

**The Great Grid Upgrade**

Eastern Green Link 5 (EGL 5)

# Preliminary Environmental Information Report

Volume 2

Part 1

Appendix 1.A Scoping Opinion Responses

Document Reference: EGL5-NGET-CONS-XX-RP-YL-010

May 2026

nationalgrid

# Contents

---

<b>1.A. EIA Scoping Opinion Responses</b>	<b>1</b>
1.A.1. Scoping Opinion Responses	1

---

Table 1.A-1 Applicant's preliminary response to the Planning Inspectorate's EIA Scoping Opinion comments	2
--	---

---

# 1.A EIA Scoping Opinion Responses

## 1.A.1 Scoping Opinion Responses

1.A.1.1 An EIA Scoping Opinion was adopted by the Secretary of State, administered by the Planning Inspectorate, on 13 October 2025, in response to the Eastern Green Link (EGL) 5 EIA Scoping Report. The information provided in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) is preliminary and not all of the Scoping Opinion comments have been addressed at this stage, however all comments will be addressed in the Environmental Statement (ES). **Table 1.A-1** provides a summary of the response in relation to EIA co-ordination and requirements, the description of the Project, EIA methodology and scope of assessment. The aspect chapters (in **Volume 1, Part 2, Part 3** and **Part 4**) provide further responses to the Scoping Opinion.

Table 1.A-1 Applicant's preliminary response to the Planning Inspectorate's EIA Scoping Opinion comments

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
2.1.1	The Scoping Report states that Eastern Green Link (EGL) 5 comprises a 2 gigawatt (GW) high voltage direct current (HVDC) system linking the Scottish coastline and Lincolnshire in England but does not make it clear how this is related to the voltage terminology used throughout the Scoping Report. The ES should provide a clear description of the technical terminology used.	Included as appropriate in the <b>PEIR Glossary</b> .
2.1.2	The ES should confirm the predicted number of AIL movements and the type and routing of vehicles carrying AIL, which has been used as the basis for assessment. The ES should also consider the use of existing rail and river connections in the assessment of alternatives.	This feedback has been noted and will be included in the ES.  The PEIR has considered project alternatives in <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 3: Reasonable Alternatives</b> . The ES will include information on the consideration of the use of rail and river modes for AIL delivery during construction.  AIL information is provided in <b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> of the PEIR and presents the assessment of the local transport network.
2.1.3	The Scoping Report states that in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Laws of the Sea (UNCLOS) and s81 of the marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (MCAA) cable installation beyond 12 nautical miles (NM) is exempt from requiring a marine licence and that the deemed marine licence (DML) within the development consent order (DCO) would be structured to reflect licensable activities within and outside of 12 NM. Regardless of the consenting strategy, the ES should assess any likely significant effects arising from the installation of the cable, including cumulative effects as relevant.	The English Offshore Scheme complies with this comment. The potential for significant environmental effects from all aspects of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the English Offshore Scheme has been assessed by the EIA no matter their jurisdiction.  Potential cumulative effects with other developments will be presented within <b>Volume 1, Part 4, Chapter 27: Cumulative Effects Assessment</b> of the ES. <b>Volume 2, Part 4, Appendix 27.A: Long List of other Development</b>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
2.1.4	<p>The Scoping Report describes the applicant’s options’ appraisal, including strategic options for the marine route alignment to Scottish waters. The EIA Regulations require an applicant to provide ‘A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects’. The Inspectorate acknowledges the applicant’s intention to provide a detailed description of siting and routeing options appraisal process in the ES as stated in Chapter of the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate would expect the ES to provide details of the reasonable alternatives studied and the reasoning for selection of the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the environmental effects. Technical studies or feasibility work produced to support the appraisal process should be summarised or appended to the ES.</p>	<p>provides a list of all the other developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment.</p> <p>A summary of the optioneering work done to date is presented within <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 3: Reasonable Alternatives</b> of the PEIR and will be updated for the ES.</p>
2.1.5	<p>The Scoping Report describes emerging preferences for several infrastructure components, including 2 siting zones for the proposed converter station, corridors for onshore cables, and 2 marine route alignments for offshore cable. The converter station siting zones (CS05 and CS06) as shown on Figure 3-4 include a large extent of land. The applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options, and to refine the siting location within areas of search and explain clearly in the ES which elements of the proposed development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. The description of the proposed development in the ES must not be so wide that it is insufficiently certain to comply with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the EIA Regulations. The need and justification to support the level of flexibility sought must</p>	<p>Following submission of the Scoping Report, and receipt of the Scoping Opinion, the siting and routeing of the EGL 5 project has continued to be refined, and the updated draft Order Limits are presented within the PEIR. Any optionality that remains has been clearly explained within the relevant chapters of the PEIR.</p> <p>The project description has been updated since the Scoping Report and is presented in <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> of the PEIR.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	<p>be explained in the ES, including how it has been considered in the assessments through relevant parameters (temporal and spatial) and a defined worst-case for resulting environmental effects. It will be essential to ensure consistency throughout the ES and any other relevant assessments supporting the application from which the ES draws.</p>	
2.1.6	<p>A range of potential methods for onshore cable installation are identified, including open cut trenching or trenchless crossings, such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD) or microtunnelling. It states that trenchless methods would be used where required for environmental or infrastructure features such as main rivers. The ES should identify the cable installation method, location and type of crossings within the onshore cable corridor, as well as the nature of any associated construction works (for example dewatering, trenching and HDD). The ES should assess the likely significant effects from accidental release of drilling fluids, where HDD methods are proposed. The ES should describe any likely significant effects arising from these activities. Where reliance is placed on the use of a specific method to mitigate significant effects, the applicant should demonstrate that the method is feasible, through assessment based on robust baseline data, and that such commitments are appropriately defined and secured. A drilling fluid management plan should form part of the outline construction environmental management plan (CEMP). The applicant should seek to agree the depths of trenchless crossings below watercourses with the relevant consultation bodies, including the Environment Agency (EA) and Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs), as appropriate.</p>	<p>A drilling fluid management plan will be incorporated within <b>Volume 2, Part 1, Appendix 5.C: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)</b> of the PEIR.</p> <p>The Water Environment (<b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 9: Water Environment</b>) discipline will determine minimum depths of trenchless crossings below watercourses in consultation with the EA and IDBs, as appropriate. The indicative location of crossings are shows on <b>Volume 3, Part 1, Figure 4-1: English Onshore Scheme Components</b>.</p> <p>The ES will provide details of the proposed cable installation method(s), and associated works, to be used during construction.</p>
2.1.7	<p>It is proposed that cable installation at landfall would be trenchless where possible to avoid direct impacts to the intertidal area. The applicant's attention is drawn to NE's comments (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding the geotechnical information required to evidence the technical viability of HDD. The Inspectorate advises that the</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>It will be clearly stated in the ES if NE's method is relied upon as a mitigation measure.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	<p>minimum level of information identified by NE must be set out in the ES if this method is relied upon as a mitigation measure. This includes ground investigation and baseline habitat surveys of the coastal habitat. The ES should confirm the method selected, or where options remain, set out the worst-case parameters for each option and assess the potential environmental effects. These include effects arising from accidental release of drilling fluids where HDD is selected, and from other construction activities such as dewatering and trenching. It should also assess significant effects associated with any anticipated changes at the coastal landfall site throughout the lifetime of the proposed development, such as vertical change in beach profile and coastal retreat. The ES should describe how cable burial and siting of associated infrastructure would be managed throughout the lifespan of the proposed development. Any requirement for open pits and use of heavy plant on the beach, which could affect coastal geomorphology and ecology should be identified.</p>	<p>Worst-case parameters and potential environmental effects relevant to HDD will be presented in <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4 Description of the Project</b> and the relevant onshore technical chapters <b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity</b> to <b>Chapter 16: Health and Wellbeing</b>.</p> <p>We confirm that a dedicated drilling fluid management plan will be incorporated within <b>Volume 2, Part 1, Appendix 5.C: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)</b> of the PEIR.</p>
2.1.8	<p>The Inspectorate notes the intention to apply a ‘Rochdale Envelope’ approach to the onshore and offshore schemes. This is employed when there is a need to seek flexibility to address uncertainty. The applicant should make every attempt to narrow the range of options including for onshore cable routeing (noting that there are several references to ‘careful routeing’ being a possibility to avoid environmental receptors) and the width of the offshore cable corridor, including at landfall. The ES should clearly explain which elements of the proposed development have yet to be finalised and provide the reasons. The Inspectorate advises that flexibility in design should only be sought where necessary, in the interests of a proportionate ES based on the most realistic and refined design envelope possible. The ES should assess the worst case that could potentially be built out in accordance with the authorised development of the DCO being applied for.</p>	<p><b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> sets out the construction methods and maximum design scenarios with explanations of where information was unavailable for the PEIR but will be provided for the ES.</p> <p>Worst case scenarios have been carefully considered and are described, with multiple scenarios assessed where there is still optionality. The approach recommended by the Inspectorate has been taken.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
2.1.9	<p>The Scoping Report describes the need for several temporary construction compounds, including along the cable installation route, but states that locations are not yet known although these would be within the scoping boundary. Approximate footprints are provided. The ES should describe the proposed number, location and dimensions of temporary construction compounds and laydown areas required during construction and decommissioning of the proposed development. The ES should assess any likely significant effects arising from installation and use of the compounds.</p>	<p>Temporary construction compounds are included within <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> of the PEIR, and on <b>Volume 3, Part 1, Figure 4-2: English Onshore Scheme Temporary Components</b>.</p> <p>Design of the project will be refined following PEIR and the ES will provide details of proposed temporary construction compounds required during construction.</p> <p>The ES will assess the likely significant effects arising from installation and use of temporary construction compounds.</p>
2.1.10	<p>The ES should confirm the width of easements required for the onshore HVDC and HVAC cable, or the worst-case parameters if this is still to be determined. Assessment in the ES should be based on the full land extent required including permanent easements for operational maintenance.</p>	<p>The extent of land required for construction of the English Onshore Scheme cable is identified in the PEIR, <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b>.</p> <p>The full extent of land required for temporary and permanent easements will be provided and assessed within the ES. Permanent easements will be required for operational maintenance.</p>
2.1.11	<p>The Scoping Report states that temporary access roads and alterations to existing accesses from the public highway will be required. This includes a proposed Alford Construction Route to accommodate AIL being delivered to Anderby Creek. Temporary watercourse crossings (including culverts and bridges) may also be needed. The ES should describe the location and parameters of temporary access routes, including any changes proposed to the existing highway, and confirm the predicted number and type of traffic movements. Where details are unknown, a worst-case scenario should be presented. Where crossing of watercourses and culverts are required, these should be discussed with the EA and evidence of agreement or otherwise to the proposal provided in the ES. The ES should confirm if the Alford bypass is</p>	<p>Temporary and permanent access routes are presented within <b>Volume 3, Part 1, Figure 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3: English Onshore Scheme Permanent Components</b> of the PEIR.</p> <p>Details of watercourse crossings are provided within <b>Volume 2, Part 2, Appendix 9.C: Preliminary Watercourse Crossing Schedule</b> of the PEIR. Any potential significant effects of these crossings on the water environment are provided within <b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 9: Water Environment</b> of the PEIR and will be discussed with the EA prior to ES.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	required only for construction or on a permanent basis and assess any likely significant effects accordingly.	<p>The ES will confirm if the Alford Construction Route is required only for construction or permanently and will be assessed for any likely significant effects.</p> <p>Updated traffic numbers have been incorporated into PEIR stage assessments.</p>
2.1.12	The Scoping Report states that the minimum design life of elements of the onshore scheme is 40 years but there are no specific plans to decommission as it would be subject to maintenance, reinforcement and asset replacement with an unspecified end date. The ES should be clear as to the lifespan of different components of the onshore scheme, and how this has been considered as part of the assessment of likely significant effects arising from asset maintenance and replacement.	<p><b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> and <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 5: PEIR Approach and Methodology</b> detail the approach to assessment of the different phases of the Project, including decommissioning.</p>
2.1.13	The onshore and offshore scheme overlap in the intertidal zone between mean low water springs (MLWS) and mean high water springs (MHWS). The ES should review the spatial areas considered in each relevant aspect chapter so it is clear what activities fall within each defined area and that these terms are used consistently across the ES. Where aspect assessments cross between 'offshore' and 'onshore' areas, it should be clear where the assessment of effects for the intertidal area can be found to avoid gaps in the assessment. This should be supported by figures at an appropriate scale.	<p>The potential for significant effects on the intertidal area has been assessed for both the English Onshore Scheme and English Offshore Scheme where relevant.</p> <p>Intertidal receptors have been clearly identified in the relevant topic chapters, please see <b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity</b> to <b>Chapter 16: Health and Wellbeing</b> and <b>Part 3, Chapter 17: Coastal and Marine Physical Processes</b> to <b>Chapter 25: Marine Archaeology</b>.</p>
2.1.14	The Inspectorate notes the intention to seek consent for UXO clearance (if required) through a future marine licence application, and that the effects of UXO clearance would be considered at a high level in the ES for the proposed development. The Inspectorate is content with this approach, which should be based on the worst case in terms of UXO parameters (numbers and weight) and method for clearance. The ES should also address any cumulative effects from the construction of the	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed approach was agreed by the Inspectorate.</p> <p>Please refer to <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> for details on the methods of clearance and findings of the UXO desk-based assessment.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	<p>proposed development and UXO clearance. The findings of the initial UXO desk-based assessment should be reported in the ES. The ES should describe mitigation that would be available to address any significant adverse effects, and how this would follow the mitigation hierarchy.</p>	<p>A high-level assessment of the potential significant effects of UXO clearance is provided in the relevant offshore topic chapters.</p>
2.1.15	<p>The Scoping Report provides a high-level description of the activities likely to be required to prepare the seabed for cable laying. The ES should confirm and assess the maximum design scenario or worst-case parameters for each activity, including the locations, methods to be used, predicted volumes of materials and proposed disposal routes or locations. The need for dredging, quantities of material and likely disposal location should be identified and likely significant effects assessed in the ES.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Please refer to <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> for the requested detail.</p> <p>Where information that has not been provided at PEIR stage, this will be available for the ES.</p>
2.1.16	<p>The Scoping Report states that the ‘punch out’ points for the HDD ducts and cable trench may be left to naturally backfill or be manually infilled with excavated material. The ES should assess any likely significant effects arising from these different approaches. The applicant’s attention is drawn to NE’s comments (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding the need for exit pit locations to avoid the sunken forest present in the area, and the likely requirement for cable protection at exit pit locations due to the dynamic nature of the coastline. The ES should explain how these matters have been addressed.</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>Please refer to <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> for the details of Project parameters and proposed construction methods. The comments provided by NE have been and will be considered within the ES, within the relevant topic chapters.</p>
2.1.17	<p>The Inspectorate welcomes the commitment to prepare a preliminary CBRA to inform the ES and advises that this should be submitted with the DCO application. The ES should be clear on the range of burial depths that have been considered as part of the preliminary CBRA and explain the effectiveness and degree of confidence that can be placed on this in the absence of the final version.</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>These recommendations will be considered and incorporated into the preliminary Cable Burial Risk Assessment (CBRA), to be submitted with the ES.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
2.1.18	<p>The Scoping Report states that the subsea HVDC cables would run in parallel with another offshore HVDC cable project proposed by NGET, EGL3 and EGL4. It states that a minimum horizontal separation of 50m would be required between the proposed development and the EGL3 and EGL4 cable corridors unless constrained by pinch points. The ES should confirm the minimum separation distance for the full length of offshore cable running parallel to EGL3 and EGL4 and explain why this distance is required and could not be further reduced, where it could result in significant adverse effects.</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>Please refer to <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> for the requested detail.</p>
2.1.19	<p>The ES should set out the burial hierarchy that would be implemented to avoid, prevent or reduce the need for external cable protection, and confirm how this would be secured. It should confirm the maximum design scenario (MDS) or worst-case parameters for external cable protection, including the location and maximum length, area and volume, and these parameters should be demonstrably secured. The parameters of any cable protection required in or adjacent to the Holderness Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) should be confirmed. This should be provided for the construction (installation of cable) phase and for repair and replacement during operation. Assumptions made in determining the MDS should be clearly explained. The ES should assess the likely significant effects arising from placement of cable protection. It should explain the environmental effects arising from the different cable protection methods proposed, including any implications for decommissioning, and identify mitigation, for example by discounting methods, where these would result in significant adverse effects. The applicant's attention is drawn to Joint Nature Conservation Committee's (JNCC) comments (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding potential future prohibition of bottom towed gear in the MCZ, which could minimise the need for rock protection. The ES should confirm if such a</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>Please refer to <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> for the requested detail.</p> <p>Information that has not been provided at PEIR stage will be available for the ES. If this is the case it is clearly described within the PEIR submission documents.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	prohibition has been implemented and how that has informed determination of the maximum cable protection parameters proposed.	
2.1.20	The Scoping Report states that the minimum design life of the subsea cables is 40 years although with repairs some systems can last upwards of 60 years. It states that the scheme would be licensed for 40 years, after which it would require an extension to the DML or be decommissioned. The ES should be clear as to the lifespan of different components of the offshore scheme, and how this has been considered as part of the assessment of likely significant effects arising from asset maintenance and repair.	This comment is acknowledged.  Please refer to <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> for the requested detail.
2.1.21	The Scoping Report details (section 1.4) that the whole EGL5 development comprises 4 schemes (English offshore and onshore, Scottish onshore and offshore). Where the ES assesses cumulative effects, it should consider the potential for these projects to be developed sequentially or concurrently and the potential for this to result in differing cumulative effects dependent on the construction order. The ES should set out what measures are proposed to coordinate construction activity (if any) to minimise disruption and avoid, prevent or reduce significant adverse cumulative effects.	Potential inter-project cumulative effects with other developments are presented within <b>Volume 1, Part 4, Chapter 27: Cumulative Effects Assessment</b> of the PEIR, additionally, <b>Volume 2, Part 4, Appendix 27.A: Long List of other Developments</b> provides a list of all the other developments to be shortlisted for consideration within the cumulative effects assessment.  Construction programme information (including phasing of the different onshore and offshore elements of EGL 5) will be included in the ES, and where possible will inform the assessment of inter-project cumulative effects.
2.1.22	The Scoping Report refers to various management plans that would be implemented to manage and mitigate effects, for example a CEMP, construction traffic management plan (CTMP) and waste management plan (offshore). The Inspectorate advises that outline versions of management plans should be submitted with the ES and it should be clear how these would be secured through the DCO or other legal mechanism. In addition, an outline marine mammal management	Outline management plans as referred to in the PEIR will be submitted with the ES. These plans will be detailed within the Project Commitments Register that will be submitted as part of the DCO.

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	<p>protocol should be submitted to set out how effects to marine mammals from geophysical and seismic surveys along the offshore cable route would be mitigated. An outline plan(s) setting out environmental management measures during operation should also be submitted, which should include ongoing management of landscape and ecological mitigation.</p>	
2.1.23	<p>The applicant's attention is drawn to NE's comments (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding the location of the proposed development in the tentative East Coast Flyway WHS. The ES should set out the status of this potential receptor at the point of DCO application. Where significant effects are likely to occur to the receptor beyond those assessed for the individual international and national nature conservation site designations, the ES should provide an assessment and identify mitigation as needed.</p>	<p>We will review the progress of the status of the potential WHS and if designated as a WHS at the point of application it will be included within the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.</p> <p>If the site is not designated at the point of application, the statutory sites included within the assessment will cover the majority of the land and therefore it will be assessed indirectly.</p>
2.2.1	<p>Paragraph 5.3.2 of the Scoping Report states that the reasonable worst case scenario for any given design parameter may vary by technical aspect, depending on how that parameter may interact with the receptors being considered. The ES should provide details in each chapter of the worst-case parameters relevant to that aspect chapter and provide a justification for why that represents the worst case for that chapter.</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>A section has been included in each environmental topic chapter within the PEIR (<b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity to Chapter 16: Health and Wellbeing, Part 3, Chapter 17: Coastal and Marine Physical Processes to Chapter 25: Marine Archaeology and Part 4, Chapter 26: Greenhouse Gases</b>).</p>
2.2.2	<p>The Scoping Report states that if extension of operational life is not possible, it is assumed that the proposed development would be removed with the process being like construction but in reverse. Paragraph 5.4.11 states that a high-level decommissioning assessment would be provided in the ES, with a full assessment at the time of decommissioning, in line with applicable regulations and guidance. However, later paragraphs state that decommissioning effects from the</p>	<p>It is anticipated that rather than the Project be decommissioned, parts would be replaced to extend the operational life. As such, the operational assessments in the PEIR have been undertaken under the assumption that the Project will continue to operate in perpetuity.</p> <p>Acknowledging the complexities of completing a detailed assessment for decommissioning works up to 40 years in</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	<p>onshore scheme, including landfall, are proposed to be scoped out as the anticipated impacts would be no greater than for construction. Based on the information presented in the Scoping Report, the Inspectorate agrees that a full decommissioning assessment can be scoped out at this stage but advises that future detailed assessment of decommissioning phase effects (if decommissioning is required) should be demonstrably secured in the DCO.</p>	<p>the future for the English Onshore Scheme, and given that there are no current plans to decommission the Project, an assessment of effects associated with decommissioning is not presented for the English Onshore Scheme in the PEIR, and will not be undertaken for the ES. Instead, Table 4-19 in <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 4: Description of the Project</b> provides a high level summary assessment of the likely significant effects associated with decommissioning for each environmental aspect based on existing information.</p> <p>For the English Offshore Scheme, given the level of information available regarding the approach to decommissioning, reasonable assumptions with regards to likely environmental impacts at the time of decommissioning can be made. As such, the PEIR has considered impacts associated with decommissioning within the English Offshore Scheme technical aspect chapters <b>Volume 1, Part 3, Chapter 17: Coastal and Marine Physical Processes</b> to <b>Chapter 25: Marine Archaeology</b>. This will also be included in the English Offshore Scheme ES chapters.</p>
2.2.3	<p>The Scoping Report sets out a similar position for offshore components as onshore but proposes a high-level assessment in line with the decommissioning principles of The Crown Estate in the ES. The Inspectorate is content with the applicant's approach but advises that the ES should provide as much detail as possible about the expected decommissioning activities and consider future climate and erosion trends. It should indicate as far as possible assumptions made about options for decommissioning and explain how these have been considered in the assessment of different aspects of the environment.</p>	<p>This comment is acknowledged.</p> <p>The Inspectorate's recommended approach has been taken into account for the PEIR.</p>

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	Where alternative options are presented in the ES, the worst-case scenario should be addressed. For example, if flexibility is retained for either removal or retention in situ of the undersea cables. It should be clear how future detailed assessment of decommissioning phase effects would be secured.	
2.2.4	Where the ES utilises professional judgement to either assign significance or in the absence of a recognised methodology, the ES should provide a justification and methodology for this. Where judgement is used to assess that a significance of 'moderate effect' is not considered a significant effect, this should clearly be stated in the ES.	The overarching approach to the PEIR is presented within <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 5: PEIR Approach and Methodology</b> .  Justifications and methodologies of significance criteria for each environmental topic are presented within the individual chapters of the PEIR ( <b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity to Chapter 16: Health and Wellbeing, Part 3, Chapter 17: Coastal and Marine Physical Processes to Chapter 25: Marine Archaeology and Part 4, Chapter 26: Greenhouse Gases</b> ).
2.2.5	For each aspect, the Scoping Report describes design and control measures that are proposed to be implemented to minimise effects. The ES should include a full description of proposed design measures that are relied upon to avoid or minimise likely significant effects. It should explain how the measures would be secured and implemented, including in the context of any flexibility that is sought in the DCO. It should describe any engagement that has been held about design measures, including for example with affected landowners, and whether agreement has been reached.	This comment is acknowledged.  A Register of Design Measures will be included as part of the ES, and a Commitments Register will be submitted as part of the DCO.
2.2.6	Applicants should ensure that assessments take account of updated data sets as these become available through Defra's Data Services Platform. Where relevant, the applicant is encouraged to liaise with the	This comment is acknowledged.

ID*	Planning Inspectorate comments	How addressed in this PEIR
	EA to determine the implications for project design and the scope of assessment.	The EGL 5 project has an established ongoing relationship with the EA and will engage throughout the EIA with them as necessary.
2.2.7	The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments of the EA, JNCC and NE (Appendix 2 of this Opinion) regarding additional guidance and data sources for flood risk and coastal erosion, coastal habitat mapping and the condition of designated sites. The ES should be informed by these sources as relevant to the assessment.	This comment is acknowledged.  The recommended guidance and data sources have been considered and have informed the PEIR assessment where relevant.
2.2.8	The Inspectorate notes that the study areas for many of the assessments use buffers of a fixed distance from the scoping boundary. The applicant should ensure that the study areas of each assessment reflect the likely extent of potential significant effects. Where effects are likely to extend beyond a fixed distance in discrete areas, for example, variations in tidal excursion, then this should be reflected in the Zol and corresponding study area. The ES should also clearly justify, with evidence, how each study area reflects the Zol for the proposed development and, where possible, seek agreement with the relevant consultees.	The overarching approach to the PEIR is presented within <b>Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 5: PEIR Approach and Methodology</b> .  Justifications for the study areas used for each environmental topic and how these reflect the Zol for the EGL 5 project are presented within the individual chapters of the PEIR ( <b>Volume 1, Part 2, Chapter 6: Biodiversity to Chapter 16: Health and Wellbeing, Part 3, Chapter 17: Coastal and Marine Physical Processes to Chapter 25: Marine Archaeology and Part 4, Chapter 26: Greenhouse Gases</b> ).

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

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