

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 March 2023

### SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA

#### Item 8 Page No.1 (separate papers)

##### Update

On the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2023 the Examining Authority (ExA) issued further letters with regard to the Medworth Development Consent Order application:

##### Rule 8 Letter:

This provides further information on the Medworth Development Consent Order application. The updated timetable is included in **Appendix 1** below. The full letter can be viewed at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010110/EN010110-001041-Medworth%20EfW%20Rule%20%20letter%20Final.pdf>

This letter provides important information about the Examination of the Medworth application. The letter includes:

- Appointment of Panel as the Examining Authority (ExA)
- The Examination Timetable
- An invitation to submit Written Representations
- Details of the publication of the Examining Authority's (ExA) Written Questions
- A request for Statements of Common Ground
- A request for Local Impact Reports from Local Authorities
- Other Procedural Decisions made by the ExA
- Information about Hearings and Accompanied Site Inspections
- Information about the availability of Examination Documents
- Guidance on the use of the 'Make a submission' tab on the project webpage

##### Examining Authority's Written Questions:

The deadline for the Council to respond is 24<sup>th</sup> March 2023. This request can be viewed at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010110/EN010110-001049-230302%20ExA%20First%20Written%20Questions.pdf>

##### Action Points:

It requests the written submissions of oral cases heard at the Issue Specific Hearing. This includes a request for Cllr. De Walley to respond by 10<sup>th</sup> March 2023. This can be viewed at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010110/EN010110-001047-230302%20Action%20points%20from%20ISH1%20Final.pdf>

##### The Preliminary Meeting Note:

This can be viewed at: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010110/EN010110-001048-230302%20Note%20of%20Preliminary%20Meeting.pdf>

#### Rule 4 letter

Confirms that two Examining Inspectors will now conduct the examination, instead of one. The link to this letter is:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/EN010110/EN010110-001043-Rule%204%20letter%20notice%20of%20appointment%20of%20Examining%20Authority%20final.pdf>

#### **Assistant Director's comments:**

The comments above are noted.

#### **Item 9/1(a) 20/01893/FM Page No.9 (separate papers)**

##### **Applicant's Supporting Case:**

This statement intends to offer commentary from the applicant on planning application ref. 20/01893/FM, ahead of the application appearing at Planning Committee on 6 March 2023.

This planning application seeks consent to erect a new Lidl foodstore with a gross internal area (GIA) of 1,895 sqm and a net sales area of 1,251 sqm. The proposed foodstore will be supported by a total of 131 parking spaces (including six accessible spaces; eight parent & child spaces; two rapid electric vehicle charging (EVC) spaces; and 12 fast EVC spaces). Safe and convenient parking provision for 12 cycles will also be provided. The proposed access to the site has been subject to consultation with the local Highways authority and has been deemed acceptable.

##### Background of the proposed foodstore

As members are aware, this application was previously approved by King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council on 17 May 2022 but was subsequently quashed on 27 July 2022, following a Judicial Review lodged by Tesco Stores Limited. The sole ground for the application being quashed was that: -

The consideration of the proposed financial contribution [which was an offer for Lidl Great Britain Limited to contribute £50,000 for Downham Market town centre improvements] involved an error of law.

Subsequently, the application has gone back to the Council's Planning Officers for redetermination.

Following the legal challenge, the proposed floorspace of the proposed store (including the net sales area) was reduced. The Council's retail consultant, Alder King, previously predicted that the larger foodstore would have resulted in significant adverse impact on the town centre. However, the subsequent reduction in the size of the store, more specifically the net sales area, means that the latest retail advice from Alder King (dated November 2022) concludes that "[the proposed foodstore] will not give rise to significant adverse impact on the town centre".

As such, due to there being no perceived impact on the Town Centre, the financial contribution no longer forms a part of the planning application. As such, this ground for Judicial review has been addressed.

As highlighted in the Committee report, other minor changes have been made to the scheme to ensure that the scheme is feasible and address comments raised by statutory consultees. Updated technical documents have been submitted, where necessary, to ensure that the application pack presented at Committee is consistent. All relevant statutory consultees have been consulted on the latest plan pack and technical reports, prior to the committee. As can be seen in the committee report there are no objections to the proposed development from statutory consultees.

It should also be noted that there is overwhelming support from the local community, with 455 representations of support registered against the application; and only 28 objections. Based on the

number of supportive comments, and the contents of the comments summarised in the committee report, it is clear that the residents of Downham Market are eager for the proposed foodstore to come forward on the site.

#### Benefits of the proposed foodstore

The proposed foodstore development will deliver a number of significant benefits to the residents of Downham Market and surrounding area, namely the development will: -

- Provide a much-needed discount foodstore in Downham Market, which will improve Downham Market's convenience retail provision and give locals greater opportunity to reduce the cost of their grocery shopping;
- Create up to 40 new employment opportunities for local residents, all of which will pay a base rate of £10.90 per hour with the opportunity for upward progression within the company;
- Represent a multimillion-pound investment in the local economy, including over £200,000 of CIL contributions;
- Promote sustainability, with a large roof-top solar panel array and a total of 14 'active' electric vehicle charging spaces; and
- Include an attractive contemporary design and enhanced landscaping, which includes the planting of additional trees, wetland wildflower and ornamental shrubs.

Based on the conclusion reached by your planning officers, who recommend that the application is approved, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms and should be approved subject to conditions by the Planning Committee.

As outlined above, the issues that led to the previous Judicial review have now been fully rectified and there are no outstanding objections from any statutory consultees, including the Council's retail advisor. Furthermore, the public have demonstrated overwhelming support for the proposed development; and the development will bring substantial benefits to Downham Market.

Given the above, it is hoped that members at the Committee will follow the Officer's recommendation and approve the application.

#### **Third party comments:**

An additional third party objection (in addition to those already made) has been received commenting:

*We have recently seen the written response on behalf of the applicant that states "...that all reference to 'eco-store' has now been removed from the documents." A similar statement appears in the Officer's Report to the 6th March meeting, i.e., "Reference to the eco-store has now been removed from the application. The store itself is smaller than what was originally proposed, however it retains the same floorspace and net sales area as the proposal that was deferred at Planning Committee on 9th January 2023." The second sentence is a matter of fact relating to the floorspace of the proposal and is not new. However, the nature, or format, of the smaller store has not been the subject of any comment other than to state that reference to an 'eco-store' has been removed. That Lidl had at least temporarily, a proposal that would provide a "more value-orientated convenience goods product lines" i.e., as understood in comparison with the original proposal is not denied. To then withdraw it without explanation is, at best, confusing and raises the question as to the motive for labelling their revised proposal as an 'eco-store'.*

*Otherwise, our continuing representations of objection focus on the following important considerations:*

- 1. The correct application of development plan policy relating to retail impact,*
- 2. The prospect of a harmful "significant adverse impact" on Downham Market Town Centre,*
- 3. Breach of development boundary and countryside policy,*

4. *Inadequacy of sequential assessment in terms of failure to adequately consider a preferable opportunity, and*
5. *The poor accessibility of the application site, including when compared with the potentially sequentially preferable opportunity.*

Further comments relate to the concern that the advice the Council received from its retail planning experts, Alder King, dated February 2023, was published on the Council's website on 28th February – at best only 4 working days before Monday morning's Planning Committee meeting.

**Assistant Director's comments:**

The applicant's Supporting Case is noted.

In response to the third-party comment, reference to the eco-store was removed as the store is essentially a slightly smaller store than what was originally proposed. The amendment to the store size is referenced in the Committee Report.

The Committee Report considers the relevant planning policy and material planning considerations. It concludes with a planning balance.

The impact of the proposal on Downham Market Town Centre, the breach of the development boundary and countryside policy, sequential test, and accessibility, have all been assessed within the Committee Report.

In response to the third party comments about the date the Council's Retail Consultant's comments were published online, it should be noted that the Council did not need to publish this advice online, but chose to as a matter of transparency.

**Item 9/2(a) 22/01490/FM Page No. 45**

**KLACC:** Makes the following comments:

'The application was considered at the Kings Lynn Area Consultative Committee-Planning Sub-Group. The minutes from that meeting are as follows:-

The Senior Planner presented the application and outlined the proposal to the Sub-Group. She explained that there were already two turbines in the vicinity and highlighted them on a plan. In 2014 there had been an application for a third mast and was refused and went to appeal. The Inspector made it clear that they considered that the cumulative impact of 3 turbines was not acceptable. The Local Plan made it clear that the Council supported renewable energy unless it was wind turbines, and the emerging Local Plan still had that same policy. In a Ministerial Statement it made it clear that we should only be permitting a wind turbine if it had been allocated.

Councillor Bambridge asked how far away it would be from the bungalows at Estuary Road. It was explained that a flicker study had been carried out, but it was considered that there would not be any impact.

Councillor Bambridge also asked if this was going to be part of the Norfolk Coastal path when it extended? In response, it was explained that the Inspector had raised concern in relation to the proximity of the byway. The Senior Planner explained that weight could not be given to the Norfolk Coastal path proposals if it was not currently adopted.

Councillor Jones advised that a survey had been carried out with residents of North Lynn in relation to the application and asked if this held any weight. The Senior Planner advised that the Ministerial

Statement made it clear that in order for something to be acceptable it had to have community backing. The site also had to be identified within the Local Plan.

Councillor Jones added that within this energy crisis should consideration be given to every form of energy production.

The Planning Control Manager advised that decisions had to be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. In this case there was a previous appeal decision stating that a third turbine in that area would not be acceptable and a Ministerial Statement saying that a site had to be allocated and had to have community support, and it was also against Local Plan policies.

Conclusion

That the KLAAC Planning Sub-Group objected to the application’.

## **CORRECTIONS**

**Amended consultation response (page 50, paragraph 6) - Ministry of Defence (MoD)**

### **REMOVE**

*‘OBJECTS’ due to the impact of the proposal on the proposed wind turbine on the operation and capacity of Air Traffic Control Radar sited at RAF Marham and the introduction of a physical obstruction to air traffic movements’*

**REPLACE WITH THE FOLLOWING:-** *NO OBJECTION subject to safeguarding conditions.*

**Amended section ‘Impact Upon Aviation’ (Page 56, 3<sup>rd</sup> heading)**

Paragraph two of this section **REMOVE** ‘Objected’ and **REPLACE** with ‘raise no objection’.

**REMOVE THE REMAINDER OF THE TEXT IN THIS SECTION.**

**Amended section ‘Conclusion’ (page 58, 2<sup>nd</sup> heading)**

**REMOVE** ‘ Furthermore, the Ministry of Defence have objected to the development on the grounds that the development would lead to the introduction of a physical obstruction to air traffic movements’.

**Amended Section ‘ RECOMMENDATION’**

**REMOVE REASON 4 (page 58 and 59)**

**Assistant Director’s comments:** The report has been corrected to accurately reflect the position regarding the impact on aviation. Refusal reason 4 has therefore been removed.

**Item 9/3(a) 22/01797/O Page No. 60**

### **ADDITIONAL CONDITION:**

13 Condition: The reserved matter of landscaping (as referred to in Condition 1 above), shall include the existing hedgerow along the roadside of the site as being retained and maintained at a height not exceeding 1.0m; if this is not possible by reason of access/visibility creation, then there shall be either a new hedge of indigenous species planted or the existing hedge replanted at least 2.4m back from the edge of the highway carriageway.

13 Reason: To define the terms of this permission in the interests of the visual amenity of the locality and to accord with Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM15 of the SADMPP (2016).

**Item 9/3(c) 22/01456/F Page No. 90**

**Third Party: TWO OBJECTIONS** received from neighbouring dwelling (summarised) -

1. The applicants partner states they want to be part of the community of Feltwell, will the family be living above the kebab shop? In the village? Will their children attend local schools? If not then they will not be a member of the community, they will just have a business which they work in, in the village.
2. This takeaway could be anywhere in Norfolk, more suited. Applicant does not own the premises ( as he states on the signed declaration on his application, and as such I feel he cannot be trusted in what he promises going forward), nor, I believe, has a signed tenancy/ lease agreement, this all depends upon planning approval, Therefore I believe there is nothing contractually holding the applicant to this property.
3. With ref to his statement re vermin control, this means rat traps and poison being used close to my property, I own a jack Russell dog who will be likely to catch and eat any poisoned rats/mice thus potentially poisoning my pet and local wildlife, we have owls, hedgehogs etc in the gardens ( all of which are in decline). There would be no need for such traps of the kebab shop wasn't there
4. His idea of controlling customers telling them to park away from the shop when collecting food is unrealistic as is them being able to stop any unsocial behaviour.
5. I realise as far as planning is concerned this does not matter to you but as a village resident of nearly 16 years I am very concerned. This is next door to my home, I have poured all my inheritance from my parents estate into my property for my future retirement and this will certainly make my home unsaleable, or at a great financial loss .
6. As for them putting up hanging baskets , do they honestly think that will distract from the constant cooking smells ?
7. The agent of change somehow seems to have been disregarded in your decision to approve this planning as CSNN doc dated 06/02/23 states " I have some concerns how they will control external aspects , ie, where delivery drivers and customers will park and whether those waiting for food to be cooked ( in cars or on foot especially if the shop capacity has been reached) could pose noise issues for the adjacent neighbours- they can't control these in my opinion ". This seems to be overlooked and should be addressed as signage will not be sufficient and will affect mine and my family's quality of life.
8. Lets be honest, how many committee members want to live next door to a kebab shop ? How this has even come this far beggars belief, a kebab shop adjacent to residential housing and opposite a beautiful church, surely the applicant can find alternative premises to rent to set up his new venture in a more commercial location. And surely the shop owner can consider alternative tenants complying with current business use retail E(a).
9. Opening hours have been recommended as per CSNN comment ref 5294785 as of 06/02. 12-8.30 mon -Thursday and 12-9 on Friday & Saturday. This contradicts the opening hours shown on your committee agenda 8/3 (c), this states 12 til 9 mon-Thurs and 12-9.30 on fri & Saturday . Please refer to CSNN guidance.
10. On drawings noise management plan appendix 4 provided there is a noise receptor NSR showing on my property 3 St Mary's St, can you confirm if this is going to be attached to my property, and if so, shouldn't I be informed/asked?

The business will cause a nuisance as defined by the Environmental Protection Act 1990. It would give rise to smells, noise and fumes, cause litter, and insects are likely to emanate which will give neighbours cause to complain to the local authority. The business is not wanted here.

## CORRECTION

**Amended Condition:** Condition 2 to be amended as follows:

2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans Drawing Nos P-104B, P102B **and the Location Plan.**

2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

**Assistant Directors comments:**

Many of these issues have already been addressed within the Officers Report. Discussions with CSNN have been ongoing and the officers report and proposed conditions reflect the latest comments and recommendations from CSNN. CSNN have considered potential noise and odour impacts of the proposed development and conditions are attached to address/ manage these. In terms of where the applicant lives, the details of their lease, impact on the value of neighbouring properties and potential impacts on their pet are not material planning considerations. In terms of the placing of the noise receptor, this would be for discussion between the applicant and neighbour and CSNN, to ensure the noise is fully assessed for neighbouring residents.

The correction clarifies the need to include the Location Plan within the approved plans.

### Item 9/3(e) 22/00536/F Page No. 127

**Agent:** The Agent provided an email querying lack of re-consultation with the Parish Council following receipt of amended tree works plans and lack of request of a supporting statement.

**Assistant Directors comments:** The Scheme of Delegation requires re-consultation on significant amendments. The Parish Council objection, provided in the committee report, relates to two reasons for refusal. Whilst plans were amended to retain trees, no changes were made to address impacts on form and character. It was not considered necessary to re-consult the Parish Council on this basis.

The Agent has been given the opportunity to provide a supporting statement for inclusion within this document however to date, none has been provided.

### Item 9/3(g) 22/00284/F Page No. 154

**Amended Condition:** Condition 15 to be amended as follows:

15 Condition: Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no works shall commence on site unless otherwise agreed in writing until detailed drawings for the off-site highway improvement works (carriageway widening across the roadside frontage and the private access, including culverting) as indicated on Drawing No.6324 PL01d have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

15 Reason: To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor including the provision of a satisfactory access.

**Assistant Directors comments:** This clarifies the need to include details relating to the culverting of the drain, when providing the detailed drawings for the carriageway widening and private access into the site.

## APPENDIX 1

### Examination Timetable

The Examining Authority (ExA) is under a duty to **complete** the Examination of the application by the end of the period of six months beginning with the day after the close of the Preliminary Meeting.

The Examination of the application primarily takes the form of the consideration of written submissions. The ExA will also consider any oral representations made at hearings.

| Item | Matters  | Date  |
|------|--|---|
| 1.   | <b>Issue by the ExA of:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Examination Timetable</li></ul> <b>Publication by the ExA of:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1)</li></ul>   | <b>As soon as practicable following the Preliminary Meeting</b> |
| 2.   | <b>Deadline 1</b><br>For receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Comments on Relevant Representations (RRs)</li><li>• Summaries of all RRs exceeding 1500 words</li><li>• Post-hearing submissions including written submissions of oral cases as heard on OFH1, OFH2 and ISH1</li><li>• Applicant's draft itinerary for Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI)</li><li>• Local Impact Report(s) (LIRs)</li><li>• Draft Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) requested by the ExA</li><li>• Draft Statement of Commonality (SoC) of SoCG</li><li>• The Compulsory Acquisitions (CA) Schedule</li><li>• Draft National Policy Statement (NPS) Tracker</li><li>• Draft Application Document Tracker</li><li>• Updated BoR and schedule of changes to the BoR in clean and tracked versions</li></ul> | <b>Friday 10 March 2023</b>                                     |

|    |  |                                    |
|----|--|------------------------------------|
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification by Statutory Parties of their wish to be considered as an IP by the ExA</li> <li>• Requests by Interested Parties to be heard at a subsequent Open Floor Hearing (OFH)</li> <li>• Requests by Affected Persons (defined in section 59(4) of the Planning Act 2008) to be heard at a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH)</li> <li>• Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010</li> <li>• Comments on any information/submissions accepted by the ExA</li> </ul>   |                                    |
| 3. | <p><b>Deadline 2</b></p> <p>For receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response to the ExA's ExQ1</li> <li>• Written Representations (WRs)</li> <li>• Summaries of all WRs exceeding 1500 words</li> <li>• Comments on LIR(s)</li> <li>• Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers</li> <li>• An updated version of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) in clean, tracked and Word versions (if required as a result of the ExA's ExQ1)</li> <li>• Updated BoR and schedule of changes to the BoR (if required) in clear and tracked versions</li> <li>• Comments on the Applicant's draft itinerary for the ASI</li> <li>• Draft Application Document Tracker (if required)</li> <li>• Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of the Examination Rules</li> </ul> | <p><b>Friday 24 March 2023</b></p> |

|           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
|           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments on any further information/submissions received by <b>Deadline 1</b></li> </ul>  |   |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>Issue Specific Hearing (ISH2)</b><br>On the draft Development Consent Order   | <b>Wednesday 12 April 2023</b>                |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>Compulsory Acquisitions Hearing (CAH1)</b>  | <b>Thursday 13 April 2023</b><br>(am session) |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>Compulsory Acquisitions Hearing (CAH2)</b>  | <b>Thursday 13 April 2023</b><br>(pm session) |
| <b>7.</b> | <b>Deadline 3</b><br>For receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post-hearing submissions including written submissions of oral cases</li> <li>Comments on WRs</li> <li>Updated SoCG</li> <li>Updated SoC</li> <li>An updated version of the dDCO in clean, tracked and word versions (if required as a result of the ExA's commentary)</li> <li>Updated BoR and schedule of changes to the BoR (if required)</li> <li>Updated CA Schedule (if required)</li> <li>Comments on dDCO</li> <li>Comments on responses to ExQ1</li> <li>Draft Application Document Tracker (if required)</li> <li>Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of the Examination Rules</li> <li>Comments on any further information/submissions received by <b>Deadline 2</b></li> </ul> | <b>Tuesday 25 April 2023</b>                  |
| <b>8.</b> | <b>Publication by the ExA of:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ExA's final itinerary for the ASI (if required)</li> </ul>  | <b>Friday 28 April 2023</b>                   |

|     |  |                       |
|-----|--|-----------------------|
| 9.  | <b>Publication by the ExA of:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) and any associated questions (if required)</li> </ul>  | Tuesday 9 May 2023    |
| 10. | <b>Compulsory Acquisitions Hearing (CAH3)</b><br>(if required)   | Wednesday 10 May 2023 |
| 11. | <b>Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI)</b> (if required)   | Thursday 11 May 2023  |
| 12. | <b>Issue Specific Hearing (ISH3)</b><br>On Environmental Matters   | Tuesday 16 May 2023   |
| 13. | <b>Issue Specific Hearing (ISH4)</b><br>On Environmental Matters   | Wednesday 17 May 2023 |
| 14. | <b>Issue Specific Hearing (ISH5)</b><br>On Environmental Matters   | Thursday 18 May 2023  |
| 15. | <b>Deadline 4</b><br>For receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post-hearing submissions including written submissions of oral cases</li> <li>Updated Status of negotiations with Statutory Undertakers</li> <li>Updated CA Schedule (if required)</li> <li>Comments on the RIES (if published)</li> <li>Requests by Affected Persons (defined in section 59(4) of the Planning Act 2008) to be heard at a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing (CAH)</li> <li>Requests by Interested Parties to be heard at a subsequent Open Floor Hearing (OFH) and participate at an Issue Specific Hearing (ISH)</li> <li>Draft Application Document Tracker (if required)</li> <li>Updated Guide to the Application in clean and tracked versions</li> <li>Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of the Examination Rules</li> </ul> | Thursday 25 May 2023  |

|            |  |                                     |
|------------|--|-------------------------------------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments on any further information/submissions received by <b>Deadline 3</b></li> </ul>  |                                     |
| <b>16.</b> | <b>Publication by the ExA of:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ2) (if required)</li> <li>ExA's commentary on, or schedule of changes to, the dDCO (if required)</li> </ul>   | <b>Monday 5 June 2023</b>           |
| <b>17.</b> | <b>Deadline 5</b><br>For receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses to ExQ2 (if published)</li> <li>Updated SoCG</li> <li>Updated SoC</li> <li>Draft Application Document Tracker (if required)</li> <li>Comments on the ExA's commentary on, or schedule of changes to, the draft DCO (if required)</li> <li>An updated version of the dDCO in clean, tracked and word versions (if required as a result of the previously held Hearings)</li> <li>Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of the Examination Rules</li> <li>Comments on any further information/submissions received by <b>Deadline 4</b></li> </ul> | <b>Friday 16 June 2023</b>          |
| <b>18.</b> | <b>Dates reserved (if required) for:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any Compulsory Acquisition Hearing</li> <li>Any Issue Specific Hearing</li> <li>Any Open Floor Hearing</li> </ul>  | <b>Week commencing 26 June 2023</b> |
| <b>19.</b> | <b>Deadline 6</b><br>For receipt by the ExA of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments on responses to ExQ2 (if published)</li> <li>Post-hearing submissions including written submissions (if required)</li> </ul>   | <b>Wednesday 12 July 2023</b>       |

|     |   |                              |
|-----|---|------------------------------|
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final SoCG</li> <li>• Final SoC</li> <li>• List of matters not agreed where SoCG could not be finalised</li> <li>• Updated Status of negotiations with Statutory Undertakers</li> <li>• Final Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers</li> <li>• An updated version of the dDCO in clean, tracked and word versions (if required)</li> <li>• Comments on the dDCO</li> <li>• Draft Application Document Tracker (if required)</li> <li>• Updated Guide to the Application in clean and tracked versions</li> <li>• Comments on any further information/submissions received by <b>Deadline 5</b></li> <li>• Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of the Examination Rules</li> </ul> |                              |
| 20. | <b>Publication by the ExA of:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ExA's Further Written Questions (if required)</li> </ul>   | <b>Friday 21 July 2023</b>   |
| 21. | <b>Deadline 7</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response to Further Written Questions (if published)</li> <li>• Final DCO to be submitted by the Applicant in the SI template with the SI template validation report</li> <li>• Final updated BoR and schedule of changes to BoR</li> <li>• Final Guide to the Application</li> <li>• Final Status of Negotiations CA Schedule</li> <li>• Final NPS tracker</li> <li>• Comments on the REIS and responses to any associated questions (if published)</li> </ul>  | <b>Friday 04 August 2023</b> |

|            |   |                              |
|------------|---|------------------------------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on any additional information/submissions received by <b>Deadline 6</b></li> <li>• Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010</li> </ul>  |                              |
| <b>22.</b> | <p><b>Deadline 8</b></p> <p>For receipt by the ExA of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on responses to further Written Questions (if published)</li> <li>• Comments on any further information/submissions received by <b>Deadline 7</b></li> <li>• Any further information requested by the ExA under Rule 17 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010</li> </ul> | <b>Friday 18 August 2023</b> |
| <b>23.</b> | The ExA is under a duty to complete the Examination of the application by the end of the period of six months   | <b>Monday 21 August 2023</b> |