

# Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm

---

Project Two

---

**Appendix Q to the Applicant's Submission of 27 April 2015**

**Environmental Information Signposting Document**

[smartwind.co.uk](http://smartwind.co.uk)

## **1. Introduction**

---

- 1.1 SMart Wind Limited, as agent on behalf of Optimus Wind Limited and Breesea Limited (together “the Applicant”), submitted an application (“the Application”) for a Development Consent Order (“DCO”) in relation to Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm Project Two (“the Project”) on 30 January 2015.
- 1.2 The Application was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) on 19 February 2015. Accompanying the notification of this acceptance was a Section 51 Letter and Section 55 checklist identifying a number of areas in the Application requiring clarification. The Applicant responded to this advice in April 2015 providing the clarification sought as well as providing additional areas of clarification. This has resulted in the submission of an Errata List and separate clarification notes relevant to the Environmental Statement (“ES”) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (“HRA”).
- 1.3 To ensure that all environmental information is easily locatable, the Applicant has provided this Signposting Document.
- 1.4 It is intended that this Signposting Document will be a working document which will be periodically updated by the Applicant if and when required.
- 1.5 This document should be consulted alongside the Index to the Environmental Statement (PINS Doc ref 1.4) which provides an index of all ES chapters, accompanying ES documents and relevant non-ES documents which accompanied the Application. A copy of this document is available on the Planning Inspectorate website – [here](#).

## **2. Structure of Signposting Document**

---

- 2.1 The first column of the table below provides a reference to each chapter of the ES and to the HRA submitted with the Application and provides a link to that part. The second column then identifies the principal clarification documents which have been subsequently submitted and which are relevant to the particular part of the ES or the HRA. When these documents are published on the Planning Inspectorate webpage for the Project a link will be provided. The final column then seeks to summarise (in high level terms) the relevance of the clarification note to the ES or HRA topic and the purpose for its submission.

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<b>7.1 Introduction</b>		
<a href="#">7.1.a Non-technical Summary</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.1.b Glossary</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.1.1 Introduction</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.1.2 Policy and Legislative Context</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.1.3 Project Description</a>	Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)	<p>The Applicant has identified a typographical error in paragraph 3.5.5 of the Project Description, which incorrectly stated the construction period for intertidal area will be completed within 4 and a half years. This should instead have read "completed within 5 sequential years."</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed in the Errata List that this typographical error was limited to this reference in the Project Description only and that the assessments within the ES (where relevant) were assessed on the basis of the correct 5 year period.</p>
<a href="#">7.1.4 Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.1.5 Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology</a>	-	-
<b>7.2 Offshore</b>		

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<p><a href="#">7.2.1 Marine Processes</a></p>	<p>Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix R to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix S to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p>	<p>Table 3.6 of the Project Description details that the largest monopile foundation is for a 8MW turbine, which allows for a maximum of 225 turbines within the Project's parameters by consequence. However, the assessments included within the Marine Processes Chapter were incorrectly based on a maximum monopile foundation for a 15MW turbine, which would have a commensurately reduced maximum number of 120 turbines. The Errata List and the Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note address this minor discrepancy in the assessment. This clarification note confirms that the original assessment conclusions within the relevant ES chapters remain valid and unchanged.</p> <p>Table 3.7 of the Project Description details that the diameter of the main tubular elements of the jacket foundation is 3m for each turbine type. However, the Marine Processes chapter to the ES incorrectly lists a diameter of 2.5m instead. The Applicant has documented this in the Errata List and has produced a Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note to address this minor discrepancy in the assessment. This Clarification Note provides scour calculations for a 3m diameter and confirms that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.</p>

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<p data-bbox="143 834 456 930"> <a href="#">7.2.2 Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology</a> </p>	<p data-bbox="528 675 1167 738">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p data-bbox="528 754 1120 882">Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix R to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p data-bbox="528 898 1167 1026">Humber SAC Subtidal Benthic Habitat Disturbance Clarification Note (see Appendix U to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p data-bbox="528 1042 1104 1137">Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix S to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p>	<p data-bbox="1205 339 2045 786">Table 3.6 of the Project Description details that the largest monopile foundation is for a 8MW turbine, which allows for a maximum of 225 turbines within the Project's parameters by consequence. However, the assessments included within the Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology Chapter was incorrectly based on a maximum monopile foundation for a 15MW turbine, which would have a commensurately reduced maximum number of 120 turbines. The Errata List and the Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note address this minor discrepancy in the assessment. This clarification note confirms that the original assessment conclusions within the relevant ES chapters remain valid and unchanged.</p> <p data-bbox="1205 802 2045 1058">Table 2.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology of the ES lists the temporary habitat loss for subtidal benthic habitats (Annex 1 estuary) as 128,000m<sup>2</sup>. This is incorrect and should have stated 256,000m<sup>2</sup>. The Errata List and the Humber SAC Subtidal Benthic Habitat Disturbance Clarification Note confirm that the overall conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged as a result of this correction.</p> <p data-bbox="1205 1074 2045 1425">Table 3.7 of the Project Description details that the diameter of the main tubular elements of the jacket foundation is 3m for each turbine type. However, the Marine Processes chapter to the ES incorrectly lists a diameter of 2.5m instead. The Applicant has documented this in the Errata List and has produced a Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note to address this minor discrepancy in the assessment. This Clarification Note provides scour calculations for a 3m diameter and confirms that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.</p>

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<a href="#">7.2.3 Fish and Shellfish Ecology</a>	Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015) Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix R to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)	Table 3.6 of the Project Description details that the largest monopile foundation is for a 8MW turbine, which allows for a maximum of 225 turbines within the Project's parameters by consequence. However, the assessments included within the Fish and Shellfish Chapter was incorrectly based on a maximum monopile foundation for a 15MW turbine, which would have a commensurately reduced maximum number of 120 turbines. The Errata List and the Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note address this minor discrepancy in the assessment. The Errata List and the Clarification Note confirm that the original assessment conclusions within the relevant ES chapters remain valid and unchanged.
<a href="#">7.2.4 Marine Mammals</a>	Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015) Marine Mammals Decommissioning Vessels Clarification Note (see Appendix T to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)	Table 4.17 of Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals of the ES assessed vessel movements over the decommissioning phase to a maximum number of 739. This is incorrect and should instead have been assessed to a maximum number of 2,956. The Applicant has documented this in the Errata List and produced the Marine Mammals Decommissioning Vessels Clarification Note to address this discrepancy in the assessment. The Errata List and the clarification note confirm that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.
<a href="#">7.2.5 Ornithology</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.2.6 Commercial Fisheries</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.2.7 Shipping and Navigation</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.2.8 Aviation, Military and</a>	-	-

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<a href="#">Communications</a>		
<a href="#">7.2.9 Marine Archaeology and Ordnance</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.2.10 Seascape and Visual Resources</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.2.11 Infrastructure and Other Users</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.2.12 Inter-related Effects (Offshore)</a>	-	-
<b>7.3 Onshore</b>		
<a href="#">7.3.1 Geology and Ground Conditions</a>	<p>Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p>	<p>The Applicant has identified certain instances across the ES of inconsistent referencing of the "transition joint bays" and the "jointing pits", as well as their dimensions and the approach to their reinstatement. The Applicant has documented this in the Errata List and produced a Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note to address and clarify these matters to avoid confusion. The Errata List and the clarification note confirm that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.</p>

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<a href="#">7.3.2 Hydrology and Flood Risk</a>	<p>Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p>	<p>Table 2.11 of Volume 3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk of the ES details the target depth for cable duct installation to be 1.2m. This is incorrect and should read 1.5m. The Applicant confirmed in the Errata List that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct 1.5m target depth and thus the conclusions reached remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Applicant has identified certain instances across the ES of inconsistent referencing of the "transition joint bays" and the "jointing pits", as well as their dimensions and the approach to their reinstatement. The Applicant has documented this in the Errata List and produced a Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note to address and clarify these matters to avoid confusion. The Errata List and the clarification note confirm that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.</p>
<a href="#">7.3.3 Ecology and Nature Conservation</a>	<p>Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p>	<p>The Applicant has identified certain instances across the ES of inconsistent referencing of the "transition joint bays" and the "jointing pits", as well as their dimensions and the approach to their reinstatement. The Applicant has documented this in the Errata List and produced a Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note to address and clarify these matters to avoid confusion. The Errata List and the clarification note confirm that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.</p>

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<a href="#">7.3.4 Intertidal Ornithology</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.3.5 Landscape and Visual Resources Part 1 of 3</a> <a href="#">Landscape and Visual Resources Part 2 of 3</a> <a href="#">Landscape and Visual Resources Part 3 of 3</a>	Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)	Table 5.7 of Volume 3, Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Resources of the ES lists the maximum dimensions of one onshore HVAC substation building as 82m long x 111m wide x 15m high. This is incorrect and should accord with the dimensions outlined in Table 3.32 of the Project Description – 82.5m long x 18.5m wide x 15m high. The Applicant confirmed in the Errata List that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct dimensions listed in the Project Description and thus the conclusions remain unchanged.

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<a href="#">7.3.6 <u>Historic Environment</u></a>	Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015) Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)	<p>Table 6.13 of Volume 3, Chapter 6: Historic Environment of the ES lists the cable trench dimensions as 1.5m wide x 2m deep. This is incorrect and should mirror the equivalent dimensions outlined in Table 3.29 and Figure 3.28 of the Project Description – 1m wide x 2m deep. The Applicant confirmed in the Errata List that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct dimensions listed in the Project Description and thus the conclusions remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Applicant has identified certain instances across the ES of inconsistent referencing of the “transition joint bays” and the “jointing pits”, as well as their dimensions and the approach to their reinstatement. The Applicant has documented this in the Errata List and produced a Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note to address and clarify these matters to avoid confusion. The Errata List and the clarification note confirm that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.</p>
<a href="#">7.3.7 <u>Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation</u></a>	Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)	<p>Table 7.12 of Volume 3, Chapter 7: Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation of the ES states that the dimensions of the temporary compound on the landward side of the sea defences are 65m x 120m. These dimensions are incorrect and should reflect the correct dimensions outlined in paragraph 3.3.59 of the Project Description, which lists them as 200m x 150m. The Applicant confirmed in the</p>

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
		Errata List that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct dimensions listed in the Project Description and thus the conclusions remain unchanged.
<a href="#">7.3.8 Traffic and Transport</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.3.9 Noise and Vibration</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.3.10 Air Quality and Health</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.3.11 Socio Economics</a>	-	-
<a href="#">7.3.12 Inter-Related Effects Onshore</a>	-	-

Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)	Document submitted post Application (Link)	Relevance of Document
<p>12.6 <a href="#">Habitats Regulations Part 1 of 2</a></p> <p><a href="#">Habitats Regulations Part 2 of 2</a></p>	<p>Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening and Integrity Matrices (Version 2) (see Appendix P to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>The Humber SAC Benthic Habitat Disturbance Clarification Note (see Appendix U to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p> <p>In-combination Auk Displacement Clarification Note (see Appendix W to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</p>	<p>These HRA Appendices have been updated to include a number of missing footnotes. The footnotes provide necessary context to the conclusion drawn in the relevant matrix. The inclusion of these footnotes has not affected the outcome of the Screening and Integrity Matrices (and therefore, HRA conclusions).</p> <p>The HRA incorrectly referenced the temporary disturbance of 128,000m<sup>2</sup> of benthic subtidal habitat within the Humber Estuary SAC for the Project alone and in-combination with other projects. It should have stated 256,000m<sup>2</sup>. The Errata List and the Humber SAC Benthic Habitat Disturbance Clarification Note address this erratum and confirm that the overall conclusion of the HRA remains valid.</p> <p>The Applicant has produced the Auk Displacement Clarification Note to update the assessment of in-combination displacement effects for guillemot, razorbill and puffin as part of the work contained in the HRA. The purpose of this note is to provide clarification to the in-combination displacement figures for guillemot, razorbill and puffin for the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA. This note, therefore, updates the in-combination displacement figures published in Section 5.8 of the HRA Report. The Applicant can confirm that this Clarification Note does not affect the outcome of the conclusions drawn within the HRA.</p>