate 'no significant effect' that would aid understanding.</p> <p>TDC welcomes the increase of viewpoints that are now presented in the ES. Although the number of viewpoints has been increased, TDC still judge there are critical gaps in the viewpoint distribution that need filling in order to demonstrate assertions regarding extent of significance.</p> <p>Whilst all agreed criteria (on which assessment judgements are based) have now been identified and presented in the ES, TDC retain issue with the approach to landscape value and value of the view.</p> <p>In our forthcoming LIR TDC will identify several additional areas where we believe data quality and presentation could be improved in order to aid access and interpretation.</p>	Under discussion
3.9.4	Assessment methodology (including LVIA methodology)	<p>The outline methodology for assessing Landscape and Visual was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and the <b>6.19 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> 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 November 2024 to follow up any additional changes to the assessment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to viewpoints, whilst generally welcoming the increased viewpoint coverage, TDC agrees with ECC and retain concerns in a select individual areas where there remain gaps in the coverage – more detail will be provided in TDCs LIR.</li> <li>• In relation to valued landscapes see comments at 3.9.1 and 3.9.3 above.</li> <li>• TDC strongly support ECC's position</li> </ul>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>The assessment methodology is set out in <b>6.13. A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 - Landscape and Visual Methodology (Final Issue A) [APP-227]</b>.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.4.9 and Table A13.1.4 of <b>6.13.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.1 - Landscape and Visual Methodology (Final Issue A) [APP-227]</b> set out the approach to consideration of landscape value. The Applicant's position regarding the concerns raised regarding the approach to landscape value is set out in response ID 7.5.1 in Table 4.20 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	<p>and also retain concerns that without a separate valued landscape assessment the project cannot be judged fairly against policy in (EN-1) 5.10.12 '<i>Outside nationally designated areas, there are local landscapes that may be highly valued locally</i>' nor how the following in the current Holford Rules has been addressed, when the route was selected before landscape value criteria were included in the assessment: '<i>Where possible choose routes which minimise the effect on Special Landscape Areas, areas of Great Landscape Value and other similar designations of County, District or Local value.</i>' This issue is highly relevant to the valued landscapes surrounding Ardleigh and Little Bromley, including the National Landscape areas and fringe areas immediately to the north, north west and north east of Ardleigh and Little Bromley. These landscapes would experience significant impacts as a result of NGET's preferred route and the proposed EACN location.</p>	
3.9.5	Key parameters and assumptions	<p>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment are summarised in Section 13.4 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</p>	<p>TDC not sure what is meant by the terms key parameters and assumptions.</p>	Under Discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.9.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Landscape and Visual are presented in Section 13.5 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant's position regarding the concerns raised regarding the approach to visual receptors and groupings is set out in response ID 7.8.2 in Table 4.20 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant awaits further correspondence and will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>	<p>TDC identified concerns with the Visual Receptors and Groupings that are based only partially on shared landscape characteristics and a similarity in views. TDC also understand that, as the Project area is so large, the Visual Receptor Areas are a pragmatic way of organising the data, but fear clarity and detail may have been lost as a result. TDC retain these concerns.</p>	Under Discussion
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.9.7	Embedded mitigation	<p>The Applicant's approach to Landscape and Visual is presented within <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>, and in Section 4.11 'Landscape and Visual' of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>Embedded measures are those that are intrinsic to and built into the design of the Project, which are presented in Table 4.2 in <b>6.4 Environmental Statement Chapter 4 - Project Description (Final Issue A) [APP-130]</b> and also Paragraphs 13.6.2 to 13.6.4 in Section 13.6 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in</p>	<p>In terms of Landscape: TDC retain concerns around adequacy of undergrounding, mitigation and lack of adequate compensation.</p> <p>TDC acknowledges the embedded and standard mitigation measures proposed. However, these measures are not adequate and significant residual impacts remain, particularly the rural landscape areas in and around Ardleigh (to the north west, north and north east of Ardleigh), the vast area between Ardleigh and Little Bromley, and particularly severely affected areas to the west of Little Bromley.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Feedback from various respondents requested the proposed overhead line be replaced by the use of underground cable between the EACN substation and the Great Horkeley underground cable section. This area is not subject to designations that change the presumed general acceptability of overhead lines (as set out in EN-5) although the overhead alignment is relatively close to the Dedham Vale National Landscape (AONB). However, whilst potentially visible from locations within the AONB it is not considered that this would lead to effects that would justify, in policy terms, the very substantial additional costs and environmental effects arising from the installation of underground cable.</p> <p>Additionally, there are various locations (for example the crossing of Ardleigh reservoir and at the Wick Lane and Old Ipswich Road junction) where the adoption of underground cable would present substantial technical challenges that may not be possible to address without further increased effects. It is therefore considered that the use of 400 kV overhead line is still the most appropriate connection technology in this area.</p> <p>The Applicant refutes TDC's statement that the measures presented are not adequate, and therefore the Applicant proposes that this matter is not agreed.</p>		
3.9.8	Standard mitigation	<p>Standard mitigation measures comprise management activities and techniques which would be implemented during construction of the Project to limit effects through adherence to good site practices and achieving legal compliance.</p> <p>Standard mitigation measures to reduce potential</p>	<p>Standard mitigation measures do not wholly mitigate substantial significant temporary impacts caused by construction.</p> <p>Compensation for residual landscape and residual impacts, particularly in relation to the overhead infrastructure, is still not</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>Landscape and Visual effects during construction are summarised in Section 13.6 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b> and the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>The Applicant's position in relation to landscape compensation is set out in Section 3.10 'Landscape and Visual-Landscape Compensation' of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with TDC on this matter.</p>	addressed.	
3.9.9	Additional mitigation	<p>Additional mitigation comprises measures over and above any embedded and standard mitigation measures. The consideration of additional mitigation measures is presented in Section 13.6 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>.</p> <p>Section 2.5 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b> sets out the Applicant's approach to the mitigation hierarchy for the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on landscape mitigation and compensation is also set out in Section 3.10 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	Additional mitigation measures do not address significant residual negative impacts from pylons and the overhead cables.	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</b>				
3.9.10	Construction effects	The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 13.7 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b> . The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.	Potential tree and hedgerow loss along the route has not been meaningfully or accurately quantified in landscape and visual terms in the assessment (more detail and clarification will be forthcoming in TDCs LIR).	Under discussion
3.9.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 13.7 of <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b> . The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.	<p>To further reduce significant landscape and visual effects at the operational stage, greater use of undergrounding or route refinement is required, particularly within river valleys and where pylons are close to historic settlements such as Ardleigh, and to protect valued local landscapes, long distance public rights of way, and rural amenity areas.</p> <p>TDC has also noted that the PEIR acknowledges significant adverse landscape and visual effects during both the construction and operational phases across the length of the Project. However, no substantive proposals have been presented to offset or compensate for these impacts. As a result, these issues remain largely unaddressed.</p> <p>While the ES now sets out assessment criteria, including sensitivity (susceptibility and value) and magnitude of effect, TDC retains concerns regarding how some of these criteria are defined and applied.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.9.12	Outline CoCP	<p><b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Responses to matters raised in TDC's LIR can be found in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	A significant number of outstanding issues remain which are to be discussed and will be set out in TDCs LIR.	Under discussion
3.9.13	Outline LEMP	<p><b>7.4 Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Clean) (Final Issue D) [REP3-030]</b> includes all relevant operational related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b> and is appropriate.</p> <p>Responses to matters raised in TDC's LIR can be found in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	TDC echo ECCs concerns and also retain major issues particularly in relation to definition, scope and scale of term 'compensation'.	Under discussion
<b>Other matters as required</b>				
3.9.14	Cumulative Effects	<p>The cumulative effects of the Project have been assessed and are presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>.</p> <p>The cumulative assessment will be updated and published at Deadline 4 to include Five Estuaries, North Falls, the Tarchon Interconnector Project and any other newly identified schemes in the area.</p>	Concern regarding potential cumulative adverse landscape and visual effects, both at construction and long-term operational, particularly in relation to other NSIP projects such as North Falls and Five Estuaries substations and the Tarchon Interconnector.	Under discussion

### 3.10 Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism

Table 3.10 Matters Agreed, Not Agreed or Under Discussion in relation to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.10.1	Policy and legislation	The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and Section 15.2 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>	Agreed that all the relevant policy context, legislation and guidance have been included.	Agreed
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.10.2	Study area	<p>The <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> stated <i>“The Applicant should seek to agree the study area with the relevant local authorities”</i>.</p> <p>A meeting was held on 12 September 2024 to seek to agree this point in the Scoping Opinion.</p> <p>During the Thematic Group meeting in November 2024, it was agreed that the study area for businesses would be increased from 1 km to 3 km to account for visual effects on businesses.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> Technical Note was issued to TDC in March 2025 to seek agreement on the study area and methodology.</p> <p>Businesses where visual impact would be likely to be an economic consideration, that fall beyond the 3 km study area were not considered likely to have significant</p>	In principle, TDC considers the revised study area and assessment criteria for the Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism assessment to be acceptable. However it is unclear whether specific businesses that fall outside the defined study area but are likely to experience adverse effects—such as wedding and wellness venues, hotels, or other ‘quiet countryside’ tourism uses (list not exhaustive)—have been identified and assessed on a case-by-case basis – more information around this will be set out in TDC’s LIR.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		adverse effects. These included impact on land take, disruption to direct access or visual amenity.		
3.10.3	Data sources	<p>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Section 15.4 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>.</p> <p>The potential number of construction local employment is set out in the <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b> paragraphs 15.7.13 to 15.7.14.</p> <p>Post construction job opportunities are limited given the nature of the development however we will still work with Local Planning Authorities (including facilitating local partners) to understand what is important to them around skills and employment to ensure we leave a lasting positive legacy in the communities where we operate. With regards to a delivery mechanism, the above measures will be delivered as part of our community benefit package, which will look at both local and regional initiatives. This will be delivered outside the development consent process and is not a material consideration in the decision on the proposed 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).</p> <p>In response, and to elaborate on what the Applicant set in response to Relevant Representations and without prejudice to the Applicant's position that such matters do not constitute mitigation, the Applicant now proposes to</p>	Clarification is needed on what is being done for training and skills. There is a lack of reference to data on employment and skills and it is suggested a regional skills analysis is undertaken.	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>prepare and submit an Employment and Skills Plan into the Examination at Deadline 5. This document is intended to provide transparency and clarity regarding the approach that the Applicant and its delivery partner, The Great Grid Partnership, will take to employment, skills, training and supply chain engagement during construction of the Project. The Applicant will engage with host authorities to inform the content of the Employment and Skills Plan.</p>		
3.10.4	Assessment methodology	<p>The <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b> 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 14 November 2024 to seek to agree the points raised in the Scoping Opinion. Technical Notes were shared in June 2023 and April 2024.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> Technical Note was issued to TDC on 28 March 2025 to seek agreement on the study area and methodology.</p> <p>Businesses where visual impact would be likely to be an economic consideration, that fall beyond the 3 km study area were not considered likely to have significant adverse effects. These included impact on land take, disruption to direct access or visual amenity.</p>	<p>In principle, TDC considers the revised study area and assessment criteria for the Socioeconomics, Recreation and Tourism assessment to be acceptable. However, TDC considers that where specific businesses fall outside the defined study area but are likely to experience adverse effects—such as wedding and wellness venues, hotels, or other ‘quiet countryside’ tourism uses—these impacts should be identified and assessed on a case by case basis.</p>	Not agreed
3.10.5	Key parameters and assumptions	<p>In response, and to elaborate on what the Applicant set in response to Relevant Representations and without prejudice to the Applicant’s position that such matters do not constitute mitigation, the Applicant proposes to</p>	<p>Again, clarification is requested on what NGET are doing for training and skills. There is a lack of reference to data on District level employment and skills, and it</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>prepare and submit an Employment and Skills Plan into the Examination at Deadline 5. This document is intended to provide transparency and clarity regarding the approach that the Applicant and its delivery partner, The Great Grid Partnership, will take to employment, skills, training and supply chain engagement during construction of the Project. The Applicant will engage with host authorities to inform the content of the Employment and Skills Plan.</p>	<p>is suggested that a regional skills analysis is undertaken. TDC would also like to take the opportunity again to suggest that skills should be considered separately from community benefits.</p>	

### EIA – Baseline Conditions

3.10.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism are presented in Section 15.5 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p>The <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b> set out the identified tourism and recreation businesses within the Order Limits. <b>6.15. A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1 - Built and Other Assets within the 3 km Study Area (Final Issue A) [APP-266]</b> set out the identified tourism and recreation businesses within a 3 km buffer from the Order Limits.</p> <p>The level of sensitivity matrix has been guided by various EIA guidance documents. Multiple factors have been considered when assigning a level of sensitivity, including availability, visitor numbers and the employment scale.</p>	<p>Generally acceptable however the baseline would benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater local nuance, particularly in recognising the vulnerability of smaller, “quiet countryside” tourism and leisure businesses; and</li> <li>• More explicit acknowledgement of sensitivity, given Tendring’s high deprivation ranking and reliance on recreation, tourism, and amenity value for local wellbeing.</li> </ul>	Under discussion
--------	-----------------------------------	---	---	------------------

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.10.7	Embedded mitigation	<p>Embedded mitigation measures, designed as an inherent part of the Project relevant to Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism effects, are set out in Section 15.6 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>. Embedded mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Following each consultation the Applicant reviewed and considered all feedback received. The Applicant then went through a series of change control meetings to consider potential design changes in response to feedback, which resulted in changes to the alignment, access and order limits, ahead of the Applicant finalising its design for its DCO application. The mitigation hierarchy has been implemented sequentially, beginning with avoidance measures, followed by the targeted change control process, and concluding with the development of construction management plans.</p> <p>The Project has carefully considered the district's specific context. By prioritising the avoidance of sensitive receptors throughout the design process, the embedded mitigation aims to minimise potential impacts on these critical social and economic factors.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed and responded to comments raised in TDC's LIR in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b>.</p>	<p>The proposed embedded mitigation relies heavily on avoidance rather than targeted design responses, and therefore offers limited reassurance for dispersed small tourism businesses, events, and amenity based uses; and</p> <p>The embedded mitigation does not fully reflect the district's higher vulnerability, including deprivation levels and reliance on countryside recreation and tourism for wellbeing and the local economy.</p> <p>Therefore, the embedded mitigation is not, on its own, sufficient in scale to address potential socio-economic, recreation, and tourism effects in Tendring. Additional, more locally responsive mitigation and management measures are likely to be required. TDC will elaborate on these points in our forthcoming LIR.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.10.8	Standard mitigation	<p>Standard and specific mitigation measures to reduce potential socio-economics, recreation and tourism effects during construction are summarised in Section 15.6 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265], 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025], 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028] and 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Final Issue A) [APP-329]</b>. These include the proactive management of anticipated disruption to minimise the potential impact. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects</p> <p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025], 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028] and 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Final Issue A) [APP-329]</b> will be further developed post-consent to provide site-specific construction management plans.</p> <p>Due to the linear and rolling nature of the construction works, activities within any given area are anticipated to be of short duration. Therefore, potential significant cumulative impacts at a local level are not expected.</p>	<p>Insofar as the standard mitigation measures proposed for recreational/tourism businesses in the district of Tendring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mitigation is largely reactive and generic, focusing on managing disruption once it arises rather than proactively avoiding or minimising impacts at particularly sensitive locations;</li> <li>• It does not sufficiently distinguish between low sensitivity and more vulnerable businesses, such as small rural tourism businesses, caravan parks, events, amenity based uses, and small agricultural businesses with a recreational offer that rely heavily on setting and continuity of access; and</li> <li>• The scale of mitigation does not fully reflect the cumulative intensity and long duration of construction activity expected in parts of Tendring, nor the district's higher levels of deprivation and reliance on recreation and tourism for wellbeing and local resilience.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, whilst the standard mitigation put forward may be appropriate as a baseline framework, on its own it will not be sufficient to address potential socio-economic, recreation and tourism effects in Tendring without additional, locally tailored mitigation, enhanced</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.10.9	Additional mitigation	<p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in Section 15.6 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>The Applicant notes TDC's comment on potential impacts on the road network arising from the proposed construction works. The Additional Mitigation section referenced different ES chapters that provide mitigations for Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism effects, including <b>6.16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16 - Traffic and Transport (Final Issue A) [APP-271]</b> which includes traffic related mitigation measures in the <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028]</b>. These measures include managing impacts arising from temporary road closures, providing diversion routes where appropriate, and maintaining communication with the local authorities and residents throughout construction activities.</p> <p>Peake Fruit Ltd falls beyond the study area for the business assessment. Both the Fishing lake north-west of Ardleigh, and Ardleigh and Ardleigh Caravan and Camping Park have been assessed to have a potential permanent, long-term, moderate adverse and significant effect.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to having ongoing communication with the affected business, aiming to</p>	<p>engagement, and clearer and legally binder delivery commitments during detailed design and construction.</p> <p>Whilst the additional mitigation measures set out aim to respond directly to the types of impacts expected locally (e.g., temporary disruption to events, PRow's, businesses, recreational assets, and community access) and are generally considered proportionate, this section fails to properly take into account potential for road network disruptions, road closures/addition HGV traffic on local roads and potential impacts on local business, tourism, hospitality etc (also see comments under corresponding sections above around highways mitigation or lack thereof).</p> <p>There are at least three receptors in Tendring (Peak Fruit, the fishing lake north-west of Ardleigh and Ardleigh Caravan &amp; Camping Park) that will undoubtedly experience significant residual adverse effects, and these relate to permanent land-take or long-term physical change that cannot be mitigated due to the severity of the impacts. TDC note NGET position which appear to be that Compensation discussions sit outside the ES however this does not address the potential prospect that some/all of these businesses (and others as mentioned in Ardleigh and Little Bromley Parish Councils</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>minimise the impact on the businesses. Please note that compensation cannot be accounted as a mitigation measure in EIA terms. Hence, this matter falls beyond the scope of the ES.</p>	<p>Relevant Representation (and other submission) will face very significant impacts which could put their future in doubt.</p>	
<b>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</b>				
3.10.10	Construction effects	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 15.7 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>. The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p>The sensitivity matrix has been guided by various EIA guidance documents. These documents provide best practice frameworks for evaluating receptor sensitivity. For each receptor identified within the study areas, the level of sensitivity has been systematically assessed using a consistent and transparent methodology. This approach ensures that all receptors are evaluated based on the same criteria, reducing potential bias and subjectivity in the assessment process, as well as ensuring that sensitivity ratings assigned to different receptors can be reliably compared, supporting a robust analysis across the study areas.</p> <p>Cumulative effects on the tourism economy, businesses and other built assets are set out in the <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>.</p> <p>Indirect effects, including financial effects on individual businesses, have been scoped out of the ES to maintain a proportionate assessment and the financial matter</p>	<p>Sensitivity for a large number of businesses in the location in and around Ardleigh, Little Bromley, Great Bromley, Lawford and further afield is likely understated for especially:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small, rural, seasonal businesses (e.g. caravan parks, angling venues, recreation-based enterprises and business relying on the rural road network to function).</li> <li>• Businesses with limited resilience to short-term to medium term (read up to 7 years) disruption, even where impacts are judged to be “temporary”.</li> </ul> <p>Cumulative and indirect effects (e.g. reputational impacts, loss of custom during peak season, repeated access disruption) are explicitly (and conveniently) scoped out.</p> <p>The assessment is area-wide, meaning very significant and serious localised harm in places like Ardleigh and Little Bromley can be diluted when judged at the Wider Study Area scale.</p> <p>In summary, the assessment in 15.7 likely underplays the practical and economic risk</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>would be the subject of individual landowner negotiations and fall beyond the scope of an EIA. This is in accordance with the scope set out in the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and the <b>6.19 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b>.</p> <p>The assessment of businesses and other built assets has been conducted individually for each receptor identified. This is set out in <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>; Table 15.22: Potential residual construction effect on built and other assets, Table 15.28 Residual operation (and maintenance) effect on built and other assets, and <b>6.15.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1 - Built and Other Assets within the 3 km Study Area (Final Issue A) [APP-266]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges TDC's comment on the effects on small tourism and recreation businesses in Tendring. Given the rolling nature of the linear works, the construction activities in any particular area are likely to be short-term in nature.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed</p>	<p>to small tourism and recreation businesses in Tendring, particularly around Ardleigh and Little Bromley, and local business impacts may be more severe in reality than the "not significant" conclusions suggest, especially during peak tourist and event seasons.</p>	
3.10.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 15.7 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Findings for impacts on businesses, recreation and tourism during operation (and maintenance) are that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most businesses and recreation/tourism assets, including those in and around Ardleigh and Little Bromley will be experiencing 'negligible or minor</li> </ul>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>The assessment of businesses and other built assets has been conducted based on the scope and methodology as set out in the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and the <b>6.19 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> and Technical Notes shared with the LPAs.</p> <p>The magnitude of impact matrix has been guided by various EIA guidance documents and further developed following different thematic group engagement throughout the EIA stages. The magnitude of impact has been systematically assessed using a consistent and transparent methodology with no 'isolated cases'.</p> <p><b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue) [REP3-025]</b>, <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028]</b> and <b>7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Final Issue A) [APP-329]</b> set out the proposed mitigation measures to ensure potential construction impacts arising from the Project will be managed.</p> <p>The assessment of the tourism economy has been conducted based on the Wider Study Area. Financial effects on individual businesses have been scoped out of the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed and responded to the LIR accordingly in Deadline 2 in <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports (Final Issue A) [REP2-030]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed</p>	<p>adverse, not significant operational effects'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conclusion is driven largely by findings that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Access is retained,</li> <li>– Operations can continue, and</li> <li>– Visual effects are not considered to translate into material economic harm at business or area scale.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>TDC disputes all these points for multiple reasons set out in this version of the SOCG, in our RR and in our forthcoming LIR</p> <p>TDC notes that exceptions exist (i.e. higher impacts than the levels set out above) where permanent land take may lead to business closures or loss of use (e.g. the fishing lake), which are acknowledged as significant adverse effects but treated as 'isolated cases'.</p> <p>Tourism economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ES concludes that operational effects will not materially affect the Tendring tourism economy, on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Attractions remain available,</li> <li>– The area's overall appeal is maintained, and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
			<p>– Visual change alone is not assumed to cause economic loss.</p> <p>Not only does TDC dispute this but also, these conclusions underestimate long-term operational risk for especially small recreation and tourism businesses around Ardleigh and Little Bromley, and those that rely heavily on the local road network and the current tranquil rural environment that will of course dramatically change.</p> <p>Also, localised economic impacts may be greater in practice than the “not significant” conclusions suggest, particularly where business viability depends on landscape quality and visitor perception.</p>	
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.10.12	Outline CoCP	<p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant construction related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>A meeting was held in March 2025 to discuss the second iteration of the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Final Issue A) [APP-300]</b> (Superseded by <b>[REP2-14, and REP3-025]</b>)</p> <p>A further iteration of the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Final Issue A) [APP-300]</b></p>	<p>Most of the construction related mitigation measures are Non-specific by design and location because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Outline CoCP is high level, with no asset/location specific commitments for individual businesses in Tendring.</li> <li>• The success of suggested mitigation is, for the most part, reliant on future contractor behaviour</li> <li>• Effectiveness of mitigation especially for small tourism and recreation businesses depends on:</li> </ul>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>(Superseded by [REP2-14, and REP3-025]) was issued in May 2025 following the meeting and feedback.</p> <p><b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025], 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028] and 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (Final Issue A) [APP-329]</b> will be further developed post-consent to provide site-specific construction management plans. The final CoCP would be approved by the relevant local planning authorities as detailed in Requirement 4(1) of the <b>3.1 Draft DCO (Final Issue C) [REP3-004]</b>.</p> <p>Please note that compensation cannot be accounted as a mitigation measure in EIA terms. Hence, this matter falls beyond the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to having ongoing communication with the affected business, aiming to minimise the impact on the businesses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Early and continuous engagement from NGET/Contractors?</li> <li>– Timely communication,</li> <li>– Sensitivity to peak seasons.</li> </ul> <p>There is no economic mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CoCP focuses on managing disruption, not on compensating for loss of trade, reputational impacts or closure (because of impacts).</li> </ul> <p>The suggested mitigation package clearly aims to manage construction impacts in principle, including in Ardleigh and Little Bromley. These measures may not fully protect small, rural recreation and tourism businesses unless implemented proactively and locally sensitively – it is imperative that the DCO address these matters and effectively secure these measures in a legally enforceable manner.</p> <p>Detailed, location specific Construction Management Plans and strong local engagement will be critical to make the mitigation effective in practice.</p>	

## 3.11 Cumulative Effects

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

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
<b>EIA – Regulatory, Planning Policy Context and Guidance</b>				
3.11.1	Policy and legislation	<p>The policy context, legislation and guidance considered when undertaking the Cumulative Effects assessment is presented in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b> and Section 17.2 of <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b></p> <p>All relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been identified and appropriately considered to inform the assessment.</p>	Appropriately cover policy context, legislation and guidance	Agreed
<b>EIA – Approach and Methods</b>				
3.11.2	Study area	<p>The study area was agreed through <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	The study area was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	Agreed
3.11.3	Data sources	<p>Sufficient desktop and survey data has been collected to inform the assessment as presented within Sections 17.4 and 17.5 of <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b></p>	Unclear – TDC need more time to thoroughly consider desktop and survey data.	Under discussion
3.11.4	Assessment methodology	<p>The methodology for assessing Cumulative Effects was agreed through the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report (Final Issue A) [APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> received from the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	The methodology for assessing Cumulative Effects was agreed through the EIA Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion received from the Planning Inspectorate.	Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.11.5 a	Key parameters and assumptions	<p>Key parameters and assumptions associated with the Cumulative Effects assessment are summarised in Sections 17.5 and 17.6 of <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>. The key parameters and assumptions presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p><b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b> includes an assessment of Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism, including effects on local businesses (Table 15.22, Table 15.28 and <b>6.15.A1 Environmental Statement Appendix 15.1 - Built and Other Assets within the 3 km Study Area (Final Issue A) [APP-266]</b>) and tourism economy (Paragraphs 15.7.15 to 15.7.19 of <b>6.15 Environmental Statement Chapter 15 - Socio-economics Recreation and Tourism (Final Issue A) [APP-265]</b>) in the Tendring area. The assessments were undertaken in accordance with <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report - Appendix A Part 1 – 8, and Appendix B to K (Final Issue A) [APP-288 to APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> together with other similar projects including Yorkshire GREEN and Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement. The assessments conclude potential effects on local businesses located in Tendring range from negligible to moderate adverse (three businesses are predicted to be moderate adverse) effects during construction, and neutral to moderate adverse (two businesses are predicted to be moderate adverse) effects during operation, as well as a negligible adverse effect on tourism economy during construction.</p>	<p>TDC's view is that section 17.4 (Chapter 17) underrepresents the intensity and lived reality of cumulative construction effects in Tendring, particularly around Ardleigh and Little Bromley.</p> <p>For socio-economics, recreation and tourism (and as set out elsewhere), assumptions rely heavily on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard mitigation being effective,</li> <li>• Disruption being temporary and manageable,</li> <li>• No meaningful interaction between perception, repeated disruption, and economic impacts.</li> </ul> <p>This approach is not suitable to TDC because communities will be experiencing stacked, prolonged construction phases across multiple (<i>known</i>) projects.</p>	Not Agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.11.5 b	Key parameters and assumptions	<p>Cumulative effects on socio-economics (including effects on local businesses and tourism economy), are set out in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant considers it is unlikely that the two parties will find a mutually agreed position, and therefore suggest this matter is moved to Not Agreed</p> <p>A cut-off date of 1 April 2025 was used to confirm the long list of cumulative developments to be assessed. The s35 Direction was not issued for the Tarchon project until 7 April 2025, however, since 1 April, the Applicant has been undertaking monthly reviews of planning registers and will continue to do so during the Examination period, to check whether there are any new relevant developments. If this review identifies the potential for new or different significant effects or changes to the conclusions presented in the ES, these would be published during Examination as updates to the relevant inter-project Cumulative Effects documents (as appropriate). Cumulative Effects documents would not be updated just because there is new information available about a development, where this information has been assessed as having no change to the assessment or conclusions presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>. In addition, the Tarchon Interconnector project will be required to undertake its own cumulative effects assessment with other developments as part of their respective development consent application.</p>	<p>The cutoff date (for known project insofar as cumulative assessment is concerns is 1 April 2025, this date clearly excludes later stage proposals that may realistically overlap in Tendring and completely ignores the fact that housing targets in TDC and wider Essex have now doubled, this approach reduces sensitivity and accuracy of assessment insofar as the genuine emerging cumulative pressure It appears as though minor developments and non NSIP infrastructure are excluded, despite their relevance in an already saturated infrastructure landscape. The assessment also ignores the likely follow-up renewable energy related proposals that may well follow in this area if all this infrastructure is built here (e.g. more solar farms, interconnectors (such as Tarchon) etc).</p> <p>No corresponding uplift or acknowledgement in sensitivity is applied to areas like Ardleigh / Little Bromley</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>The Applicant has engaged with other developers who are proposing development in proximity of the Project to understand their requirements. Meetings have been held with the North Falls and Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm project teams. Both of these wind farms are proposed to connect into the proposed East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) Substation. Both projects involve the construction of new substations, which are proposed to be located adjacent to the EACN Substation. The Applicant worked with North Falls and Five Estuaries project teams up to the submission of the development consent application and assessments are considered to be accurate and reflective of the current numbers included within each of the wind farm projects application/DCO (North Falls and Five Estuaries). It is noted and accepted that the Norwich to Tilbury numbers included within the wind farms assessments are reflective of an earlier stage of assessment for the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing to work with the wind farms to establish if any programme adjustments can be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reduce the likelihood of both projects' peak construction activities coinciding</li> <li>• To ensure the proposed connection to the East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) Substation for the wind farm takes place at the correct stage of the Project.</li> </ul> <p>Project teams have worked collaboratively to reduce potential cumulative traffic effects should they be undertaken in parallel. Examples of this include use of a shared haul road for construction traffic, a common noise</p>	<p>despite acknowledged infrastructure clustering.</p> <p>Assumptions that effects are “no worse than assessed alone” tend to mask the severity of the compounding disruption, particularly for access, amenity and rural tourism perception.</p> <p>Ultimately, the cumulative assessment is not fully reflective of the exceptional cumulative construction burden experienced in Tendring.</p> <p>TDC strongly argues that the assumptions underplay prolonged, concentrated disruption effects in a highly rural area that is significantly disconnected from the strategic road network currently, and these are disruption effects outside landscape and visual topics (so it does not even take into account landscape and visual effect topics).</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>monitoring protocol, and coordination over landscape and ecological mitigation.</p> <p>Landscape – The assessment presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b> relating to landscape and visual receptors identifies major adverse and significant interproject effects on the landscape of Bromley Heaths Landscape Character Area (both during construction and operation). As such the effects are not under-represented for landscape effects. The assessment also identifies moderate adverse and significant inter-project visual effects within Visual Receptor Area (VRA) C13 Little Bromley during construction. The Applicant notes an error in the reporting of inter-project visual effects during operation (and maintenance). The assessment should state that major adverse and significant cumulative effects are predicted within the VRA during operation (and maintenance) – this will be reflected in the next iteration of the Errata List (<b>8.1 Errata List (Final Issue A) [REP1-071]</b>).</p>		
<b>EIA – Baseline Conditions</b>				
3.11.6	Baseline conditions and receptors	<p>The baseline conditions and receptors for Cumulative Effects are presented within the environmental topic chapters (Chapter 6 – 16) of the ES <b>[APP-123 to APP-287]</b>. The baseline conditions and receptors presented are considered appropriate.</p> <p><b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b> has been undertaken in accordance with the <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report - Appendix A Part 1 – 8, and Appendix B to K (Final Issue A) [APP-288 to APP-</b></p>	<p>TDC generally agree that the baseline conditions and receptors are consistent with EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note because they appear to:</p> <p>Include all relevant local developments and sensitive receptors; and are Reflective of Tendring's rural character, landscape sensitivity, PRow density, and ongoing NSIP activity.</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b> by competent and professional experts.</p> <p>The cumulative assessment for the Project had a cut-off date of 1 April 2025. However, since 1 April the Applicant has been undertaking monthly reviews of planning registers and will continue to do so during the Examination period, to check whether there are any new relevant developments. Where this review identifies the potential for new or different significant effects or changes to the conclusions presented in the Environmental Statement, these would be published during Examination as updates to the relevant inter-project Cumulative Effects documents (as appropriate). Cumulative Effects documents would not be updated just because there is new information available about a development, where this information has been assessed as having no change to the assessment or conclusions presented in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>. Please see ID3.11.7 to 3.11.9 for details on cumulative effects across the topics.</p>	<p>However, it should be stressed that TDC strongly disagree with the conclusions in the ES around cumulative impacts (see sections below and more information will be set out in our forthcoming LIR).</p>	
<b>EIA – Embedded, Standard and Additional Mitigation Measures</b>				
3.11.7	Embedded mitigation	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects considers the residual effects identified during construction and operation (and maintenance) within the environmental topic chapters (<b>Chapters 6 – 16 of the ES) [APP-123 to APP-287]</b>. 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.</p>	<p>The ES states that no additional mitigation is proposed for cumulative effects beyond the measures already embedded within the topic level assessments. However, as TDC has set out in multiple locations within this revised SoCG, and will further detail in our forthcoming LIR, we fundamentally disagree that the embedded mitigation presented in several topic</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>The Applicant has set out how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied to the Project in <b>6.5 Environmental Statement Chapter 5 - EIA Approach and Method (Final Issue A) [APP-135]</b> and other application documents including <b>5.6 Planning Statement (Final Issue A) [APP-085]</b>. National Policy Statements EN-1 (2024) and EN-5 (2024) do not state that all residual effects must be compensated for or that any compensation measure proposed must be accepted if there are residual effects.</p> <p>Section 4.15 of <b>8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030]</b> sets out the Applicant's response to matters raised by TDC in relation to cumulative effects.</p>	<p>chapters is sufficient or effective. It therefore follows naturally that, if the cumulative effects assessment relies entirely on these same embedded measures—which we consider to be inadequately and inaccurately assessed—TDC must strongly disagree with the conclusion that no further mitigation for cumulative effects is required.</p>	
3.11.8	Standard mitigation	<p>The assessment of cumulative effects considers the residual effects identified during construction and operation (and maintenance) within the environmental topic chapters (<b>Chapters 6 – 16 of the ES) [APP-123 to APP-287]</b>. Standard mitigation measures during construction are summarised in the environmental topic chapters (Chapter 6 – 16) of the ES and set out in the <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. The standard mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>See comments on landscape and visual standard mitigation at ID3.9.8.</p> <p>The Applicant is required to consider National Landscapes under planning policy and guidance when routeing, designing and assessing new electricity transmission infrastructure. Further details of the</p>	<p>TDC has taken note of the package of standard mitigation measures proposed although the adequacy and success of this package will depend on whether the mitigation is sufficient in scale to manage the actual level of impact that Tendring faces—especially cumulative impacts from multiple NSIPs and local developments in and around Ardleigh and Little Bromley. On landscape and visual, TDC maintains that the standard measures reduce nuisance but cannot mitigate against significant cumulative landscape impacts in Tendring's sensitive open plateaux and landscapes bordering the Dedham Vale National Landscape.</p>	Not agreed

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>approach taken in relation to National Landscapes can be found in <b>6.2 Environmental Statement Chapter 2 - Key Legislation and Planning Policy Context (Final Issue A) [APP-126]</b>, <b>6.3 Environmental Statement Chapter 3 – Alternatives (Final Issue A) [APP-127]</b>, <b>5.7 Policy Compliance Document (Final Issue A) [APP-086]</b>, <b>5.15 Design Development Report (Final Issue A) [APP-122]</b> and <b>7.15 Design and Access Statement (Clean) (Final Issue B) [REP2-020]</b>.</p> <p>The Project has been designed to minimise effects on Dedham Vale National Landscape, including consideration of the Project within the National Landscape and its setting. While there would be significant effects during construction due to the installation of underground cables, these would reduce and be not significant during operation. There would be no significant effects on the National Landscape as a result of the proposed new East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) Substation or overhead lines. The assessment of effects of the Project on Dedham Vale National Landscape is set out in <b>6.13. A5 Environmental Statement Appendix 13.5 - National Landscape Assessment Study (Final Issue A) [APP-235]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that stakeholders may have concerns about the cumulative effects arising from overlapping Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and other schemes in the local area. <b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 – Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> includes a specific assessment of the impacts of the Project on mental health and wellbeing during both construction and operation. A cumulative assessment is provided in <b>6.17</b></p>	<p>On PROWs, Recreational countryside use (by the Public) and other community impacts – whilst the standard mitigation may be deemed 'appropriate' on paper for safety and access management, TDC maintains the view that they are insufficient to address cumulative impacts on valued and well used rural paths and recreation assets.</p> <p>On Traffic, Noise, Dust, Water &amp; General Environmental Risks – whilst the package of mitigation measures are wide ranging and aimed at reducing impacts on the environment, TDC continue to have reservations around whether the local roads will be able to cope with the sheer volumes of cumulative construction traffic and whether the noise and dust mitigation measures will in fact be effective if for example the very long cumulative construction phases for all the NSIPs combined (over 5 years) will straddle dry and hot summers which are becoming more prevalent now.</p>	

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Environmental Statement Chapter 17 - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>. Paragraph 17.5.47 identifies that, in a number of instances, adverse effects on mental health and wellbeing may be particularly relevant as a result of the scale of other development (for example significant residential or infrastructure development) and associated perceived effects on neighbourhood quality / sense of place / uncertainty during the construction phases.</p> <p><b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> includes an assessment of impacts on both physical and mental wellbeing during both the construction and operation (and maintenance) phases of the Project. The assessment has been informed by the findings from other Environmental Statement chapters, for example <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b>, <b>6.7 Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Air Quality (Final Issue A) [APP-147]</b>, <b>6.16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16 - Traffic and Transport (Final Issue A) [APP-271]</b> and <b>6.13 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 - Landscape and Visual (Final Issue A) [APP-226]</b>. The scope of environmental assessments has been undertaken in line with the approach set out in <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report - Appendix A Part 1 – 8, and Appendix B to K (Final Issue A) [APP-288 to APP-296]</b> and agreed in <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b>. The scope of the health and wellbeing assessment was discussed with stakeholders prior to DCO submission at two Health and Wellbeing Thematic Group meetings. <b>6.10</b></p>		

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> includes an assessment of the potential impacts of the Project in relation to the four protective factors for mental health and wellbeing set out in the National Mental Health Development Unit<sup>3</sup> toolkit.</p> <p><b>6.10 Environmental Statement Chapter 10 - Health and Wellbeing (Final Issue A) [APP-192]</b> also considers the potential impact of the Project on physical activity, which includes the potential for disruption to recreational routes or areas of open space and how that may affect opportunities for physical activity. Impacts on both the general population and on vulnerable groups (including children and the elderly) have been considered throughout the health and wellbeing assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to the principle of reducing traffic impacts on the district's highway network, identified within the <b>7.11 Transport Assessment (Final Issue A) [APP-333]</b>. The Applicant is undertaking further analysis to understand whether there are any opportunities to phase work activities differently to reduce peak hour traffic impacts.</p> <p>The Applicant has developed the <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028]</b> which includes a section on communicating and liaising with other developments within the area of the Project. Section 2.4.2 of <b>7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Final Issue B) [REP3-028]</b> states that the Applicant is proposing to use the Permit Scheme in place and</p>		

<sup>3</sup> Cooke et al., (2011) National Mental Health Development Unit toolkit.

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>operated by Essex CC to best coordinate the street works required for the Project.</p> <p>An assessment of construction noise is presented in <b>6.14 Environmental Statement Chapter 14 - Noise and Vibration (Final Issue A) [APP-256]</b> which was undertaken in accordance with <b>6.19 EIA Scoping Report - Appendix A Part 1 – 8, and Appendix B to K (Final Issue A) [APP-288 to APP-296]</b> and <b>6.20 Scoping Opinion (Final Issue A) [APP-297]</b>. The assessment provided indicates that no significant effects are expected in relation to noise and vibration from the construction of the East Anglia Connection Node (EACN) Substation, cable corridor, or pylon construction with appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>Additionally, the Main Works Contractor(s) would undertake detailed construction noise and vibration assessments based on their specific methodologies (including working hours), as per Commitment NV05 in <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b>. Based on the outcome of these assessments, specific mitigation measures (including temporal restrictions, where appropriate) would be identified and implemented such that significant adverse effects are avoided. These measures would be documented in the Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) (which would be updated from <b>7.4 Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix F – Outline and Vibration Management Plan (Final Issue A) [APP-306]</b>), and this is secured via Requirement 4 in <b>3.1 Draft DCO (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-004]</b></p>		

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
3.11.9	Additional mitigation	<p>Significant cumulative noise effects are also not predicted within <b>6.17 Environmental Statement - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>.</p> <p>The consideration of additional mitigation measures are presented in Section 17.4 and 17.5 of <b>6.17 Environmental Statement - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>. Additional mitigation is considered appropriate and adequate, in terms of its nature and scale, to address potential effects.</p> <p>Please see ID3.11.8 for details on cumulative landscape effects.</p> <p>Please see ID3.11.8 for details on cumulative community and health effects.</p>	<p>Again TDC note that no new or bespoke additional mitigation has been proposed specifically in response to cumulative effects – for the same reason as set out under 3.11.7 TDC disagree.</p> <p>To be clear, standard mitigation proposed under all the environmental topics are not adequate in scale to address some of the most key and significant cumulative effects affecting Tendring—including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and visual cumulative effects, and</li> <li>• Cumulative recreational/PRoW and residential amenity effects (list not exhaustive).</li> </ul> <p>The ES does not introduce any genuinely additional or enhanced mitigation targeted at cumulative effects themselves. As such, TDC's most critical cumulative impacts remain unmitigated beyond standard and embedded measures.</p>	Not Agreed
<b>EIA – Assessment Conclusions</b>				
3.11.10	Construction effects	<p>The assessment of effects during construction is presented in Section 17.4 and 17.5 of <b>6.17 Environmental Statement - Cumulative Effects (Final</b></p>	<p>TDC's position is whilst the assessment (of effects during construction) is generally sound it falls short in fully representing the scale of cumulative construction disruption</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p><b>Issue A) [APP-281].</b> The assessment of effects during construction presented is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Please see ID3.11.8 for details on cumulative landscape effects and cumulative community and health effects.</p>	<p>experienced by Tendring's rural communities, especially the communities in and around Ardleigh and Little Bromley, in, particularly relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• landscape and visual amenity</li> <li>• PRow and recreational access</li> <li>• combined sensory / residential amenity disturbance (noise, dust, general construction movement /t activity)</li> <li>• community and rural character impacts</li> </ul> <p>So, whilst TDC consider the assessment to be technically sound, it falls short in capturing how multiple, simultaneous construction pressures compound the lived experience for residents and users of Tendring's open countryside in the areas in and around Ardleigh and Little Bromley.</p>	
3.11.11	Operational (and maintenance) effects	<p>The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) is presented in Section 17.4 and 17.5 of <b>6.17 Environmental Statement - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b>. The assessment of effects during operation (and maintenance) presented is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Yes – the assessment of cumulative operational (and maintenance) effects is broadly appropriate for Tendring District, however as detailed elsewhere below and in our forthcoming LIR the appropriateness does not necessarily mean that all operational impacts are acceptable, only that the assessment method and coverage are appropriate.</p>	Agreed
<b>Draft DCO / Outline Management Plans / Mitigation and Monitoring</b>				
3.11.12	Outline CoCP	<p>The <b>7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice (Clean) (Final Issue C) [REP3-025]</b> includes all relevant</p>	<p>The CoCP contains no additional or enhanced measures targeted at the</p>	Under discussion

ID	Matter	National Grid's Position	Tendring District Council's Position	Status
		<p>construction related mitigation measures specified in <b>6.17 Environmental Statement - Cumulative Effects (Final Issue A) [APP-281]</b> and is appropriate for managing construction impacts from the Project.</p> <p>Please see ID3.11.8 for details on cumulative landscape effects, cumulative community and health effects and cumulative traffic, dust and noise effects.</p>	<p>significant cumulative construction impacts affecting areas in and around Ardleigh, Little Bromley and the surrounding countryside, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and visual effects during construction</li> <li>• PRow disruption and recreational amenity loss</li> <li>• Combined sensory disturbance (traffic, plant movement, haul roads, noise, dust) in small rural settlements</li> </ul> <p>The ES itself recognises that significant cumulative effects remain even after embedded/standard CoCP measures are applied, particularly for landscape/visual receptors and PRow users.</p> <p>Therefore, while the mitigation is appropriate in type, it is not sufficient in scale to avoid these significant residual effects in Tendring.</p>	

Other matters as required

### 3.12 Development Consent Order

3.12.1 Tendring District Council defer to Essex County Council regarding the draft Development Consent Order and proposed requirements within the Statement of Common Ground and will work alongside all host authorities and the Applicant to progress this separately.

## 4. Confirmation of Agreement

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

Signed for and on behalf of National Grid:

.....

Date:

.....

Signed for and on behalf of Tendring District Council:

.....

Date:

.....

# Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Reference
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Loads
AIS	Air Insulated Switchgear
AOD	Above Ordnance Datum
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
CSE	Cable Sealing End
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
EACN	East Anglia Connection Node
EHO	Environmental Health Officer
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
GI	Ground Investigation
GW	Gigawatt
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
NCR	National Cycle Route
NETS	National Electricity Transmission System
NPSs	National Policy Statements
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PRoW	Public Right of Way
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoCC	Statement of Community Consultation
SPZ	Source Protection Zone
TDC	Tendring District Council
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

Abbreviation	Full Reference
Zol	Zone of Influence
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

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)