



NORWICH TO TILBURY

EN020027

Response to the Rule 17 Letter dated 14 July 2026

Babergh District Council [REDACTED]

Mid Suffolk District Council [REDACTED]

Deadline 7
21 July 2026

Table of Contents

Glossary of Acronyms.....	2
Purpose of this Submission	3
Response to the Rule 17 Letter dated 14 July 2026.....	4
1 Draft Development Consent Order	4
2 Compulsory acquisition and temporary possession of land and rights.....	17
3 Biodiversity, ecology and the natural environment.....	21
4 Historic environment.....	22
5 Land use and soils, green infrastructure	24
6 Landscape and visual.....	25
7 Safety and security (aviation safety)	30
8 Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism.....	31
9 Water environment: flood risk, hydrology and drainage	33

Glossary of Acronyms

AMS-OWSI	Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
DCO	Development Consent Order
LIR	Local Impact Report
LPA	Local Planning Authority
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
PPA	Planning Performance Agreement
SCCAS	Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service

“BDC” refers to Babergh District Council; “MSDC” refers to Mid Suffolk District Council; “BMSDC” refers to BDC and MSDC jointly; “SCC” refers to Suffolk County Council; and “the Councils” refers to BDC, MSDC, and SCC jointly.

Purpose of this Submission

The document has been prepared by Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils to provide a response to the Rule 17 Letter dated 14 July 2026. The Rule 17 Letter stated a request for further information relating to: the Development Consent Order; compulsory acquisition and temporary possession of land and rights; biodiversity, ecology and the natural environment; the historic environment; land use, soils and green infrastructure; landscape and visual effects; safety and security; socioeconomics, recreation and tourism; and the water environment. Examination Library references are used throughout to assist readers.

Response to the Rule 17 Letter dated 14 July 2026

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
1	Draft Development Consent Order		
1.1	All local authorities Norfolk Wildlife Trust Suffolk Wildlife Trust Essex Wildlife Trust Natural England	Requirement 11: Biodiversity Net Gain At deadline 6 the applicant submitted a revised draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP6-030]. In Schedule 3 of [REP6-030] a new requirement 11 on biodiversity net gain has been included. Comments are sought on this additional requirement, including any alterations to any of the wording that you would recommend.	<u>Requirement 11: Biodiversity Net Gain</u> The Council note that the dDCO [REP6-031] has been updated to include a Biodiversity Net Gain Condition, as well as an updated wording in the “interpretation” section of Schedule 3. The Council welcomes the inclusion of a biodiversity net gain requirement within the draft DCO. However, while the Council do not object to the Applicant's "interim/final assessment" approach, which appears pragmatic for a project of this scale, the Council is concerned that Requirement 11 does not provide any mechanism for review, approval or agreement by the relevant planning authority. As currently drafted, compliance with the requirement is capable of being determined solely by the undertaker through submission of the relevant assessments. Given that biodiversity metric calculations require professional judgement regarding habitat classification, habitat condition, distinctiveness, temporal risk and post-development outcomes, the

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
			Council considers that the interim biodiversity net gain assessment, final biodiversity net gain assessment and any biodiversity offsetting scheme should be subject to approval by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with relevant ecological advisors where appropriate. Without an approval mechanism, there is no means by which concerns regarding the methodology, assumptions or conclusions of the biodiversity net gain assessments can be formally addressed. Furthermore, the Council considers that the proposed drafting provides limited ability for the relevant planning authority to verify that the biodiversity net gain calculations have been undertaken appropriately prior to any determination that the 10% target has been achieved. The Council considers that an approval mechanism would provide greater certainty, transparency and enforceability. The Council therefore recommends that Requirement 11 be amended so that: the interim biodiversity net gain assessment is submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority;

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
			- the final biodiversity net gain assessment is submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority; - where a biodiversity offsetting scheme is required, the scheme is submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority before implementation; and - no part of Requirement 11 is discharged solely through submission of information. Owing to the above, the Council consider that the requirement wording would be better suited to say: <i>(1) Prior to commencement of the authorised development, an interim biodiversity net gain assessment must be submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority.</i> <i>(2) Within six months of the end of the construction period, a final biodiversity net gain assessment must be submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority.</i> <i>(3) If the approved final biodiversity net gain assessment demonstrates that less than 10% biodiversity net gain has been achieved overall across the Order land, a biodiversity offsetting scheme must</i>

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
			<i>be submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority.</i> <i>(4) The approved biodiversity offsetting scheme must be implemented in accordance with the approved details.</i>
1.2	The applicant	Requirement 11: Biodiversity Net Gain The ExA notes that in the revised draft DCO [REP6-030], as it is currently written, requirement 11(1), (2) and (3) only state that interim and final biodiversity net gain assessments, and the biodiversity offsetting scheme (if required), must be submitted to each relevant planning authority. Notwithstanding, article 55(1) of the draft DCO, there is no wording within the current requirement 11 that states that written approval of each relevant planning authority is required and that the assessment/ scheme shall thereafter be implemented as approved. The applicant is requested to provide amended wording to either reflect this in the next version of the draft DCO, or justify its proposed wording in this regard.	N/A
1.3	All local authorities	Validation checklists for discharge of requirement submissions/ requirement 15 of Schedule 3 (Employment and Skills Plan)	BMSDC suggest the following items as a minimum for an effective discharge of requirement validation checklist: Accurate description

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		The ExA draws the attention of all relevant local authorities to the applicant's response to questions 1c and 2b of [REP6-132]. Question 1c relates to the possible use of development validation checklists for the discharge of requirement submissions. The applicant previously responded on this matter in [REP4-303], acknowledging such check lists could be helpful, noted it would be appropriate for drafting to be proposed by the host authorities for its consideration. The applicant advises "No drafting has yet been proposed however the applicant will continue discussions on this matter with the host authorities as it progresses ways of working for the discharge of requirements." All local authorities are asked to signpost where such drafting has been previously provided in examinations submissions or to enter such drafting into the examination. Question 2b concerned the Employment and Skills Plan (ESP) and whether requirement 15 of schedule 3 of the draft DCO should be worded to require the document submitted pursuant to that requirement to be approved by the relevant discharging authorities. In the light of the applicant's comments on this matter, as set out in	Accurate plans and, where relying on plans already approved, full citation of these plans with link to a living library of current approved plans (see BMSDC D5 submission REP6-135 regarding strategy for compliance monitoring, reporting and enforcement) Full context / trail of relevant approved outline / final management plans, drawings and DCO provisions that underpin / support. To include document reference, page numbers, paragraph numbers for as much detail as possible. Full context of response to draft DOR submission including how the final submission responds to comments / decision Details of any relevant licensing or other agreement BMSDC are aligned with SCC in terms of responses to this matter. BMSDC notes that no substantive amendments have been made to Requirement 15 since Deadline 5 [REP6-167]. Therefore, BMSDC's position remains unchanged. BMSDC continues to support the principle of securing a Final Employment and Skills Plan ("ESP") through Requirement 15. However, we remain concerned that the

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		[REP6-132], the ExA seeks the views of all relevant local authorities on this matter, especially in relation to the tests of necessity, relevance to planning, relevance to the development sought, enforceability, precision and reasonableness in all other respects.	Requirement, as currently drafted, does not provide sufficient certainty, control or enforceability to ensure that the ESP will operate as an effective mechanism for managing the Project's socio-economic impacts and delivering meaningful skills, employment and supply chain outcomes. In particular, BMSDC maintains that submission of the ESP alone is insufficient and that the Requirement should secure approval of the Final ESP by the relevant local authorities prior to commencement. Approval is necessary to ensure that the ESP is supported by a robust assessment of workforce and supply chain demand, contains clearly defined interventions, monitoring and reporting arrangements, and aligns with established governance structures, including the Regional Skills Coordination Function ("RSCF"). BMSDC also maintains its concerns regarding the use of the terms "substantially in accordance with" and "general accordance". In the absence of greater detail within the Outline ESP, these terms introduce uncertainty as to how compliance will be assessed and risk allowing commitments to be diluted at the post-consent stage.

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
			For the reasons set out previously, including the continued absence of clear linkages between workforce and supply chain demand and proposed interventions, the lack of defined targets and monitoring arrangements, and the deferral of key elements to the post-consent stage, BMSDC considers that Requirement 15 should be strengthened to require written approval of the ESP by the relevant local authorities before commencement and to provide greater certainty regarding compliance, monitoring and ongoing review.
1.4	All local authorities who replied to second written question (ExQ2) [PD-023] DCO 2.S3	Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix E (Community Engagement and Public Information) and Appendix F (Outline Noise and Vibration Management) The applicant responded to ExQ2 questions DCO 2.S3 and DCO 2.S6 in [REP6-115]. Revisions were made to the ‘Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix E - Community Engagement and Public Information’ [REP6-078] and the ‘Outline Code of Construction Practice Appendix F - Outline Noise and Vibration Management’ [REP6-080]. The ExA seeks a response from all local authorities who responded to ExQ2 [PD-023] DCO	Appendix E - Community Engagement and Public Information BMSDC acknowledge that the revisions made to Appendix E substantially address a number of the concerns previously raised , including provision of a complaints register, dedicated community relations arrangements, complaint investigation procedures, escalation routes and review of recurring issues. However, the revised drafting does not include all of the measures previously requested, particularly in relation to approval of the subsequent detailed complaints procedure, defined acknowledgement timescales, provision of complaints data to the

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		2.S3 and DCO 2.S6, regarding the adequacy of the revisions submitted, bearing in mind their previous responses to ExQ2 submitted at deadline 5.	relevant planning authority and identification of a named responsible officer. Whilst the revisions represent a significant improvement on the previous drafting, further amendments (as outlined above) are considered necessary to ensure confidence, transparency and oversight during the construction phase. Appendix F - Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan BMSDC acknowledge that the Applicant has made a number of substantive amendments to both the Outline NVMP (REP6-080) and the Outline CoCP (REP6-072) in response to concerns raised by local authorities during the Examination. In particular, the revised Outline NVMP now provides for monitoring proposals, monitoring locations, thresholds, trigger levels, reporting arrangements and exceedance actions to be developed and agreed with the relevant local planning authority through the detailed NVMP. The revised document also provides for complaint-led monitoring, investigation of

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
			exceedances, implementation of remedial measures and reporting of monitoring outcomes to the relevant local planning authority. BMSDC consider these amendments appropriate to largely address the concerns previously raised in relation to monitoring and enforcement mechanisms for noise and vibration impacts. Furthermore, through amendments to commitment NV05 and the operation of Requirement 4, the Applicant has confirmed that the detailed NVMP will be submitted to the relevant local planning authority for approval prior to commencement of the relevant stage of development. This is a significant improvement to the control framework, as it provides the relevant authority with direct oversight of the detailed noise and vibration mitigation, monitoring and management measures that will be implemented during construction. Whilst acknowledging the progress on the matter of noise and vibration compliance, BMSDC wish to take this opportunity to reiterate their request, set out in REP6-135 for a comprehensive strategy, to be in the

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
			form of an appendix to the CoCP, for ongoing and regular proactive compliance monitoring and reporting, plus enforcement and regularisation procedures for all reported complaints and identified non-compliance. This is necessary for all matters in the delivery of the development, not solely limited to noise and vibration management.
1.5	Applicant Suffolk Wildlife Trust Suffolk County Council Essex County Council	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and ecological working group In its response to ExQ2 DCO 2.S5, Suffolk Wildlife Trust advised it was happy to support the wording, including in relation to the wording of a requirement, for an ecological working group, as proposed and submitted by Suffolk CC [REP5-270]. The applicant has amended the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [REP6-084] to confirm the remit of the ecological working group broadly aligns with the text suggested by Suffolk Wildlife Trust [REP1- 278]. The establishment of such a working group is supported by Essex CC ([REP5-241], [REP5-243]), who also request the expansion of the scope of the group to include landscape matters, which is	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		reflected in the outline LEMP [REP6-084]. To the applicant: a) Explain why you have chosen to amend the text to broadly align with the text suggested by Suffolk Wildlife Trust in its deadline 1 submission and not amended the outline LEMP to reflect the more up to date position where Suffolk Wildlife Trust had agreed to support the wording submitted and proposed by Suffolk CC ([REP5-270] Appendix A (entitled LEWG Requirement)) concerning an ecological working group (which may include landscape considerations). b) Explain why you consider in your response to Essex CC [REP6-114] the remit of such a working group should be constrained to ecological matters only and justify why the draft DCO requirement has not been included with reference to both landscape and ecology matters. To Suffolk Wildlife Trust, Suffolk CC and Essex CC: c) Advise whether you are satisfied in regard to the applicant's wording, as set	

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		out in the applicant's outline LEMP [REP6-084], which it advises broadly aligns with Suffolk Wildlife Trust's suggested text, as contained in its deadline 1 submission [REP1-278] at paragraph 2.3. d) Provide examples of the types of landscape matters that you consider should fall within the remit of this working group.	
1.6	Applicant	Protective Provisions (1) The ExA notes a number of Protective Provisions (PP), including some PPs already incorporated into the draft DCO, have not been finally agreed with the interested party (IP)/ statutory undertaker (SU) to which they relate. The ExA understands currently some 16 bespoke PPs are to be included, with the applicant also negotiating in regard to number of side/ other agreements. In the absence of confirmation from relevant IPs, including SUs, in regard to: i) withdrawal of outstanding objections; ii) agreeing finalised PPs; and/ or iii) reaching agreement with regard to any side/ other agreements required, the ExA is	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		concerned about the status of PPs and any side/ other agreements. In the absence of finally agreed PPs and/ or any necessary side/ other agreements being satisfactorily concluded, the ExA is concerned it will not have adequate information required to make a firm recommendation regarding the matter of PPs and/ or any related side/ other agreements, in its recommendation to the secretary of state. This is especially important in regard to SUs in regard to the matter of serious detriment to a SUs undertaking. In the light of the above concern, the ExA would urge the applicant to resolve outstanding matters related to PPs and/ or any side/ other agreements as a matter of urgency. The ExA would also remind the applicant that it will be unable to consider any matters resolved after the close of the examination in its recommendation. This would include any agreement as to PPs, side agreement, interface agreement or other relevant agreements received after the close of the examination.	
1.7	All relevant local highway authorities and lead local flood authorities (including	Protective Provisions (2) A number of preferred PPs having been submitted into the examination. If you have not submitted a	Defer to the comments of SCC

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
	the Water Management Alliance), Affinity Water Ltd, Anglian Water Services Ltd, Cadent Gas Ltd, Equinor New Energy Ltd, National Gas Transmission, National Highways and National Highways (Lower Thames Crossing), Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd, Northumbrian Water Ltd, Scottish Power Renewables UK Ltd (including East Anglia 1 and East Anglia 3 Ltd) and TC East Anglia 1 OFTO Ltd	preferred PP into the examination, the listed interested parties are asked to do so. If you have already submitted your preferred PP into the examination, please signpost the reference where it can be located in the Examination Library .	
2	Compulsory acquisition and temporary possession of land and rights		
2.1	Applicant	Affected Persons	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		Respond to the specific matters raised in the following deadline 6 submissions and update the ExA on your intended actions to resolve outstanding issues: a) ARU Writtle [REP6-134] b) Cullum Agri Ltd [REP6-191] c) TA Cullum Contracting [REP6-236] d) D N Grady and Sons Ltd [REP6-192] e) Kathleen Lee [REP6-214] f) Conrad Energy [REP6-146]	
2.2	Applicant Ministry of Defence Land Management Services	Crown Land (1) In [REP6-046] the applicant notes “<i>Applicant received email 04/06/26 confirming 'The MOD Land Management Services (LMS), on the information provided by the DCO to date, is content to confirm that there are currently no land impacts on the MOD landed estate. However, LMS reserves its position should the DCO route or design change in the future'.</i> 26/06/26 The Applicant issued draft consent wording to the MOD, with the request that the MOD submit this to the ExA at Deadline 6.” No such confirmation has been received at deadline 6 from the Ministry of Defence (MOD).	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		To MOD-LMS: Please confirm the above quote is your understanding and provide the consent wording in relation to crown land. To the applicant: Provide the email exchange to confirm the comment.	
2.3	Applicant	Crown Land (2) In [REP6-046] the applicant notes that progress is being made to the transfer of the crown estate (Escheat/Bona Vacantia) interaction land. This has not been executed as yet. Confirm the latest position on the transfer and if complete identify the resultant effect on documents – removal from crown land book of reference and crown land plans and whether this becomes Class 8 white land as it is then in the applicant's control. Furthermore, in the event the transfer is not complete by the close of the examination outline the applicant's position.	N/A
2.4	Affinity Water Ltd Network Rail	Sec 127/138 applications The applicant has submitted applications under sections 127/138 in respect of the following SUs.	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
	Infrastructure Ltd Northumbrian Water Ltd	The ExA requests responses from the named SUs in respect of those submissions: a) Affinity Water Ltd [REP6-129] b) Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd [REP6-130], c) Northumbrian Water Ltd [REP6-131]	
2.5	Applicant	Karl Owen [REP6-213] Respond to the issues raised and update the ExA on progress and how and if the applicant proposes to resolve the issues raised.	N/A
2.6	Applicant	Claire Lanham and Dick Lanham At page 22 of [REP6-114] reference is made to alternative access arrangements via third party land to address the Lanham's issues. Update the ExA on the latest position, including whether this land is within the application site boundary, how access would be secured and any potential timescale for reaching agreement.	N/A
2.7	National Highways All local highway authorities: Norfolk County Council Suffolk County Council	Compulsory acquisition of operational highway Notwithstanding your reply to question 1.7 above, please confirm if the applicants submitted PPs, (or other mechanisms secured in the draft DCO) ensure that if compulsory acquisition powers are	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
	Essex County Council Thurrock Council	approved the highway authority will be able to ensure operation of the public highway.	
3 Biodiversity, ecology and the natural environment			
3.1	Applicant All local authorities Natural England	Assessment of impacts on bat species and proposed mitigation In paragraphs 6.1.11 to 6.1.14 of the revised version of the outline LEMP [REP6-084], the applicant has included further details of mitigation measures for bat species. To the applicant: For the sake of consistency clarify whether the references made within [REP6- 084] to “preliminary roost features” are the same as the “potential roost features” references that are stated in the Bat Roost Report [AS-034] and amend accordingly. Furthermore, confirm that all trees that have currently been classified “further assessment required” as per [AS-034] would be assessed in order to determine the presence or absence of potential roost features. Also, justify why the use of a 10% figure for bat boxes and/ or tree veteranisation for trees with potential roost features that you have cited in paragraph 6.1.12 of [REP6-084] would provide an adequate level of mitigation.	The Deadline 6 Outline LEMP (REP6-085) contains new text necessary to agree matters previously outstanding, relating to bat roost tree resource compensation. The Deadline 6 Outline LEMP (REP6-085) and Outline CoCP (REP6-073) both contain new text necessary to agree SoCG matters 3.3.16 and 3.3.17. With respect to BNG matters in the SoCG matters the pre-mandatory NSIP BNG status of the project affords the applicant greater control of their BNG methods, and generally speaking, those methods are in accordance with general BNG standards. However, in comparison to DEFRA’s recently released NSIPs: biodiversity gain statement for energy requirements, the applicant's assessment of their on-site habitat reinstatement as all temporary impact and non-significant (and therefore not needing 30 yrs management to be counted) is rather questionable.

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		To all local authorities and Natural England: Comment on whether the amendments made to the revised outline LEMP [REP6-084] now satisfy your concerns in relation to the assessment of impacts on bats and proposed mitigation. This should include whether you think the 10% figure, as proposed in paragraph 6.1.12, would be sufficient. If you have any remaining concerns then please set these out, including what specific actions you consider should be undertaken by the applicant to resolve your concerns.	
4	Historic environment		
4.1	Historic England	Bush Hall non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) The Code of Construction Practice [REP6-072] contains new proposed restrictions to ensure that proposed pylons RG68 and RG87 do not move to the south or east respectively to prevent physical impact to Bush Hall. Please confirm if this allays your concerns relating to this NDHA.	N/A
4.2	Applicant	Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation At deadline 5 the applicant submitted a revised version of the outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) and outline Written Scheme of	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		Investigation (WSI) [REP5-161]. Essex CC [REP6-147] (also included in [REP6-170] from Thurrock Council) and Suffolk CC [REP6-165] have responded and raised concerns about elements of the wording and matters that they consider have been omitted. It would appear to the ExA that both Essex CC and Suffolk CC have expressed doubt that the outline AMS and outline WSI, in its current form, would be suitable as a control document to inform future archaeological evaluation and mitigation. Matters and/ or specific wording still not agreed include those relating to geoarchaeology, trial trenching proposals and proposed mitigation. As stated in requirement 5 of the draft DCO [REP6-030] no stage of the authorised development may commence until a detailed WSI has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. Consequently, the applicant is requested to respond to the concerns raised by these authorities and submit at deadline 7 a further version of the outline AMS and outline WSI that seeks to address the matters raised by Essex CC and Suffolk CC. This further version can be submitted on a 'without prejudice' basis, either in	

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		full or in part, with the appropriate elements marked accordingly. For any comments from Essex CC and Suffolk CC that the applicant is not proposing to take on board in a revised outline AMS and outline WSI, the applicant is requested to justify its position and explain why it considers requirement 5 of the draft DCO would still be capable of being ‘discharged’ in order to allow works to commence. The applicant is also requested to explain what it considers the process would be if the applicant and the discharging authorities could not reach full agreement on the contents of any future detailed WSIs.	
5 Land use and soils, green infrastructure			
5.1	Applicant	Green Infrastructure At [REP6-147] paragraphs 1.6 and 1.12-1.20 Essex CC refers to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and how it has been fully integrated in the identification of mitigation to ensure multifunctional environmental outcomes. Can the applicant explain how it has fully embedded and aligned its compensation, enhancement and mitigation strategies to accord with the LNRS and how this addresses green infrastructure	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		requirements as a cross-cutting matter along the length of the proposed development, given that this is an issue wider than just in Essex.	
6	Landscape and visual		
6.1	Applicant	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) A number of IPs raise concern over the accuracy of the information contained within the RVAA. Respond to such concerns, specifically, representations over the accuracy of measurements used in the RVAA, the accuracy of RVAA visualisations (the ExA notes in this respect that the visualisations are not verified views as data has not been collected in person), and representations over the 200m distance as taken from properties?curtilages [REP6-212], [REP6-218] [REP6-203], [REP6-212], [REP6-229]	N/A
6.2	Applicant All local authorities	Masterplans A number of IPs have made representations at deadline 6 concerning the Masterplans [REP5-199]. The ExA acknowledge that these plans have been produced in consultation with local authorities, their draft status, and that such plans are illustrative in nature. The ExA also note the applicant's point of view, as made in ISH4 and	BMSDC defer to the response of SCC recognising that the proposed mechanism seeks to pay funding to the county councils. BMSDC expect to participate in the delivery of mitigation in collaboration with SCC and consultation with local communities.

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		restated in [REP6-118] that the provisions within the masterplans are not necessary to make the application acceptable in planning terms. To the applicant: a) While accepting the illustrative nature of the plans, some information submitted from IPs could be usefully incorporated within the masterplans. For instance (but not limited to), Aldham Parish Council [REP6-175] identify a number of veteran trees and notable trees from the Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory that do not appear on the constraints plans. Consider whether the plans should be updated and resubmit if necessary. b) The ExA would appreciate further information on the preferred method of the applicant to deal with the matter via an article in the DCO and how this was dealt with in the London Luton DCO (noting the applicant caveat that compensation for residual landscape and visual effects is not required pursuant to the legal and policy framework).	

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		To all local authorities: c) Provide your views on the potential mechanism provided by the applicant to provide funding for provision of landscape compensation (as contained in Annex of REP6-118).	
6.3	Applicant	Good design and lighting controls The ExA notes the submission of the amended Design and Access Statement (DAS) [REP6-090] and Design Approach for Site Specific Infrastructure (DASSI) [REP6-092]. a) The DASSI states that the operational lighting at the proposed East Anglian Connection Node (EACN) substation will “have regard” to the Dedham Vale Lighting Design Guide. Should such wording be strengthened, and if not, why not? b) Would similar wording as for (a) be useful for all substations, extensions and sealing end compounds? While not all are within the setting of the National Landscape, the use of dark skies principles for such lighting would seem appropriate in such rural areas. The ExA	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		note in this respect the submissions of Burstall Parish Council at deadline 6 [REP6-143] and their existing issues of light pollution. c) In particular around the EACN and Burstall, how will potential cumulative lighting issues be dealt with given other works potentially happening in their vicinity? d) Pylons East Anglia [REP6-229] note that the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment DCO included a requirement for a lighting design strategy. Would such a requirement be appropriate in this case, and if not, why not?	
6.4	Applicant All local authorities Norfolk Wildlife Trust Suffolk Wildlife Trust Essex Wildlife Trust	Good design The ExA notes the design review panel (DRP) proposals contained within the DAS [REP6-090] and DASSI [REP6-092] and the provisions for local planning authorities, Dedham Vale National Landscape officials, wildlife trust representatives and North Falls and Five Estuaries project representatives to be invited to meetings where relevant. To the applicant:	BMSDC welcome the revisions to requirement 12 in respect of the scope of matters to be considered by the DRP and the mechanism for approval of some details by the LPAs. BMSDC also welcome the statement at 6.2.32 to invite the LPAs and National Landscape team to be part of the DRP. It is critical for the LPAs to be appropriately involved in the decision making process to represent the interests of the affected communities, businesses and environments. The

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		a) How often is the DRP likely to meet and at what stages of the process will the DRP have input into the design? b) Notwithstanding issues of safety regulation and security, what powers or control or influence will the DRP have and how will this be secured? c) The more formal inclusion of the environmental areas around the cable sealing ends for DRP review would seem useful. A similar table to table 6.1 of the DASSI should be provided in this regard to provide more certainty than currently exists within the DASSI. To all local authorities and the Wildlife Trusts: d) Provide your views on the DRP proposals and any other final comments you wish to make on the subject of good design.	DASSI is unclear as to precisely how the LPAs will be involved and the weight given to LPA participation in decision making. BMSDC therefore look forward to further discussion on this matter. Please also refer to BMSDC's submission at D6 REP6-135
6.5	Applicant	Design scenarios The ExA notes design scenario B is being taken forward around Flying Trade Group and Crown Quarry east and west of the A12 (table 2.4, [REP6-122]). [APP-130] details this option. Provide a	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		summary and signpost to the environmental assessment undertaken for design scenario B.	
6.6	Applicant	Offsite planting The outline Offsite Planting Delivery Scheme (OPDS) [REP6-128] includes a section on management and maintenance. Separately the outline LEMP [REP6-084] has been updated to include a number of adaptive aftercare measures. a) The outline LEMP refers to the outline OPDS but do the documents need to be more interlinked? b) Do the adaptive aftercare measures within the outline LEMP also need to be included in the outline OPDS? If not, please explain why not.	N/A
7 Safety and security (aviation safety)			
7.1	Applicant Raydon Wings Aerodrome	Aerodrome safety A range of views were received at deadline 6 from aerodromes [REP6-219], [REP6-220], [REP6- 227], [REP6-230], some of whom do not fully recognise the evidence provided in ISH4 [REP6- 118].	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		To the applicant: a) Respond to such views and provide an update on any further meetings or progression made with the relevant aerodromes. b) Provide any evidence as may be available from the British Gliding Association to support your views regarding effects upon Tibenham airfield. To Raydon Wings: c) Provide evidence relating to commercial opportunities that may be lost in the event that the DCO for the proposed development is made.	
7.2	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Wattisham Station The applicant confirms at deadline 6 [REP6-118] that agreement has been virtually met concerning effects on Wattisham Station, with outstanding matters solely relating to the exact wording of requirements within the draft DCO [REP6-030]. Please provide an update and confirm (or otherwise) your agreement with the applicant.	N/A
8	Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism		

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
8.1	Applicant	Employment and Skills Plan Essex CC [REP6-147] and Suffolk CC [REP6-165] raise concerns regarding the ESP. For example, the outline ESP lacks sufficient detail, certainty, governance or evidence to demonstrate that workforce, skills and employment impacts have been fully understood or will be effectively managed, the matter of supply chains and inadequate consideration of the context of the scale, complexity and cumulative nature of demand arising from multiple projects across Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex. The ExA is concerned at the lack of focus from the applicant on socio-economics matters, and is not satisfied in regard to the concerns raised in local impact reports (Essex CC [REP1-161] and Suffolk CC [REP1-178]) relating to ESPs. Indeed Suffolk CC advises it “...remains concerned that the absence of this evidence limits the ability to understand the scale and nature of workforce demand arising from the Project and, in turn, restricts the ability to assess the significance of socio-economic effects and determine whether appropriate evidence-led mitigation can be identified and secured at the pre-consent stage, consistent with the expectations of NPS EN-1.”	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		The applicant should revisit its outline ESP with a view to ensuring it adequately addresses the concerns raised, including utilising established mechanisms such as that referenced by Suffolk CC (ie the Regional Skills Coordination Function). Should the applicant choose not to amend the outline ESP, it should provide a full and reasoned justification as to how it considers the evidence submitted to date provides adequate evidence to enable the ExA to understand the scale and nature of workforce demand arising from the proposed development. In doing so, the applicant should provide evidence that adequately assesses the significance of socio-economic effects and that clearly defines appropriate evidence-led mitigation that has been or can be identified and secured at the pre-consent stage. The applicant should demonstrate this is consistent with the expectations of NPS EN-1.	
9 Water environment: flood risk, hydrology and drainage			
9.1	Applicant	In its ISH4 post-hearing submission [REP6-158] Norfolk CC continues to raise concerns about infiltration rates not being undertaken and therefore concerns about the full assessment of drainage requirements and compliance with NPS EN-1. In your comments to responses at deadline	N/A

Ref	Question to	Question	BMSDC Answer
		5 [REP6-115] you state.. <i>“The information the LLFA requests on infiltration testing will be provided following the DCO Examination as secured by the Surface Water Management Plan that is secured via commitment GG22 within 7.2 Outline Code of Construction Practice [Revision F].</i> <i>The Applicant will follow the discharge hierarchy set out in Section 5.3 of 8.2 Drainage Strategy DCO [Revision C]. As stated in this section, appropriate justification will be provided for any progression between the hierarchy levels”.</i> How can the ExA be satisfied that, taking account of the acknowledged lack of infiltration testing results, the flood risk assessment is accurate and there will be sufficient land and ability to provide any resulting sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) infrastructure. Also provide comment on Norfolk CCs assertion that not including infiltration rates does not comply with EN-1.	