

Deadline 5 ExQ2 Response Matrix - Ardleigh and Little Bromley Area (ALBA)

Purpose. This working matrix cross-references the Examining Authority ExQ2 questions to the APC/LBPC evidence base, gives page/section references, and provides draft response points for Deadline 5. Page references are to the PDF page numbers of the named documents unless otherwise stated. A list of source documents used is at the bottom of the matrix and includes

Scope. The matrix focuses on questions most relevant to Ardleigh and Little Bromley.

Priority Response Matrix

ExQ2 question	Priority	Evidence / exact document location	APC/LBPC response	Evidence gap
GEN 2.3 - Cumulative Assessment - Methodology	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC and LBPC Response to ExQ1, pp.2-4 (GEN 1.1 and CNP), pp.8-10 (GEN 1.26); Targeted Consultation Response, pp.1-2 and 6-7; Route Alignment and EACN Siting Report, Sections 2-3 and 9 (pp.5-8, p.31). 	The cumulative assessment remains inadequate for the Ardleigh and Little Bromley Area (ALBA). The Applicant should be required to assess the ALBA as a single infrastructure cluster, not as isolated projects. Localised effects can be major and significant where the receptor is highly susceptible or valued, and ALBA is an obvious example because of EACN, Five Estuaries, North Falls, Tarchon, BESS, minerals and road works. The assessment should expressly test the maximum overlapping construction and operation scenario.	An ALBA cumulative plan and a receptor-by-receptor explanation of how significance was derived.
GEN 2.4 - Report on interrelationship with other infrastructure projects	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC Targeted Consultation Response, pp.1-2, 6-7 and 12; APC Letter to PINS 19.9.25, pp.1-3; APC Representation, pp.2, 5, 7 and 10-12; Route Alignment Report, Section 9 (p.31). 	The interrelationship report must be checked against local knowledge and should not understate the role of Tarchon or the windfarm substations. It should show EACN, Five Estuaries, North Falls, Tarchon, BESS, minerals, construction access and mitigation land on one plan. Current uncertainty about Tarchon is itself a planning risk and should not be treated as absence of effect.	ALBA schedule with status, footprint, programme, construction routes and mitigation land.
GEN 2.5 - Cumulative Assessment - Inter-Project Effects	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC and LBPC Response to ExQ1, pp.8-10; Deadline 2 Submission, pp.2-6; Targeted Consultation Response, pp.1-2 and 12; Viewpoints Report, pp.3-6. 	The Parish Councils reserve the right to comment on any later cumulative assessment. The cut-off date must capture all known ALBA schemes and material planning risks, including projects that are not yet fully designed but are functionally connected to the EACN. A Deadline 7 assessment will be too late unless accompanied by clear signposting and sufficient time for IP comment.	Any updated ES chapter, interrelationship report and plans are issued in clean and tracked form with ALBA-specific summary tables.
DES 2.1 - Independent Design Review - 1	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint Substations Design Guide comments, pp.1-3; Route Alignment Report, Sections 7-8 (pp.22-30); Statutory Consultation Response, Part 5 (pp.39-47). 	The Parish Councils support the ExA question. The EACN is not materially less sensitive than the Five Estuaries and North Falls substations. It forms part of the same landscape cluster and should be subject to equivalent design scrutiny, including siting, appearance, lighting, boundary treatment, earthworks, planting and cumulative visual effects.	Applicant to produce a comparative design sensitivity table for EACN, Five Estuaries and North Falls.
DES 2.2 - Independent Design Review - 2	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint Substations Design Guide comments, pp.1-3; APC Representation, pp.2-3 and 8; Route Alignment Report, Sections 8-9 (pp.28-31). 	The absence of independent design review for EACN is unjustified given its interrelationship with two consented windfarm substations and its position at the centre of the ALBA infrastructure cluster. The draft DCO should be amended to secure independent design review for the EACN and associated infrastructure.	DCO wording or a requirement equivalent to North Falls/Five Estuaries.
DES 2.3 - Independent Design Review - 3	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint Substations Design Guide comments, pp.1-3; Route Alignment Report, Sections 7-8; Viewpoints Report, pp.3-6 and 12-25. 	Electrical equipment, AIS infrastructure, fencing, access roads, lighting and hard standing can be visually intrusive even if not buildings. Design controls should cover all visible permanent infrastructure, not just buildings.	A requirement controlling colour, finish, height, lighting, security fencing, bunds, planting and maintenance compounds.
DES 2.5 - Approach to scenarios	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC and LBPC Response to ExQ1, pp.5-7; 	Unresolved scenarios are not peripheral for ALBA. They go to whether EACN and the associated road and cable infrastructure are necessary, proportionate and correctly sited. The Applicant should identify which	An ALBA scenario table: base case, worst case, no Tarchon, alternative windfarm connection, alternative EACN siting.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response to Deadline 1, pp.1-7; Route Alignment Report, Sections 7-8 and Appendix H; Statutory Consultation Response, Part 1 and Part 5. 	elements depend on third-party projects and what happens if those projects change.	
BIO 2.1 - Assessment of biodiversity deficit	Medium-high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Consultation Response, Environment/Habitat section (pp.7-15); Targeted Consultation Response, pp.6-7; Route Alignment Report, Section 6 (pp.18-21); Appendix C Bentley Road, p.2. 	The applicant should not assume that replacement planting removes the deficit. Mature hedgerows, trees and habitats lost to cabling, roads and EACN works may take decades to replace and during that period there is a real ecological and landscape deficit.	Localised ALBA examples showing time to maturity for hedgerow, tree and habitat replacement.
BIO 2.14 - Final BNG metric and securing BNG measures	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Consultation Response, pp.7-15 and pp.30-34; Route Alignment Report, Section 6; Targeted Consultation Response, pp.6-7. 	BNG must be secured through final approved documents, not left to later negotiation without transparent approval. In ALBA, mitigation land may interact with other projects and must be mapped cumulatively.	Certified Final BNG Report and local authority/NE approval mechanism.
BIO 2.15 - Five Estuaries and North Falls mitigation/enhancement areas	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted Consultation Response, pp.1-2 and 12; Joint Substations Design Guide comments, pp.1-3; Route Alignment Report, pp.5-8, 28-31 and Appendix H; APC Representation, pp.7 and 10-12. 	Five Estuaries and North Falls are not separate background schemes for ALBA. Their substations and cabling are functionally connected with EACN and materially contribute to the cumulative burden. The Parish Councils ask for confirmation from the windfarm promoters that N2T will not frustrate their mitigation, enhancement or BNG commitments.	A plan showing all mitigation/enhancement/BNG areas for N2T, Five Estuaries and North Falls.
BIO 2.16 - Impact on other projects mitigation measures	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted Consultation Response, pp.1-2; Route Alignment Report, Section 9; Joint Substations Design Guide comments, p.3; Preparation for Submission, cumulative effects extracts. 	The Parish Councils support the ExA request. The Applicant should not rely on general coordination assurances. Where N2T infrastructure overlaps or constrains other consented mitigation, the Applicant should identify the land, the receptor, the conflict, the developer engaged, the agreed solution and the DCO mechanism securing it.	Cconflict register with plot-level mapping.
BIO 2.17 - Assessment of cumulative effects on biodiversity	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted Consultation Response, pp.1-2, 6-7 and 12; Statutory Consultation Response, pp.7-15 and pp.30-34; Route Alignment Report, Section 6 and Section 9. 	The Parish Councils maintain that assessment only by built footprints is inadequate. Cumulative biodiversity effects must include cable corridors, construction compounds, access routes, hedgerow removal, mitigation areas, overlapping programmes and mobile species.	Cable corridors and construction timing for windfarm projects should be included.
DCO 2.S3 - Requirement 4: Construction Management Plans 1	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC and LBPC Response to ExQ1, pp.8-13; Statutory Consultation Response, pp.18-20 and pp.30-34; Examples of Residents Submissions, pp.1-8. 	There should be stronger complaints management. ALBA residents will face prolonged cumulative construction. A basic complaints log is insufficient; response times, escalation, liaison with parish councils and publication of complaint themes should be secured.	DCO/CoCP wording requiring named community contact and response deadlines.
DCO 2.S6 - Requirement 4: Noise and vibration	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Consultation Response, pp.18-20; Examples of Residents Submissions, pp.1-8; Route Alignment Report, Sections 4 and 10. 	ALBA needs routine monitoring, clear triggers and action thresholds because construction traffic and EACN works may overlap with other major schemes. Reliance on best practicable means without transparent monitoring is insufficient.	Baseline monitoring at representative ALBA receptors and monitoring during peak construction.
DCO 2.S8 - Bentley Road / PAR30 NSRs	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix C - Bentley Road (PAR30) Visualisation Request, pp.1-5; Targeted Consultation Response, p.10; Viewpoints Report, pp.4 and 25; 	Bentley Road should be treated as a key ALBA issue. The permanent widening/straightening, hedge and tree loss, ditch impacts, drainage risk and construction traffic effects have not been adequately visualised or assessed. Mitigation should apply to all affected NSRs and receptors, not only a named property.	Bentley Road photomontages, noise/vibration mitigation schedule and drainage assessment.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Consultation Response, road construction section (pp.32-33). 		
DCO 2.S9 / HE 2.10 / HE 2.13 - Archaeology and AMS/WSI	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment Submission, Sections 5-9 and 13-14 (pp.24-46); Route Alignment Report, Section 5 (pp.10-17); Ardleigh History and Heritage Survey, pp.1-3 and asset tables; Appendix A viewpoint evidence. 	Archaeology in Ardleigh is not a peripheral issue. The Scheduled Monument and wider Ardleigh cropmark complex, Roman roads and non-designated assets require robust pre-commencement control. Geophysical survey should not be treated as sufficient where known limitations exist.	Site-specific WSI, trial trenching strategy and Historic England/local authority agreement before relevant works.
DCO 2.S10 - Construction Hours	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC and LBPC Response to ExQ1, pp.8-10; Statutory Consultation Response, pp.30-34; Examples of Residents Submissions, pp.1-8. 	The Parish Councils support restrictions on Weekends and bank holidays. ALBA residents may face overlapping construction from N2T and related projects; weekend working would remove meaningful respite.	ALBA-specific programme modelling showing effect of removing Sundays and bank holidays.
DCO 2.S11 - Trees, woodland and hedgerows	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix C Bentley Road, p.2; Statutory Consultation Response, pp.7-15 and 32-33; Viewpoints Report, pp.21-25; Targeted Consultation Response, pp.6-7 and 10. 	Parish Councils support stronger pre-construction arboricultural controls. The loss of mature hedgerows and trees along Bentley Road and around the EACN cannot be treated as easily replaceable. Method statements and tree protection plans should be approved before works.	Plot-level tree/hedgerow removal and retention plans for ALBA.
HE 2.1 - Methodology	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment Submission, Sections 1-4 and 13-14; Ardleigh History and Heritage Survey, pp.1-3; Route Alignment Report, Section 5; Viewpoints Report, Sections 4.1-4.2. 	The methodology must account for Ardleigh heritage density, setting and cumulative visual intrusion. A purely asset-by-asset approach understates the effect of pylons, EACN and cable works around a historic settlement.	Applicant to address heritage setting cumulatively for St Marys, Conservation Area, Scheduled Monument and Roman roads.
HE 2.3 - Grouping of heritage assets / HE 2.4 - Multiple assets	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment Submission, Introduction and Sections 3-8; Ardleigh History and Heritage Survey, pp.1-3; APC Representation, pp.5 and 9. 	Parish Councils argue that grouping is appropriate only if it increases, not dilutes, understanding of cumulative heritage harm. Ardleigh has 71 listed buildings, a Conservation Area, a Scheduled Monument and many non-designated assets; this density is part of its significance.	A heritage density map and group assessment for Ardleigh.
HE 2.5 - Vibration / HE 2.6 - Limits of Deviation	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment Submission, Sections 3-6 and 12-14; Route Alignment Report, Section 5; Viewpoints Report, pp.12-20. 	Limits of Deviation and construction methods may alter effects on heritage assets and buried archaeology. The ES should show worst-case positions and vibration controls for sensitive receptors.	A heritage receptor schedule with vibration limits and LoD worst-case assumptions.
HE 2.8 - Scoped out Heritage Assets	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment Submission, Section 13 (pp.45-46); Ardleigh History and Heritage Survey, pp.1-3; Route Alignment Report, Section 5. 	Scoping out large numbers of Ardleigh assets risks materially understating harm. The local survey identifies assets and context not captured adequately by standard datasets.	Applicant to explain why each Ardleigh asset was scoped out and whether local survey evidence has been considered.
HE 2.10 - Assessment of impacts on archaeology	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment Submission, Sections 5-9 (pp.24-33); Route Alignment Report, Section 5 (pp.10-17); Ardleigh History and Heritage Survey, pp.1-3 and asset tables. 	The archaeology around the EACN and pylons is of high potential and the Roman road crossing at or near the proposed EACN site has not been presented coherently. The assessment should not rely on incomplete maps or geophysical survey alone.	A consolidated archaeology plan showing Scheduled Monument, cropmark complex, HER records and Roman roads.
LUS 2.5 - Green infrastructure and open space	Medium-high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment Submission, Section 10 and Appendix E; Viewpoints Report, Sections 4.3-4.5; Statutory Consultation Response, Landscape/PRoW/Green Spaces section. 	Local green spaces form part of the ALBA recreational, heritage, landscape baseline and the Ardleigh Neighbourhood Plan. Impacts should be assessed cumulatively with visual, PRoW and construction impacts.	Receptor-specific assessment of Local Green Space 1, Glebe Corner and Ardleigh Reservoir.
LV 2.6 - Cumulative Landscape and Visual Assessment methodology	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC and LBPC Response to ExQ1, pp.8-10; 	GLVIA3 factors such as susceptibility, value, scale, distribution and duration point to more serious effects in ALBA than the Applicant has	An ALBA cumulative landscape methodology note.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoints Report, Summary and Sections 3-5 (pp.3-25); Appendix A, pp.4-39. 	recognised. The methodology should expressly deal with transformation of rural landscape into an infrastructure landscape.	
LV 2.7 - CLVIA response update	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoints Report, pp.3-6; Deadline 4 Submission, pp.1-2. 	The updated cumulative assessment confirms rather than resolves ALBA concerns. Where major adverse and significant effects are identified, it is not adequate simply to say no additional mitigation is required.	Applicant to explain why significant cumulative effects do not trigger additional mitigation.
LV 2.8 - Cumulative Landscape and Visual Assessment - landscape	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoints Report, pp.3-6 and 12-25; Appendix A, pp.4-39; Statutory Consultation Response, Landscape/PRoW/Green Spaces section; Route Alignment Report, Sections 6-9. 	ALBA is a location where landscape character could be transformed by the combined presence of EACN, substations, pylons, cable corridors, road works and Tarchon. The ExA should require a plan showing affected LCAs/VRAs and an explanation of whether the receptor becomes an infrastructure landscape.	ALBA landscape transformation plan and mitigation schedule.
LV 2.9 - Cumulative Landscape and Visual Assessment - visual	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoints Report, pp.8-25; Appendix A, pp.4-39; Appendix B, pp.2-7; Appendix C, pp.2-5; Deadline 4 Submission, pp.1-2. 	The Applicant has not provided adequate cumulative ZTVs, journey scenarios or cumulative visualisations for ALBA. This is essential for Ardleigh Road, Bentley Road, PRoW users, St Marys Church, the Conservation Area and the Scheduled Monument.	Request cumulative photomontages and journey scenarios for Ardleigh Road, Bentley Road and local PRoW network.
LV 2.10 - Cumulative photomontages	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoints Report, pp.3-6 and Section 5; Appendix B correspondence, pp.2-7; Appendix A viewpoint images; Deadline 4 Submission, pp.1-2. 	The Parish Councils support the ExA request for updated cumulative photomontages. The Parish Councils have repeatedly requested visualisations and the refusal to update the 3D model has materially reduced public understanding.	Updated cumulative photomontages from ALBA viewpoints requested by APC/LBPC.
LV 2.15 / LV 2.19 - Landscape viewpoints and 3D Visualisation Tool	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoints Report, entire document; Appendix A; Appendix B; Deadline 4 Submission. 	Existing visual material does not adequately represent ALBA. Additional viewpoints requested by the Parish Councils should be provided, especially where alignment changes or Bentley Road works have not been visualised.	ExA to direct Applicant to provide missing ALBA viewpoint material.
NV 2.1 / NV 2.2 - Noise and vibration	Medium-high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Consultation Response, pp.18-20; Examples of Residents Submissions, pp.1-8; DCO 2.S6/S8 evidence above. 	Noise and vibration conclusions must be tested against worst-case LoD and cumulative construction traffic, particularly around EACN access routes and Bentley Road.	ALBA noise receptor table and construction traffic noise assumptions.
PRoW 2.1 / PRoW 2.2 - Public Rights of Way	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Consultation Response, Landscape/PRoW/Green Spaces section; Viewpoints Report, pp.8-25; Appendix A, PRoW-related images; 	PRoW effects should be assessed cumulatively, not only as temporary access management. The issue is also visual amenity, sequential experience and loss of rural character.	ALBA PRoW map showing closures, diversions, duration and cumulative visual effects.
SET 2.1 - Socio-economics	Medium-high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APC Representation, pp.2 and 7-11; Statutory Consultation Response, Impact on residents/businesses (pp.18-27); Route Alignment Report, Section 4;. 	Socio-economic effects should not be limited to large-scale regional employment. ALBA evidence identifies local businesses, community hubs, tourism and resident wellbeing which may be adversely affected by construction, visual change and industrialisation.	ALBA-specific business and community impact assessment.
TT 2.1 - PARs 1: Ardleigh Road and Bentley Road	Very high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix C Bentley Road, pp.1-5; Targeted Consultation Response, p.10; Viewpoints Report, p.4 and Section 5; Statutory Consultation Response, road construction section (pp.32-33). 	The Parish Councils have residual concerns about permanent works to Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road. The roads should be assessed in conjunction with other NSIPs and local schemes. Visual, ecological, drainage and safety effects of road widening and hedgerow removal should be addressed.	Joint NSIP road management plan for PAR30/PAR31, including maintenance, cumulative traffic and restoration.
TT 2.2 - PARs 2	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix C Bentley Road, pp.1-5; Statutory Consultation Response, pp.32-33; 	The Parish Councils support highway authorities in identifying residual PAR concerns. The Parish Councils maintain Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road as ALBA-specific routes where residual concerns remain.	Highway authorities to respond specifically on Bentley Road, Ardleigh Road and EACN access.

TT 2.3 - TT 2.9 - Outline CTMP	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statutory Consultation Response, pp.30-34; Appendix C Bentley Road, pp.2-5; Targeted Consultation Response, p.10. 	CTMP controls must be enforceable and parish-facing. It is not enough to use reasonable endeavours where residents need reliable notification and controls on routes, timings, driver behaviour, complaints and cumulative traffic.	Parish liaison mechanism and enforceable driver pack compliance.
WE 2.1 - WE 2.3 - Drainage / land drainage	Medium-high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix C Bentley Road, p.2; Statutory Consultation Response, Agriculture/Farming and road construction sections; Route Alignment Report, Section 4. 	Road widening and construction across farmland may affect drainage, ditches and flood risk. Bentley Road has ditches on either side and any widening must be assessed before approval.	Drainage assessment specific to Bentley Road, EACN access and affected farmland.
SS 2.1 - Security and resilience	Medium-high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan 2026 Additional Submission, pp.2 and 4-8; Route Alignment Report, Section 10 (p.31); Targeted Consultation Response, p.3; APC Representation, pp.2 and 8. 	Resilience and emergency access are relevant to siting. The rural road network, BESS proximity and concentration of substations raise risks which should be assessed cumulatively, not in isolation.	Emergency access and incident response assessment for EACN, BESS and nearby substations.

Source Documents Used

[EN020027-003104-N2T ExQ2 22 05 26 FINAL.docx](#) - ExQ2 question list.

[REP3-097 APC and LPC Response to the First Questions 10.pdf](#) - ExQ1 response and cumulative assessment comments.

[NG 5.1 Consultation Report APC Response to N2T Targeted Consultation 27 M.pdf](#) - March 2025 targeted consultation response.

[Relevant Representations Ardleigh Parish Council Representation Norwich.pdf](#) - Registration and Representation, 27 November 2025.

[NG 5.1 Consultation Report Ardleigh PC submission NG stat consultation Ju.pdf](#) - July 2024 statutory consultation main response.

[NG 5.1 Consultation Report Ardleigh PC submission to NG- Historic Environ.pdf](#) - Historic Environment submission.

[NG 5.1 Consultation Report Ardleigh History and Heritage Survey 2024.pdf](#) - local heritage asset survey.

[AS-065 Jan 2026 DCO RESPONSE Route alignment and subs.pdf](#) - Report on Proposed Route Alignment and EACN Substation Siting.

[AS-064 Jan 2026 DCO RESPONSE Additional Submission 27.pdf](#) - Additional submission on behalf of APC/LBPC.

[REP1-145 Response to Deadline 1 Ardleigh and Little Bro.pdf](#) - Deadline 1 comments.

[REP2-032 Deadline 2 Submission APC and LBPC + Encs 1203.pdf](#) - Deadline 2 comments.

[REP4-319 Deadline 4 Submission APC and LBPC 120526.pdf](#) - Deadline 4 visualisation submission.

[REP4-319 Viewpoints and Visualisations in Ardleigh and Little Bromley_Rev 1\[97\].pdf](#) - viewpoint and visualisation report.

[REP4-319 Appendix A - Viewpoint Maps and Images.pdf](#) - viewpoint maps and images.

[REP4-319 Appendix B - Correspondence with the Applicant \(2025\) \[REDACTED\].pdf](#) - visualisation correspondence.

[REP4-319 Appendix C - Bentley Road \(PAR30\) Visualisation Request.pdf](#) - Bentley Road visualisation and drainage/road concern.

[Joint Substations Design Guide - Ardleigh PC Co.pdf](#) - comments on North Falls and Five Estuaries Joint Substations Design Guide.