

# Response by Norfolk County Council to Examining Authority's Question reference FNA16

## County Council HOR2 SP116

23 June 2015

### Background

Norfolk County Council has not raised an objection to the Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm (Hornsea 2) subject the following issues being addressed by the applicant:

- Appropriate mitigation, and where necessary compensation, is given to those commercial fishing interests in Norfolk adversely impacted by the operation of the wind farm; and
- Mitigation measures can be found to overcome any potential impact on shipping and navigation, which might have an impact any of Norfolk's Ports.

### Response by the Applicant

The applicant has responded specifically to these issues and their email response is set out below (11/6/15):

Dear Stephen

Further to your email of 3 June 2015, the Applicant can confirm the below in response to your Section 56 response (Relevant Representation) of 9 April 2015.

*The subject areas Norfolk County Council focused on were: i) appropriate mitigation is identified for commercial fishing interests in Norfolk adversely impacted by the operation of the Project and ii) appropriate mitigation is identified to overcome any potential impact on shipping and navigation, which may have an impact on Norfolk's ports. Both of these issues were also raised by Norfolk County Council in November 2012 in response to the Applicant's Scoping Report.*

*Responses to both of the issues raised by Norfolk County Council, in response to the Applicant's Scoping Report, are provided in the following application documents, submitted as part of the Application for Development Consent to the Planning Inspectorate on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2015:*

- *Table 6.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries of the Environmental Statement (PINS Document reference 7.2.6); and*
- *Table 7.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation of the Environmental Statement (PINS Document reference 7.2.7).*

*With regards to commercial fisheries, Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement assesses the impact of the Project, both in isolation (see Section 6.6) and with other projects in the North Sea (see Section 6.7), on a fleet by fleet basis. Consultation undertaken by the Onshore Fisheries Liaison Officer (OFLO) indicates that shrimp vessels from Kings Lynn and Boston very rarely target north into the Humber area. Mitigation measures to mitigate impacts of Hornsea Project Two on commercial fisheries have been identified and these have been incorporated in to the Project design. Further details can be found within Table 6.10 of Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement. The draft DCO and DMLs also provide further protection for commercial fishing interests. For example Condition (10)(2)(c) of the DMLs provides that prior to any licensed activity commencing a Code of Construction Practice,*

*which must include details of the appointment and responsibilities of a fisheries liaison officer, must be submitted and approved by the MMO.*

*With regards to shipping and navigation, the Navigation Risk Assessment (Volume 5, Annex 5.7.1: Subzone 2 and Offshore Cable Route Navigation Risk Assessment (PINS Document reference 7.5.7.1)) considers the impact of the Project both in isolation and cumulatively with other project in the Southern North Sea on local ports (or those ports used by regular operators transiting through Subzone 2). The impacts on shipping and navigation from the Project in isolation are assessed in Section 7.8 and cumulatively with other Projects in the Southern North Sea are assessed in Section 7.9 of Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. Mitigation measures to mitigate impacts of Hornsea Project Two on shipping and navigation have been identified and these have been incorporated in to the Project design. Further details can be found within Table 7.14 of Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement. The draft DCO and DMLs also provide further protection for shipping and navigation interests. For example, Conditions 4 and 5 of the DMLs provide (amongst other things) that offshore development cannot commence until an Emergency Response and Co-operation Plan has been approved by the Secretary of State (in consultation with the MCA) and that specified aids to navigation must be used all times from construction to decommissioning.*

In light of the above, the Applicant believes that appropriate mitigation measures for commercial fisheries and shipping and navigation have been fully secured in the DCO (and DMLs). We would be happy to discuss these matters with you and suggest perhaps a meeting might be the most useful course of action as this would allow us to seek to address any remaining concerns which you have. If you are happy to arrange a meeting if you could please suggest some dates and times which are suitable for you that would be useful.

Please make sure that you include my colleague Simon Gamage (cc'd) in all correspondence as I will be on annual leave for the next couple of weeks. Simon is fully briefed and will be able to respond to all your queries.

I look forward to hearing from you.

With kind regards,

Ditte

**Ditte Bilde**

**Environmental Developer**

Mainstream Renewable Power Ltd.

Tel: +44(0) 207 776 5525

Mob: +44 (0) 770 367 9372

## **Norfolk County Council Response**

Norfolk County Council is satisfied that the issues raised originally by this authority (see above) have been addressed appropriately by the applicant. With regard to the potential impact on Norfolk's Ports (i.e. King's Lynn and Great Yarmouth), the County Council is satisfied that shipping and navigation interests have been considered by the applicant and built into the "project design" to avoid any materially impact on the above commercial Ports.

Therefore the County Council is not looking for any specific mitigation measures in relation to the above Ports over and above those measures addressed already (see above) by the applicant in respect of shipping and navigation.

Stephen Faulkner

Principal Planner

Norfolk County Council