

Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm

Project Two

Summary of Oral Case Presented by Dr Emily Wood regarding E.ON E&P UK Limited

Appendix J to the Response submitted for Deadline V

Application Reference: EN010053

12 November 2015

smartwind.co.uk

In the matter of:

The Application for a Development Consent Order for Hornsea
Project Two offshore wind farm

Oral Summary of Case Presented by:

Dr Emily Wood BSc (Hons), PhD, CENV

Issue Specific Hearings related to:

Agenda Item 4.4:

Interaction with E.ON E&P's interests in Southern North Sea

Tuesday 27 October 2015

CONTENTS

Clause		Page No
1.	Expert Witness	1
2.	Endorsement	1
3.	Scope and Structure of the Speaking Note	1
4.	Overview	1
5.	Matters Subject to On-going Discussion between the Applicant and E.ON E&P	3
6.	Drilling and seismic activity in Block 48/3	3
7.	Helicopter access	5
8.	Aviation safety risk	6
9.	Vessel operational complexity and transit times	7
10.	Vessel collision risk	7
11.	Shipping Hazard Assessment	8
12.	Pipelines and Umbilicals	8
13.	Decommissioning	9
14.	References	9

Emily Wood, RPS Energy Ltd on behalf of the Applicant

1. Expert Witness

- 1.1 I was instructed by the Applicant to present evidence on their behalf at the examination hearings for their Development Consent Order (DCO) application to the National Infrastructure Directorate of the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) for Hornsea Project Two.
- 1.2 I am a Project Director at RPS Energy. I hold a doctorate in Environmental Chemistry from the University of North Wales, a postgraduate diploma in Analytical chemistry from the University of North Wales, a postgraduate diploma in Environmental Management from the University of Surrey and a Bachelor of Science in Marine Chemistry from the University of North Wales. I am a Chartered Environmentalist from the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) and a member of the Institute of Impact Assessors (IIA).
- 1.3 I have worked as an environmental advisor to the oil and gas and renewable energy sector for 25 years both in the UK and internationally. I am an approved environmental and social assurance manager for the International Finance Corporation (IFC) part of the World Bank Group for Category A development.
- 1.4 I have extensive experience of project management and direction of EIA's including meeting UK regulatory regime, international regulations and the IFC Performance Standard requirements. Relevant project experience includes Project Manager for the ES submission for the Bains Gas Storage Project in the East Irish Sea and topic lead for infrastructure and other users (including oil and gas), aviation and shipping for the ES for Hornsea Project One and Hornsea Project Two. Expert advice on aviation has been provided by Osprey Consulting Services Ltd. Expert advice on navigation has been provided by Anatec Ltd.

2. Endorsement

- 2.1 This summary of oral submissions draws together the information provided within the Application and subsequent written responses (including the Applicant's First (15th July 2015) and Second (10th August 2015) written response (SMart Wind, 2015a and SMart Wind, 2015b) with regard to the effects of Project Two on E.ON E&P's current and proposed activities. I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions and refer where applicable to current UK regulations or Guidance.

3. Scope and Structure of the Speaking Note

- 3.1 These notes address the relevant agenda items at the Issue Specific Hearing held on 29 October 2015 with respect to E.ON E&P specifically:
- **(Agenda Item 4.4)** E.ON E&P: Update on progress of resolving issues between the Applicant and E.ON E&P Ltd.

4. Overview

- 4.1 The Applicant considers that EON's activities or proposals, which have the potential to overlap with the Project, can be divided into three categories:
- **Category One:** Existing activities and the reasonably foreseen future activities within Block 48/3, which were known at the time of the ES submission (January 2015);
 - **Category Two:** The proposed future activities within Block 48/3 associated with the known prospects Newton, Joly, Dodgson and Newton Deep, as presented in E.ON E&P's Written Representation (July 2015); and

- **Category Three:** Unknown future activities associated with unknown prospects in Block 48/3, as presented in E.ON E&P's Written Representation (July 2015).

4.2 Further details with regards to the Applicant's knowledge of E.ON E&P's known and unknown activities are provided below:

Category One

4.3 Category one includes E.ON E&P's current activities (which includes activities associated with the Babbage Platform), and the known future activities in Block 48/3, which were provided to the Applicant during pre-application consultation. These have been assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 11: Infrastructure and Other Users of the ES (Doc ref No 7.2.11) (see paragraph 11.6.91, 11.6.103, 11.6.202 and 11.6.213).

4.4 The assessment included consideration of the potential for E.ON E&P to be awarded Block 48/3 and for the potential activities within the block to include exploration wells to be drilled at the western edge of Subzone 2 and seismic data acquisition to be required across the block. Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES considered information held in the public domain regarding existing hydrocarbon fields in the Project Area for Lease (AfL) (OilandGasData 2014), information provided by E.ON E&P to the Applicant during pre-submission consultation (see Consultation Report (Doc ref No 2.1)).

4.5 Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES concluded that there will be no significant effects from the Project on E.ON E&P's known future activities (see paragraphs 11.6.102, 11.6.116, 11.6.212 and 11.6.219).

Category Two

4.6 Subsequent to the submission of the application for Development Consent (in January 2015), E.ON E&P have been awarded Block 48/3 in the 2nd tranche of the 28th licence round (in July 2015). Further information was provided to the Applicant by E.ON E&P in their Written Representation (dated 15th July 2015) on the proposed development of Block 48/3, to which the Applicant responded at Deadline II (dated 10th August 2015).

4.7 The information provided by E.ON E&P with regard to further potential development within Block 48/3, associated with the "known prospects" Newton, Joly, Dodgson and Newton Deep (whilst still subject to significant appraisal works by E.ON E&P and the requirement to obtain further consents), is new information that was not previously provided by E.ON E&P (i.e., was not previously supplied to the Applicant during pre- or post-application consultation).

4.8 Further information regarding these known prospects was then presented by E.ON E&P to the Applicant in a consultation meeting on 3rd September 2015.

4.9 At the first Issue specific hearing on 15th September 2015, the Applicant and E.ON E&P provided a brief update on discussions to date and undertook to continue to seek resolution outside of the hearings, with the Ex. A requesting a SoCG to be prepared between both parties.

4.10 Subsequent meetings on 1st October 2015, 6th October 2015, 14th October 2015, 23rd October 2015, 2nd November, 10th and 11th November have been held between the Applicant and E.ON E&P. Discussions around the potential for mutual coexistence with regard to activities associated with the known prospects (i.e., the Newton, Joly, Dodgson and Newton Deep), have progressed. A SoCG has been drafted and is currently under review by E.ON E&P.

Category Three

4.11 Category three relates to unknown future activities associated with unknown prospects in Block 48/3, as presented in E.ON E&P's Written Representation on 15th July 2015 (i.e., was not previously supplied to the Applicant during pre- or post-application consultation). The Applicant notes that there is insufficient information and too great a degree of uncertainty for the Applicant to undertake any further assessment on these unknown future activities

associated with unknown prospects (and which are subject to future consents) within the licence. The Applicant has not therefore considered these further in this response.

5. Matters Subject to On-going Discussion between the Applicant and E.ON E&P

- 5.1 The following sections provide an overview of the areas of on-going discussion between the Applicant and E.ON, for each of the three categories, which were discussed at the Issue Specific Hearings on 27th October 2015. The activities included are listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of areas of on-going discussion between the Applicant and E.ON.

Activity	Category 1	Category 2
Drilling and seismic activity	✓	✓
Helicopter access	✓	✓
Aviation safety risk	✓	✓
Vessel operational complexity and transit times	✓	✓
Vessel Collision Risk	✓	✓
The Shipping Hazard Assessment	✓	✓
Pipelines and umbilicals	✓	✓
Decommissioning.	✓	✓

6. Drilling and seismic activity in Block 48/3

- 6.1 E.ON E&P, in their Written Representation (dated 15th July 2015) and during the subsequent meetings between the Applicant and E.ON E&P on 3rd September, 1 October, 6 October, 14 October and 23 October 2015, have raised concerns with regard to the ability to proceed with drilling and seismic activity in the newly acquired licence Block 48/3.

Category One

- 6.2 The impact of the Project on category one drilling activity in Block 48/3 has been assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES (see paragraph 11.6.103). Drilling activity in Block 48/3 has been consulted on with E.ON E&P during Phase 2 consultation (see Consultation Report (Doc ref No 2.2) Annex 12). Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES stated that E.ON E&P can drill outside the AfL at any time during its licence (see paragraph 11.6.106). Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES acknowledged that the magnitude of the spatial restriction on drilling in Block 48/3 is high (paragraph 11.6.106) but it was the understanding of the Applicant that drilling would be restricted to the western area as advised by E.ON during pre-application consultation. This information was not made explicitly clear in the ES due to retaining confidentiality on licence applications at that time. The Applicant was also aware that the E.ON E&P, on applying for Block 48/3, was aware of the Project AfL and must therefore have taken this into consideration at the time of their application.
- 6.3 The effect of the Project on seismic data acquisition in Block 48/3 has been assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES (see paragraph 11.6.91).

Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES assessed the ability of E.ON to undertake conventional towed seismic survey activity within Block 48/3 within a 30 month period prior to the construction of Subzone 2, considering a start date of offshore construction of Q1 2018 (see paragraph 11.6.91 of Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES). In the event that seismic data acquisition is required once the Project has been installed within Subzone 2, E.ON E&P has advised during pre-application consultation that Ocean Bottom Cables (OBC), Ocean Bottom Nodes (OBN) or similar techniques are available for seismic data collection. The Applicant notes that Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES is guided by information provided by E.ON E&P during pre-application consultation (see Table 11.3 and Table 11.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES).

Category Two

- 6.4 The impact of the Project on drilling activity in Block 48/3 has been assessed in the ES, which considered activity in Block 48/3 based on that provided to the Applicant during Phase 2 Consultation (see Consultation Report (Doc ref No 2.2) Annex 12). New information provided by E.ON E&P post application (within E.ON E&P's Written Representation), on category 2 drilling activity, extended the potential physical extent of well locations and increased the number of potential wells. The Applicant notes that as this information was not provided until following the application for Development Consent, it could therefore not be considered in the ES.
- 6.5 Subsequent to the submission of E.ON E&P's Written Representation (dated 15th July 2015), the Applicant has discussed with E.ON the possibility of drilling within the AfL subject to necessary agreement between the parties. The Applicant has made this clear in its response at Deadline I (15th July 2015) and Deadline II (10th August 2015).
- 6.6 The Applicant notes that prior to the construction of the Project, drilling associated with the exploration, appraisal and development of the known prospects Newton, Joly, Dodgson and Newton Deep, is possible in Block 48/3, including within the Subzone 2 AfL, subject to prior agreement between both the parties. The requirement for a subsea well within the Project AfL will impact on the Project however. Drilling will also be possible in Block 48/3 once the Project construction has started, in the area outside and to the west of the Subzone 2 AfL. Any well that is drilled, or placement of subsea infrastructure, in Block 48/3 must be at a distance of 500 m from the AfL in order to not impact on the Project.
- 6.7 E.ON E&P, in its Written Representation (dated 15th July 2015), have identified the likely location of the proposed exploration well for the Newton prospect as outside the Project AfL and that it would be drilled in 2017, prior to the start of the construction of the offshore elements of the Project. The Applicant notes that if any relief well can also be drilled greater than 500 m from the Project AfL, there is the potential that there may be no interaction between the Newton prospect and the Project.
- 6.8 It is understood that the location of future appraisal and production wells within the Newton prospect cannot be known at the present time, as their location is dependent on the outcome of this first exploration well. In the event that the appraisal and production wells are located within the Project AfL, the Applicant notes that they will impact the Project. This impact can be reduced by any exploration or appraisal wells falling within the AfL being plugged and abandoned.
- 6.9 It is understood that the requirement for, and location of exploration, appraisal and production wells within the Joly, Dodgson and Newton Deep prospects is not known at the present time as the development of these prospects is contingent on the outcome of the Newton prospect. In the event that the exploration, appraisal and production wells are located within the Project AfL, the Applicant notes that they will impact the Project. This impact can be reduced by any exploration or appraisal wells falling within the AfL being plugged and abandoned before offshore construction commences.

7. Helicopter access

Category One

- 7.1 E.ON E&P operates the Babbage platform. E.ON, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), raised the concern that the construction and operation of the Project is likely to lead to increased operational complexity and result in longer transit routes and times for helicopters and water vessels between this platform and its other installations in the North Sea, including any new developments in Block 48/3.
- 7.2 The Applicant responded to the concerns raised by E.ON E&P with regard to transit times of helicopters to the Babbage Platform within Block 48/3 in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading Access and logistics – aviation: Helicopter and vessel access to the Babbage platform, of the First Response).
- 7.3 Information provided during pre-application consultation (in October 2012) between the Applicant and E.ON E&P, confirmed that E.ON E&P presently flies to the Babbage platform from Great Yarmouth. These flights would not be deviated by the presence of turbines within Subzone 2 (Figure 8.8 of Volume 2, Chapter 8: Aviation, Military and Communications of the ES (Doc ref No 7.2.8)). Due to the location of E.ON E&P's existing assets, cross zone transit across Subzone 2 is not anticipated (see paragraph 8.6.41 of Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES).
- 7.4 The Applicant notes that Paragraphs 8.6.79 of Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES also discusses and calculates the potential restriction on high altitude access to the Babbage Platform, which was assessed to be not significant in EIA terms (paragraph 8.6.92 of Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES). No further assessment was made in the ES of future rigs or platforms within Block 48/3 as the prospect of such rigs or platforms and their location was not known.

Category Two

- 7.5 E.ON E&P, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), raised the concern that the Project's turbines may infringe in the 7 NM radius required from the centre of a potential future development within Block 48/3, thereby restricting helicopter access. E.ON E&P notes that Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES discusses these points in relation to operational assets but does not consider the point for future developments and that further discussion will therefore be needed with the Applicant in order to reach an agreement which ensures that helicopter approaches to Block 48/3 are not obstructed by the Project.
- 7.6 The Applicant responded to the concerns raised by E.ON E&P with regard to helicopter access to proposed platforms within Block 48/3 in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading: Access and logistics – aviation: Helicopter approaches to potential future development in Block 48/3).
- 7.7 The Applicant notes that the ES discusses and calculates the potential restriction on high altitude access to known platforms whose 9 NM consultation zone overlap with Subzone 2 turbines (paragraphs 8.5.21, 8.6.52, 8.6.65 and 8.6.79 of Volume 2, Chapter 8). However, in order to assess the potential restriction on access to a proposed platform, the potential platform location must be known. The sector of airspace which may then be restricted can be calculated based on the separation distance of the platform and the location of turbines within Subzone 2, the wind conditions and the anticipated high altitude access requirements to that platform.
- 7.8 Paragraph 8.6.53 of Volume 2 and Chapter 8 of the ES, identifies that visual low level flights from one platform to another are used in the industry as a means of platform access. This approach could potentially be used as an approach method from the Babbage platform for example to a proposed new platform in Block 48/3.
- 7.9 E.ON E&P, in their Written Representation (dated 15th July 2015) confirmed that there is unlikely to be a platform associated with the Newton prospect,

and if there is, it will be an unmanned minimum facilities platform with no helideck and therefore as helicopter operations would not be required they would not be impacted by the Project.

- 7.10 Helicopter access requirements for drilling rigs or vessels associated with the Block 48/3 development cannot be assessed at the present time as the location of these activities is not known. It should be noted however that construction activities, and in particular those related to the installation of wind turbine structures, can proceed within the 9 NM consultation zone of any of these activities subject to consultation with the rig or vessel operator and helicopter service provider. This consultation zone as defined in CAP 764 (CAA, 2013) is not considered a prohibition on development, but a trigger for consultation between offshore helicopter operators, the operators of existing installations and developers of proposed offshore wind farms in order to determine a solution that maintains safe offshore helicopter operations. If the zone is compromised by an obstruction (i.e., a wind turbine or crane erecting a wind turbine) routine low visibility flight operations to an installation may be impaired with subsequent consequences for the drilling unit charterer.

8. Aviation safety risk

Category One and Category Two

- 8.1 Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES identifies that there will be additional helicopter flights required to Subzone 2. This will increase the risk of an air transport accident. E.ON E&P, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), requested that the risk of an air transport accident is adequately assessed and necessary steps to mitigate the risk needs to be agreed with E.ON E&P.
- 8.2 The Applicant responded to the issues raised by E.ON E&P with regard to aviation safety risk in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading: Access and logistics – aviation: Additional Helicopter Flights to Subzone 2).
- 8.3 Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES assessed the impact of the Project on the Helicopter Main Routes (HMRs) in the vicinity of the Project during both construction (paragraph 8.6.26) and operation (paragraph 8.6.35). This assessment has been consulted on with all appropriate aviation stakeholders. The effect was assessed to be not significant in EIA terms, for both the construction (paragraph 8.6.31) and operation (paragraph 8.6.39) phases of the Project. The impact of helicopter hoist operations on cross zone helicopter traffic during the operation of the Project was assessed to be not significant in EIA terms (paragraph 8.6.51).
- 8.4 The Applicant notes that aviation risk will be considered further once the operation and maintenance strategy for the Project is confirmed. Aviation risk falls under the European Commission (on guidance from the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)) and the regulations of the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). The management of risk is covered by a number of measures including regulatory controls and Air Traffic Control (ATC) (e.g., at airport of departure and NATS en route). Risk management is covered fully in the Air Operator Certificate (AOC) holder's Safety Management System (SMS).
- 8.5 It is also noted that the CAA's response at Deadline I, advises that while the airspace surrounding the Project is generally Class G and therefore not under any form of Air Traffic Control; the Area falls under the coverage and airspace management of the Air Navigation Service Provider Anglia Radar who provide a deconfliction service, traffic service, basic service and alerting service. These services are available to helicopters operating in support to the offshore oil and gas industry and to civil and military aircraft transiting the area, at and below 6,500 ft.

9. Vessel operational complexity and transit times

- 9.1 E.ON E&P, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), raised the concern that the construction and operation of the Project is likely to lead to increased operational complexity and result in longer transit routes and times for helicopters and water vessels between the Babbage platform and its other installations in the North Sea, including any new developments in Block 48/3.

Category One

- 9.2 The Applicant responded to the issues raised by E.ON E&P with regard to transit times of vessels to the Babbage Platform and future platforms within Block 48/3 in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading Access and logistics – aviation: Helicopter and vessel access to the Babbage platform).
- 9.3 The potential increase in vessels and displacement of vessels, leading to an increased collision risk during construction of the Project, has been assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation of the ES (Doc ref No 7.2.7) (see paragraph 7.8.31). There is the potential for some displacement of oil and gas service vessels transiting between the UK east coast ports and the Babbage platform, however the greatest impact from the Project construction traffic will be to the east of the Babbage platform, in the region of Subzone 2 and its 1 km advisory safety zones (see paragraph 7.8.32 of Volume 2, Chapter 7 of the ES).

Category Two

- 9.4 From the information provided to the Applicant by E.ON E&P, in their Written Representation (dated 15th July 2015), it is noted that there is the potential for overlap of the construction vessel traffic from the Project with vessels associated with activity within Block 48/3. There is the potential for mutual coexistence between these activities however no further assessment can be made until the location and timing of such activity is defined by E.ON E&P and until the Project construction programme and timing is defined.

10. Vessel collision risk

Category One and Category Two

- 10.1 There is the potential for the construction of the Project to be concurrent with the surveying and drilling to be undertaken by E.ON E&P in Block 48/3. E.ON E&P, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), raised the concern that this will lead to increased traffic movement and the potential for greater risk of collision.
- 10.2 The Applicant responded to the issues raised by E.ON E&P with regard to collision risk in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading Access and logistics – shipping: Increase in traffic movement concurrent with activity in Block 48/3).
- 10.3 The Applicant notes that Volume 5, Annex 5.7.1: Subzone 2 and Offshore Cable Route NRA of the ES (Doc ref No 7.5.7.1) presents the potential for the increased collision risk due to the presence of Project One and the Project during construction. The model considers both the current vessel traffic data ('base case') and also for a 'future case' scenario, which assumes a 10% increase in vessel traffic. The results of this modelling have been used to inform Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and Navigation of the ES, which considers increased collision risk during the construction of the Project (paragraph 7.8.162). With the additional proposed mitigation presented this risk is not considered significant in EIA terms (paragraph 7.8.169 of Volume 2 and Chapter 7 of the ES).
- 10.4 It is noted that the MCA agreed with the Shipping and Navigation assessment undertaken in the ES (see sections 3.5, 3.8 and 3.9 of Appendix PP: Statement of Common Ground with the MCA, of the Applicant's response to Deadline I).

11. Shipping Hazard Assessment

Category One and Category Two

- 11.1 E.ON E&P, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), raised the concern that the shipping hazard workshop did not include oil and gas operators, and as such the movement patterns for oil and gas support vessels to its current and future installations has not been properly taken into account when assessing the baseline and so shipping hazards have not been properly assessed.
- 11.2 The Applicant responded to the issues raised by E.ON E&P with regard to the Shipping Hazard Assessment in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading Access and logistics – shipping: Shipping Hazard Assessment).
- 11.3 Oil and gas service vessels have been included in the shipping surveys (which used both AIS and radar data) which were used in order to inform Volume 5, Annex 5.7.1 of the ES (see paragraph 16.2.3), which in turn was used to inform Volume 2, Chapter 7 of the ES.
- 11.4 In addition those oil and gas vessel that are classed as regular operators were invited to the shipping hazard workshop (Vroon and Boston Putford) and therefore were considered as a receptor with regards to navigational safety.

12. Pipelines and Umbilicals

- 12.1 E.ON E&P, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), raised the concern that drilling within Block 48/3 (scheduled for 2018/2019) will commence one to two years after construction of Subzone 2 has started, therefore any pipelines required for Block 48/3 development may be required to be laid over existing wind farm cables leading to greater risks to the safety of other marine users and more complex installation. In addition, E.ON E&P have an equity share in two existing pipelines that run through the Project area and Block 48/3. E.ON E&P is concerned that the Applicant refers to the need for crossing agreements to be made with the operator of these pipelines but makes no binding commitment to do so.

Category One

- 12.2 The effect of the Project on existing pipelines has been assessed in the ES (see paragraph 11.6.67 of Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES) and proposed pipelines have been considered in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES.
- 12.3 The Applicant responded to the issues raised by E.ON E&P with regard to pipeline crossing/proximity agreements in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading Pipelines: Existing).
- 12.4 E.ON E&P has an interest in two existing pipelines that run through the area proposed to be covered by the Project and Block 48/3. These pipelines are the SEAL pipeline (Shearwater to Bacton) and the CMS pipeline (Caister/Murdoch to Theddlethorpe). Both pipelines are owned by a consortium of companies and the Operator member for the SEAL pipeline is Shell UK Limited and the Operator member for the CMS pipeline is ConocoPhillips. The Applicant has consulted with both Operator members. The Applicant would expect to enter into further discussions with the Operator members in respect of any required crossing/proximity agreements once the design of the Project's cables has been undertaken in detail, an exercise which is expected to take place post consent.

Category Two

- 12.5 The Applicant responded to the issues raised by E.ON E&P with regard to future pipelines in Block 48/3 in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading Pipelines – future).
- 12.6 The effect of the Project on unknown future pipelines related to the Newton, Joly, Dodgson and Newton Deep prospects cannot be assessed unless their location is known. E.ON E&P has advised that pipelines could be required to be laid over existing cables. Though the process of installation may be more complex, such a crossing would require a pipeline crossing agreement to be

put in place, and the risk assessed to ensure it is acceptable to navigational safety, as is standard practise within the industry.

- 12.7 The new information presented by E.ON E&P in their Written Representation (dated 15th July 2015) for a proposed pipeline tying back the Newton development with the Babbage platform would be outside the AfL and would therefore not overlap with the Project. There would therefore be no significant effect, in EIA terms, from the Project.

13. Decommissioning

Category One and Category Two

- 13.1 E.ON E&P, in their Relevant Representation (dated 22nd April 2015), noted that the design life of the wind farm of 20 years could cause issues for decommissioning, as the operational life of the development within Block 48/3 could be longer or shorter than that of the windfarm and decommissioning of one may therefore affect the other. Without permission to leave infrastructure in situ, E.ON E&P or the applicants decommissioning operations would need to carefully avoid cables or pipelines to avoid major effects to the operation of the Project or Block 48/3. This therefore needs to be discussed further with the applicant and necessary arrangements put in place.
- 13.2 The Applicant responded to the issues raised by E.ON E&P with regard to decommissioning in its response at Deadline I (see Appendix CC, table heading Decommissioning).
- 13.3 The Applicant would like to highlight that the design life of the Project is likely to be 25 years (paragraph 3.5.110 of Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project Description of the ES (Doc ref No 7.1.3)). Decommissioning is considered to occur at the end of the operational lifetime of the wind farm. It is stated in Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES (paragraph 3.5.114) that the Energy Act 2004 requires that the construction of an offshore wind farm cannot commence until a decommissioning programme has been agreed by the Secretary of State. The decommissioning programme will be developed post consent and pre construction in accordance with Requirement 11 of Part 3 of Schedule A to the draft DCO. The decommissioning programme will include consideration of other relevant projects and activities which may be affected by the Project decommissioning. The decommissioning programme will be updated during the Project's lifespan to take account of changes in projects that may be impacted by the Project decommissioning, changing best practice and new technologies.

14. References

- 14.1 Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) (2013). CAP 764: CAA Policy and Guidelines on Wind Turbines. Fifth edition.
- 14.2 UKOilandGasData, (2014) *Oil and gas data* Available at: <https://www.ukoilandgasdata.com/dp/controller/PLEASE_LOGIN_PAGE>.
- 14.3 SMart Wind, 2015d. The Applicant's Response to Deadline I. Application Reference: EN010053 15 July 2015.
- 14.4 SMart Wind, 2015e. The Applicant's Response to Deadline II. Application Reference: EN010053 10 August 2015.