

27 April 2015

Katherine Chapman
Principal Case Manager
Major Applications and Plans
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Ms Chapman

SMart Wind Limited
Proposed Hornsea Project Two Offshore Wind Farm
Application Ref: EN010053 (the “Application”)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 As you are aware, we act for SMart Wind Limited who is the promoter of Hornsea Project Two Offshore Wind Farm (the “**Project**”) (as agent on behalf Optimus Wind Limited and Breesea Limited (the parties together being the “**Applicant**”).
- 1.2 The Application was submitted on 30 January 2015 and accepted for examination on 19 February 2015. The Section 51 Letter and Section 55 checklist, which accompanied notification of the acceptance of the Application, identified areas in the Application requiring clarification.
- 1.3 This letter provides the Applicant’s response on these points, as well as providing additional areas of clarification which the Applicant considers it helpful to raise now, to provide the earliest opportunity for review by the Examining Authority and any interested parties.
- 1.4 The Applicant would be happy to provide any additional clarification and/or information that may be required.

2. Errata

- 2.1 To address the points raised in the Section 51 Letter and Section 55 checklist, the Applicant has provided an Errata List at Schedule 2 to this letter. This Errata List sets out the areas for clarification and provides the Applicant’s response to the points raised. In addition, the Errata List also identifies some additional areas of clarification raised by the Applicant. For some areas the Applicant has provided a clarification note to elaborate on its response provided in the Errata List. Where a clarification note has been provided, it has been identified in the relevant section of the Errata List and then provided as a separate appendix to this letter. A full list of the appendices to this letter is provided at Schedule 1.
- 2.2 In addition to addressing errata as set out in the Errata List, the Applicant also proposes to make amendments to the draft Development Consent Order (“**DCO**”) and deemed Marine Licences (“**DMLs**”), the Order Limits and the Book of Reference, as outlined below.

Condor House
10 St. Paul’s Churchyard
London EC4M 8AL
DX 98945 Cheapside 2
T: +44 (0)20 7429 4900
F: +44 (0)20 7329 5939
www.shepwedd.co.uk

5th Floor, 1 Exchange Crescent
Conference Square
Edinburgh EH3 8UL
DX 551970 Edinburgh 53
T: +44 (0)131 228 9900
F: +44 (0)131 228 1222

191 West George Street
Glasgow
G2 2LB
DX GW409 Glasgow
T: +44 (0)141 566 9900
F: +44 (0)141 565 1222

1 Berry Street
Aberdeen
AB25 1HF
DX AB44 Aberdeen
T: +44 (0)1224 343 555
F: +44 (0)1224 343 555

Development Consent Order/deemed Marine Licence(s)

- 2.3 The Applicant has proposed certain amendments to the draft Development Consent Order (“**DCO**”) and deemed Marine Licence(s) (“**DML**”) which are the result of discussions with relevant statutory and non-statutory consultees (and where applicable the development of Statements of Common Ground (“**SoCGs**”). A copy of the updated draft DCO (Version 2), together with a tracked-change version against Version 1, are provided at Appendices A and B to this letter respectively.
- 2.4 To assist the Examining Authority and interested parties, the Applicant has also provided a Schedule of Changes at Appendix C, which provides the context to each DCO and DML amendment.

Order Limits

- 2.5 The Applicant has continued to engage with those persons with an interest within the Order Land following acceptance of the Application. As a result of these discussions and in an effort to minimise the impact of the Project on the affected persons, the Applicant has agreed to make minor reductions to the Order Land by the removal of certain plots. Specifically, the plots proposed to be removed from the Land Plans are plots 227, 382 to 387 (inclusive) and 389 to 391 (inclusive). Plot 226 of the Land Plans is proposed to be reduced.
- 2.6 To reflect the proposed removal of these plots, the Applicant has made amendments to the plans as detailed at Schedule 3 to this letter. Amendments to address errata as detailed in the Errata List (Schedule 2 to this letter) have also been made.
- 2.7 The Applicant has also updated the Book of Reference (as described further below) to reflect the removal of these plots by detailing that these plots are no longer used. The Applicant considers that these concurrent updates to the Land Plans (and other relevant plans) and Book of Reference ensure consistency and ease of reference for any affected person. In particular, the Applicant does not consider that it would be appropriate to delete these plots and re-number the subsequent plots to reflect these deletions as that may cause confusion.

Book of Reference

- 2.8 The Applicant has prepared an updated Book of Reference (Version 2) to reflect refreshed Land Registry and Companies House searches as at 16 April 2015 and the proposed removal of the plots from the Land Plans as identified above. Amendments to address errata as detailed in the Errata List (Schedule 2 to this letter) have also been made. Clean and tracked-change copies of this updated Book of Reference are included at Appendices D and E of this letter respectively.
- 2.9 As a result of the revised searches and through the Applicant’s diligent enquiry, the Applicant has identified certain additional persons who are believed to have an interest in the Order Land. As such, the Applicant has written to these additional persons to provide copies of the Application Documents and to make those persons aware of the process to become as an interested party under section 102A of the Planning Act 2008.
- 2.10 In addition, the Applicant is aware that ownership of the GPSS pipeline will be transferred in the near future to Compañía Logística de Hidrocarburos. The Book of Reference will be further updated to reflect this change of ownership in due course and after notification of completion of the transfer.

Environmental Signposting Document

- 2.11 A number of the Appendices to this letter clarify existing information within the Applicant’s Environmental Statement (“ES”) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (“HRA”) report to support the Applicant’s responses to errata (identified at Schedule 2 to this letter) and to facilitate agreement on SoCGs with the relevant stakeholders.

2.12 As such and for ease of reference, the Applicant has provided a signposting document (see Appendix Q), which the Applicant will update throughout the Examination as and when required.

Finally, the Applicant wishes to update you and the Examining Authority of a change to SMart Wind's internal team. As of 1 April 2015, Sophie Hartfield has taken over from Chris Jenner as the Environment and Consents Manager for the Project. Accordingly, the Applicant would be grateful if all Project relevant correspondence and documentation could be directed to Sophie, instead of Chris, going forward at Sophie.Hartfield@mainstreamrp.com and 0207 776 5512.

Yours sincerely

Scott McCallum
For and on behalf of Shepherd and Wedderburn LLP
scott.mccallum@shepwedd.co.uk
T: 0207 429 4669

SCHEDULE 1**Table of Appendices to this letter**

Appendix Reference	Description
A	Draft Development Consent Order – Version 2
B	Comparison of Version 2 of the draft DCO against Version 1
C	Schedule of Changes to Version 2 of the draft DCO
D	Book of Reference – Version 2
E	Comparison of Version 2 of the Book of Reference against Version 1
F	Land Plans (Version 2) – showing reduction to order limits on onshore sheets 11, 21, 22, and 23 of 27; reduction to order limits on inset sheets 13 and 20 of 26; and, additional inset sheets 8, 9, 16, 17, and 24 of 26
G	Offshore Works Plans (Version 2) – showing updates to the Master Index Sheet, Map Index Sheet and Sheets 2, 3 and 4 of 4
H	Onshore Works Plans (Version 2) – showing updates to the Master Index Sheet, Map Index Sheet and to reflect reduction to order limits on sheets 11, 21, 22 and 23 of 27
I	Intertidal Works Plans (Version 2) – showing update on Master Index Sheet where the inset windows have been revised in line with those in the Onshore and Offshore Work Plans.
J	Crown Plans (Onshore) (Version 2) – showing updates to reflect reduction to order limits on sheet 4 and updated Map Index Sheet
K	Statutory and Non-statutory Conservation etc. Sites Plan (Onshore) (Version 2) – showing updates to reflect reduction to order limits
L	DCO/DML Coordinates Plan (Version 2) – showing updates to reflect reduction of order limits and to include lines of longitude/latitude
M	Crossing Schedule (Onshore) (Version 2) – showing updates to reflect reduction to order limits on sheets 5 and 9
N	Project One/Project Two Interface Plan (Version 2) – showing updates to reflect reduction to order limits on sheets 13, 23, 24 and 25.
O	Compensation Compounds Plan (Version 2) – showing updates to reflect reduction to order limits on sheets 11, 21, 22 and 23.
P	Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening and Integrity Matrices (Version 2) – showing updates to include completion of missing footnotes
Q	Environmental Information Signposting Document
R	Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note
S	Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note
T	Marine Mammals Decommissioning Vessels Clarification Note

Appendix Reference	Description
U	Humber SAC Benthic Habitat /Disturbance Clarification Note
V	Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note
W	In-combination Auk Displacement Clarification Note

SCHEDULE 2**Errata List**

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
Book of Reference (Doc ref No 6.3)	The Section 51 Letter stated that a number of plots had been misidentified in the Book of Reference (as detailed in a schedule attached to the advice) and further suggested that the schedule of statutory undertakers should be removed.	As noted in paragraphs 2.8 to 2.10 of this letter, the Applicant has amended the Book of Reference (Version 2) to incorporate a number of updates, including these points identified in the Section 51 Letter. Clean and tracked-change copies of the updated Book of Reference are included at Appendices D and E of this letter respectively.
Land Plans (Doc ref No 4.1)	The Section 51 Letter identified that further inset drawings for the Land Plans were required to show the detail of certain small plots (identified in a schedule attached to the Advice) subject to compulsory acquisition.	<p>The Applicant has provided new additional inset plans to accompany the Land Plans to magnify the identified plots in the schedule attached to the Section 51 Letter. The Applicant identified no other plots which required a further inset. For the avoidance of doubt, the Applicant sets out below the interrelationship between the new inset plans and the plots in the schedule attached to the Section 51 Letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plot 154 – shown on new inset sheet 8 of 26; • Plots 195 to 197 – shown on new inset sheet 9 of 26; • Plots 307 and 308 – shown on new inset sheet 16 of 26; • Plots 312 and 313 – shown on new inset sheet 17 of 26; • Plots 495 and 496 – shown on new inset sheet 24 of 26. <p>All of these amendments are reflected in Version 2 of the Land Plans that are provided at Appendix F to this letter.</p>
Works Plans (Offshore) (Doc ref No 5.1)	The Section 51 Letter stated that sheet 4 of 4 of the Offshore Works Plans, the inset sheet for the cable route, does not meet sheet 3 of 4, the windfarm inset, and so does not show the full route of the offshore cable. The Section 51 Letter further identified that the inset sheets do not align with their extent as marked on the inset sheets.	<p>The Applicant has updated sheet 4 of 4 of the Offshore Works Plans (Version 2) to address the previous gap between sheets 3 and 4 (see Appendix G of this letter). Sheet 3 of 4 has been updated to provide easting and northing coordinates. Sheet 2 of 4 has been updated to remove lines of longitude and latitude. These changes have been made to provide consistency between the Works Plans.</p> <p>Appendix G also includes an updated "Master Index Sheet" and "Map Index Sheet" to show the full extent of the inset sheets.</p>

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
The DCO/DML Coordinates Plan (Doc ref No 12.11)	The Section 51 Letter noted that the DCO/DML Coordinates Plan does not include lines of longitude or latitude allowing the DCO coordinates to be read independently.	The Applicant has provided an updated DCO/DML Coordinates Plan (Version 2) to include lines of longitude and latitude - see Appendix L of this letter.
Works Plans (Intertidal) (Doc ref No 5.3)	Consequential changes as a result of the changes to inset sheets on the Onshore and Offshore Works Plans.	The Applicant has updated the Master Index Sheet for the Intertidal Works Plans (Version 2) to show update on Master Index Sheet where the inset windows have been revised in line with those in the Onshore and Offshore Works Plans – see Appendix I of this letter.
Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening and Integrity Matrices (Doc ref No 12.6.3)	The Section 51 Letter noted that a number of the footnotes within the HRA Screening and Integrity Matrices are incomplete.	The Applicant has updated the HRA Screening and Integrity Matrices to complete the footnotes - see Appendix P of this letter.
Project Description (Doc ref No 7.1.3)	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 “ <i>completed within 5 sequential years.</i> ”	The Applicant can confirm that this typographical error was limited to this reference in the Project Description only and that the assessments within the Environmental Statement (“ES”) (where relevant) were assessed on the basis of the correct 5 year period. Accordingly, the Applicant does not consider that any further updates/corrections are necessary in respect of this erratum.
Marine Processes (Doc ref No 7.2.1), Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology (Doc ref No 7.2.2) and Fish and Shellfish Ecology (Doc ref No 7.2.3)	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, Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology, Fish and Shellfish and Ecology, Marine Mammal and Infrastructure and Other Users chapters were incorrectly based on a maximum monopile foundation for a 15MW turbine, which would have a commensurately reduced maximum number of 120 turbines.	The Applicant has produced a clarification note to address this minor discrepancy in the assessment – the Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note, see Appendix R of this letter. This clarification note confirms that the original assessment conclusions within the relevant ES chapters remain valid and unchanged.
Marine Processes (Doc ref No 7.2.1) and Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology (Doc ref No 7.2.2)	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 and Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology chapters to the ES incorrectly lists a diameter of 2.5m instead.	The Applicant has produced a clarification note to address this minor discrepancy in the assessment – the Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note, see Appendix S of this letter. This clarification note provides scour calculations for a 3m diameter and confirms that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
Marine Mammals (Doc ref No 7.2.4)	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 produced a clarification note to address this discrepancy in the assessment – the Marine Mammals Decommissioning Vessels Clarification Note, see Appendix T of this letter. This clarification note confirms that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.
Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology (Doc ref No 7.2.2) and the Habitats Regulation Assessment (Doc ref No 12.6)	<p>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 128,000m². This is incorrect and should have stated 256,000m².</p> <p>The HRA also incorrectly referenced the temporary disturbance of 128,000m² of benthic subtidal habitat within the Humber Estuary SAC for the Project alone and in-combination with other projects.</p>	The Applicant has produced a clarification note to correct this discrepancy in the assessment – the Humber SAC Subtidal Benthic Habitat Disturbance Clarification Note, see Appendix U of this letter. This clarification note confirms that the overall conclusions within the ES and HRA remain valid and unchanged as a result of this correction.
Habitats Regulations Assessment (Doc ref No 12.6)	Tables D-7, E-8 and F7 of Appendices D, E and F of Part 2 of the HRA report present in-combination displacement figures for auks. A number of the displacement figures for projects presented in these tables are incorrect. As a result the summary tables presented in Section 5.8 of the HRA Report (Tables 5-52, 5-57 and 5-60) are also incorrect.	The Applicant has produced a clarification note to update the assessment of in-combination displacement effects for guillemot, razorbill and puffin as part of the work contained in the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) – see the In-combination Auk Displacement Clarification Note at Appendix W of this letter. 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.
Hydrology and Flood Risk (Doc ref No 7.3.2)	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 can confirm that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct 1.5m target depth and thus the conclusions remain unchanged.
Landscape and Visual Resources (Doc ref No 7.3.5)	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	The Applicant can confirm that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct dimensions listed in the Project Description and thus the conclusions remain unchanged.

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
	Description – 82.5m long x 18.5m wide x 15m high.	
Historic Environment (Doc ref No 7.3.6)	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 can confirm that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct dimensions listed in the Project Description and thus the conclusions remain unchanged.
Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation (Doc ref No 7.3.7)	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 can confirm that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct dimensions listed in the Project Description and thus the conclusions remain unchanged.
Geology and Ground Conditions (Doc ref No 7.3.1), Hydrology and Flood Risk (Doc ref No 7.3.2), Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc ref No 7.3.3) and Historic Environment (Doc ref No 7.3.6).	The Applicant has identified certain instances across the ES of inconsistent referencing of the “ <i>transition joint bays</i> ” and the “ <i>jointing pits</i> ”, as well as their dimensions and the approach to their reinstatement.	The Applicant has produced a clarification note to address and clarify these matters to avoid confusion – the Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note, see Appendix V of the letter. This clarification note confirms that the conclusions within the ES remain valid and unchanged.
Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1) Schedule A, Part 3, Requirement 2(6)(g), (h), (k), (l)	When cross checking figures in the DCO against figures in the ES, the Applicant detected an error in the area and volume of cable protection specified in paragraphs (g), (h), (k) and (l) of Requirement 2(6). This error relates to the proportions of cable protection predicted within the Humber Estuary SAC and outwith the SAC and does not affect the total area or volume of cable protection predicted for Work Nos. 4A and 4B.	The Applicant seeks to correct this error in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments: (g) The combined total area of cable protection for the electrical circuits comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located outwith the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 2,055,200 1,960,000 square metres. (h) The combined total area of cable protection for the electrical circuits comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located within the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 44,800 140,000 square metres. (k) The total volume of cable protection for the electrical circuits comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located outwith the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 1,174,400 1,120,000 m3.

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
		(l) The total volume of cable protection for the electrical circuits comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located within the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 25,600 <u>80,000</u> m3.
Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1) Schedule A, Part 3, Requirement 2(9)	When checking the detailed design parameters in the DCO, the Applicant detected an error in the terminology used in Requirement 2(9) which should read "transition joint bays" in accordance with the description of Work Nos. 6A and 6B, rather than "transition pits".	The Applicant seeks to correct this error in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments: (9) The total area in which the eight underground transition joint bays pits comprised in Work Nos. 6A and 6B may be contained must not exceed 2,000 square metres and none of the eight transition joint bays pits within that area must individually exceed 25 m by 10 m.
Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1) Schedule A, Part 3, Requirement 5(8)	When cross checking figures in the DCO against figures in the ES, the Applicant detected an error in the combined total volume of scour protection for the wind turbine generators and the offshore accommodation platforms in Requirement 5(8).	The Applicant seeks to correct this error in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments: (8) The combined total volume of scour protection for the wind turbine generators and the offshore accommodation platforms forming part of the authorised development must not exceed 4,761,555 <u>4,754,015</u> m3.
Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1) Schedules H, I, J and K, DMLs A1, A2, B1 and B2, Part 1, Paragraph 1	In reviewing the DCO post submission, the Applicant discovered a cross-referencing error in the definition of "undertaker" in the DMLs. The definition cross refers to Article 36 but this should be to Article 35 (Transfer of benefit of Order). The Applicant also spotted an inconsistency between DMLs A1 and B1 and DMLs A2 and B2 whereby additional text was included in the definition of undertaker in DMLs A1 and B1 which in the Applicant's view is not necessary in the DMLs since the works covered by each DML are clearly set out in paragraph 2 of Part 1 of the DML.	The Applicant seeks to correct these errors/inconsistencies in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments: Schedule H, DML A1: "undertaker" means for the purposes of constructing, maintaining and operating Work No. 1A and any associated development or ancillary works within the Wind Farm Area relating to that work, Optimus Wind Limited or, to the extent that the benefit of the provisions of the Order and related statutory rights in relation to Work No. 1A and such associated development or ancillary works has been transferred under article 35 <u>36</u> of the Order to another person, that other person; Schedule I, DML A2: "undertaker" means Optimus Wind Limited or, to the extent that the benefit of the provisions of the Order and related statutory rights in relation to Works Nos. 2A, 3A, 4A or 5A and such associated development or ancillary works has been transferred under article

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
		<p>35 36 of the Order to another person, that other person;</p> <p>Schedule J, DML B1:</p> <p>“undertaker” means for the purposes of constructing, maintaining and operating Work No. 1B and any associated development or ancillary works within the Wind Farm Area relating to that work, Breesea Limited or, to the extent that the benefit of the provisions of the Order and related statutory rights in relation to Work No. 1B and such associated development or ancillary works has been transferred under article 35 36 of the Order to another person, that other person;</p> <p>Schedule K, DML B2:</p> <p>“undertaker” means Breesea Limited or, to the extent that the benefit of the provisions of the Order and related statutory rights in relation to Works Nos. 2B, 3B, 4B or 5B and such associated development or ancillary works has been transferred under article 35 36 of the Order to another person, that other person;</p>
<p>Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1)</p> <p>Schedules H and J, DMLs A1, and B1, Part 1, Paragraph 2(5)</p> <p>Schedules I and K, DMLs A2, and B2, Part 1, Paragraph 2(7)</p>	<p>In reviewing the DCO post submission, the Applicant discovered a cross-referencing error in paragraph 2(5) of Part 1 of DMLs A1 and B1 and paragraph 2(7) of Part 1 of DMLs A2 and B2. The paragraph cross refers to Article 36 but this should be to Article 35 (Transfer of benefit of Order).</p>	<p>The Applicant seeks to correct this error in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments:</p> <p>(5)/(7) The provisions of section 72 of the 2009 Act shall apply to this licence, save that the provisions of section 72(7) and 72(8) relating to the transfer of the licence shall only apply to a transfer not falling within article 35 36 of the Order.</p>
<p>Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1)</p> <p>Schedules H and J, DMLs A1 and B1, Part 2, Condition 3(4)</p>	<p>When cross checking figures in the DCO against figures in the ES, the Applicant detected an error in the combined total volume of scour protection for the wind turbine generators and the offshore accommodation platforms in Condition 3(4) of DMLs A1 and B1.</p>	<p>The Applicant seeks to correct this error in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments:</p> <p>Schedule H, DML A1:</p> <p>(4) The total volume of scour protection for the wind turbine generators and the offshore accommodation platforms forming part of Work No. 1A must not exceed 4,754,015 <u>4,761,555</u> m3 provided that the combined total volume of scour protection for the wind turbine generators and the offshore accommodation platforms forming part of Work Nos. 1A and 1B does not exceed 4,754,015 <u>4,761,555</u> m3.</p> <p>Schedule J, DML B1:</p>

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
		<p>(4) The total volume of scour protection for the wind turbine generators and the offshore accommodation platforms forming part of Work No. 1B must not exceed 4,754,015 <u>4,761,555</u> m3 provided that the combined total volume of scour protection for the wind turbine generators and the offshore accommodation platforms forming part of Work Nos. 1A and 1B does not exceed 4,754,015 <u>4,761,555</u> m3.</p>
<p>Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1) Schedules H, I, J and K, DMLs A1, A2, B1 and B2, Part 2, Condition 7(8)</p>	<p>In reviewing the DCO post submission, the Applicant noted that Condition 7(8) refers to "turbine locations" and felt that this condition should not be restricted to turbines only since the authorised scheme includes other large items of infrastructure. Furthermore, reference to "turbine locations" is not relevant for DMLs A2 and B2 since those DMLs do not make provision for the construction of turbines.</p>	<p>The Applicant seeks to amend this in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments so that other works under the DML are captured:</p> <p>Schedules H and J, DMLs A1 and B1:</p> <p>(8) The undertaker must ensure that a Notice to Mariners is issued at least ten days prior to the commencement of the licensed activities advising of the commencement of licensed activities within the Wind Farm Area and the expected vessel routes from the local service ports to the <u>location of the works comprised within the authorised scheme turbine locations</u>.</p> <p>Schedules I and K, DMLs A2 and B2:</p> <p>(8) The undertaker must ensure that a Notice to Mariners is issued at least ten days prior to the commencement of the licensed activities advising of the commencement of licensed activities within the offshore Order limits and the expected vessel routes from the local service ports to the <u>location of the works comprised within the authorised scheme turbine locations</u>.</p>
<p>Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1) Schedules I and K, DML A2 and B2, Part 2, Condition 1(7), (8), (10), (11)</p>	<p>When cross checking figures in the DCO against figures in the ES, the Applicant detected an error in the area and volume of cable protection specified in paragraphs (7), (8), (10) and (11) of Condition 1 of DMLs A2 and B2. This error relates to the proportions of cable protection predicted within the Humber Estuary SAC and outwith the SAC and does not affect the total area or volume of cable protection predicted for Work Nos. 4A and 4B.</p>	<p>The Applicant seeks to correct this error in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendments:</p> <p>(7) The combined total area of cable protection for the electrical circuits comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located outwith the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 2,055,200 1,960,000 square metres.</p> <p>(8) The combined total area of cable protection for the electrical circuits comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located within the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 44,800 140,000 square metres.</p> <p>(10) The total volume of cable protection for the electrical circuits</p>

Document	Errata Detail	Applicant's Response and Suggested Action
		<p>comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located outwith the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 1,120,000 <u>1,174,400</u> m3.</p> <p>(11) The total volume of cable protection for the electrical circuits comprising Work Nos. 4A and 4B located within the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation must not exceed 80,000 <u>25,600</u> m3.</p>
Draft DCO (Doc ref No 3.1) Schedule L, Part 10	The Applicant noticed a minor typo in the heading of Part 10 of Schedule L. The heading refers to Conocophillips (U.K.) Limited when it should be to ConocoPhillips (U.K.) Limited.	<p>The Applicant seeks to correct this error in Version 2 of the draft DCO by making the following amendment:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PART 10</p> <p>For the protection of ConocoPhillips (U.K.) Limited</p>

SCHEDULE 3**Order Limits reduction – proposed amendments to plans**

Document	Description	Detail of amendments proposed
Land Plans (Doc ref No 4.1)	The Applicant has made revisions to the Land Plans to reflect the removal of plots 227, 382 to 387 and 389 to 391 from the Order Land.	The Land Plans have been updated to show the removal of plot 227, the reduction of plot 226 and the removal of plots 382 to 387 (inclusive) and 389 to 391 (inclusive) shown on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended onshore sheets 11, 21, 22 and 23 of 27; • Amended inset sheets 13 and 20 of 26. See Appendix F of this letter for a copy of the Land Plans (Version 2).
Works Plans (Onshore) (Doc ref No 5.2)	As a result of the reduction in order limits, there are consequent equivalent changes needed to reflect the revised order limits on the Onshore Works Plans.	The Applicant has updated sheets 11, 21, 22 and 23 of 27 of the Onshore Work Plans to reflect the reduction of the order limits – see Appendix H of this letter for a copy of the Onshore Works Plans (Version 2).
The DCO/DML Coordinates Plan (Doc ref No 12.11)	As a result of the reduction to the order limits, there are consequent equivalent changes needed to reflect the revised Project Two order limits on the DCO/DML Coordinates Plan.	The updated DCO/DML Coordinates Plan has been amended to reflect the reduction of the order limits – see Appendix L to this letter for copy of the DCO/DML Coordinates Plan (Version 2).
Project One/Project Two Interface (Doc ref No 7.4.5.4)	As a result of the reduction to the order limits, there are consequent equivalent changes needed to reflect the revised Project Two order limits on the Project One/Project Two Interface Plan.	The Applicant has updated sheets 13, 23, 24 and 25]of 29 of the Project One/Project Two Interface Plan to reflect the reduction of the Project Two order limits – see Appendix N of this letter for an copy of the Project One/Project Two Interface Plan (Version 2). Appendix N also includes an updated sheet 1 of 29 to update the overall order limits to reflect this reduction of land use.
Compensation Compounds Plan (Doc ref No 7.4.5.6)	As a result of the reduction to the order limits, there are consequent equivalent changes needed to reflect the revised Project Two order limits on the Compensation Compounds Plan.	The Applicant has updated sheets 11, 21, 22 and 23 of 27 of the Compensation Compounds Plan to reflect the reduction of the Project Two order limits – see Appendix O of this letter for a copy of the Compensation Compounds Plan (Version 2).

Document	Description	Detail of amendments proposed
Crossing Schedule (Onshore) (Doc ref No 7.4.3.4)	As a result of the reduction to the order limits, there are consequent equivalent changes needed to reflect the revised order limits on the Onshore Crossing Schedule.	The Applicant has updated sheets 5 and 9 of 11 of the Onshore Crossing Schedule to reflect the reduction of the order limits – see Appendix M of this letter for a copy of the Onshore Crossing Schedule (Version 2).
Crown Plans (Onshore) (Doc ref No 10.2)	As a result of the reduction to the order limits, there are consequent equivalent changes needed to reflect the revised order limits on the Onshore Crown Plans.	The Applicant has updated sheet 4 of 6 of the Onshore Crown Plans to reflect the reduction of the order limits – see Appendix J of this letter for a copy of the Onshore Crown Plans (Version 2). Appendix J also includes an updated Map Index Sheet to reflect the reduction in order limits.
Statutory and Non-Statutory Conservation etc. Sites Plan (Onshore) (Doc ref No 12.7)	As a result of the reduction to the order limits, there are consequent equivalent changes needed to reflect the revised order limits on the Onshore Statutory and Non-Statutory Conservation etc. Sites Plan.	The Applicant has produced an updated Onshore Statutory and Non-Statutory Conservation etc. Sites Plan to reflect the reduction of the order limits – see Appendix K of this letter for a copy of the Onshore Statutory and Non-Statutory Conservation etc. Sites Plan (Version 2).