

# Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm

---

Project Two

---

## Environmental Information Signposting Document – Version 6

Appendix L to the Response submitted for Deadline VII

Application Reference: EN010053

10 December 2015

[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 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 was easily locatable, the Applicant provided Version 1 of this Signposting Document (see Appendix Q to the Applicant’s submission of 27 April 2015).
- 1.4 It is intended that this Signposting Document will be a working document which will be periodically updated by the Applicant as and when required. Accordingly, further clarification information relevant to the ES and HRA subsequently provided in the Applicant’s responses to Deadlines I, II, IV and V was reflected in Versions 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this Signposting Document respectively. Within Version 6 of this Signposted Document, the Applicant has signposted additional pieces of clarification information provided as part of the Applicant’s response to Deadline VI, submission of 4<sup>th</sup> December and response to Deadline VII respectively.
- 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. Refinement of the Project’s Rochdale Envelope**

---

- 2.1 The Applicant confirmed in its response to Deadline III, Deadline VI and submission of 4<sup>th</sup> December that it has made certain reductions to the Project’s Design Envelope to:
  - 2.1.1 Reduce the Project’s order limits to remove areas of overlap with Hornsea Project One’s order limits, specifically in relation to the wind farm array and onshore substation site; and
  - 2.1.2 to remove the 5 MW turbine option and raise the minimum blade tip height of the rotor to 34.97m (relative to LAT).
- 2.2 The Applicant can confirm that these reductions to the Project’s Design Envelope do not increase the worst case scenarios considered within the Project’s ES and HRA nor alter the assessment conclusions presented therein (as confirmed within Appendix O of the response to Deadline IV, Appendix A of the response to its submission of 4 December 2015 and Appendix R of the response to Deadline VII).

## **3. Structure of Signposting Document**

---

- 3.1 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  |
|--|---|--|
| 7.1 Introduction   |   |  |
| <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>                              | <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a> | <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> | -   | -  |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)                                    | Document submitted post Application (Link)  | Relevance of Document   |
|---|---|---|
| <a href="#">7.1.5 Environmental Impact Assessment Methodology</a> | -   | -   |
| <b>7.2 Offshore</b>   |   |   |
| <a href="#">7.2.1 Marine Processes</a>                            | <p><a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix R to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix S to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix D: Additional clarification in relation to Marine Processes, as submitted within Appendix NN of the Applicant's response to Deadline I (SoCG between the Applicant and the Environment Agency)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix L of the Applicant's response to Deadline II: Clarification Note on matters relating to Marine Processes as raised by the Environment Agency</a></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> <p>Appendix D of the SoCG between the Applicant and the Environment Agency (Appendix NN of the Applicant's response to Deadline I) provides further clarification by the Applicant in response to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age of data used to calibrate tidal models and how sensitive these are to climate change;</li> <li>• Cable burial depth at the landfall; and</li> <li>• Use of tidal level data within the landfall assessment.</li> </ul> |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link) | Document submitted post Application (Link) | Relevance of Document   |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
|                                |  | <p>The clarification provided by the Applicant on these matters has provided further justification as to the assessment techniques used within the EIA process.</p> <p>Appendix L of the Applicant's response to Deadline II provides further clarification on those matters sited as being under discussion within the SoCG (Appendix NN of the Applicant's response to Deadline I).</p> |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)  | Document submitted post Application (Link)  | Relevance of Document   |
|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"> <a href="#">7.2.2</a><br/> <a href="#">Benthic</a><br/> <a href="#">Subtidal and Intertidal</a><br/> <a href="#">Ecology</a> </p> | <p> <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br/> <a href="#">Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix R to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br/> <a href="#">Humber SAC Subtidal Benthic Habitat Disturbance Clarification Note (see Appendix U to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br/> <a href="#">Jacket Foundation Scour Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix S to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a> </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 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>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>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</a> <a href="#">Fish and Shellfish Ecology</a> | <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br><a href="#">Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix R to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a>  | <p>Table 3.6 of the Project Description details that the largest monopile foundation is for an 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.</p>  |
| <a href="#">7.2.4</a> <a href="#">Marine Mammals</a>             | <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br><a href="#">Marine Mammals Decommissioning Vessels Clarification Note (see Appendix T to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a>   | <p>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.</p>  |
| <a href="#">7.2.5</a> <a href="#">Ornithology</a>                | <a href="#">Offshore Ornithology Baseline Data Clarification Note (see Appendix L to the Applicant's response to Deadline I)</a><br><a href="#">Collision Risk Modelling: Addressing Uncertainty Clarification Note (see Appendix J of the Applicant's response to Deadline I)</a><br><a href="#">Ornithological Survey Coverage: Baseline Clarification Note (see Appendix L of the Applicant's response to Deadline I)</a><br><a href="#">Appendix K of the Applicant's response to Deadline II: Updated Ornithology Baseline Data Clarification Note (as previously submitted as Appendix L to the Applicant's response to Deadline I)</a><br><a href="#">Appendix S Clarification Note - Unidentified Birds (as submitted at Deadline IIa)</a> | <p>Clarification on matters raised by Natural England in their Relevant Representation.</p> <p>The Baseline Ornithology Clarification Note provides a full breakdown of the raw (i.e. unprocessed) ornithological baseline data collected through a two year programme of boat-based surveys for Hornsea Project Two. The document responds to requests made by Natural England in their Relevant Representation for Hornsea Project Two, specifically the Baseline data collection and analysis methodology section of Appendix 1</p> <p>The Collision Risk Modelling Clarification Note further explores the Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) outputs originally presented in Volume 2, Chapter 7.2.5: Offshore Ornithology of the Environmental Statement (ES) and the Habitat Regulations Assessment Report (Document ref No. 12.6).The CRM assessment in these documents presents a range of values, including all</p> |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link) | Document submitted post Application (Link)   | Relevance of Document  |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
|                                | <p><a href="#">Appendix CC EIA Clarification Note - submitted at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix DD Kittiwake Collision Risk: Sensitivity of Parameters to Core Assumptions – submitted at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix O referred to in response to G10 – submitted at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix EE referred to in response to EOO16 – submitted at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix V - Migratory Collision Risk Modelling Clarification Note submitted at Deadline V</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix E - Summary of kittiwake position between Natural England and the Applicant at Deadline VI</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix F – Kittiwake Collision Risk; Applicant’s Position at Deadline VI as submitted at Deadline VI</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix B – Collision Risk Modelling Note – 4<sup>th</sup> December as submitted by the Applicant on 4<sup>th</sup> December</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix Q – Memorandum of Understanding between the Applicant and Natural England as submitted at Deadline VII</a></p> | <p>four options of Band (2012) and a range of avoidance rates for each assessed species</p> <p>The Survey Coverage Clarification Note has been prepared in response to queries raised by Natural England in reference to the level of survey coverage during baseline boat-based surveys as part of their Relevant Representations. Specifically this note responds to the ‘Dealing with incomplete surveys’ section in paragraphs 10 to 15 of Natural England’s Relevant Representation.</p> <p>Appendix S provides further clarification on the methodology used to assign unidentified birds recorded during boat-based surveys to species level.</p> <p>Appendix L to Deadline III provides a comparison of flight height recording bands from other offshore wind farms in response to queries raised by the Ex. A during the Issue Specific Hearings of 16<sup>th</sup> September 2015.</p> <p>Appendix CC EIA Clarification Note provides clarification to the EIA for offshore ornithological receptors and provides an update to the CIA.</p> <p>Appendix DD Kittiwake Collision Risk: Sensitivity of Parameters to Core Assumptions The note further explores the impacts from the Project on the kittiwake feature of the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA and aims to address concerns raised by Natural England during the ISH and their Deadline 3 response.</p> <p>Appendix O referred to in response to G10 provides an errata to the assessment of the maximum length of offshore cable route assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 5: Ornithology of the ES (Doc ref No 7.2.5).</p> <p>Appendix EE referred to in response to EOO16 provides a technical consideration of the points raised by Natural England in Appendix 2 of their Deadline III submission.</p> <p>Appendix V of Deadline V - The note provides an update and clarification to the assessment of collision risk for migratory seabirds as originally presented in Appendix D of the Offshore Ornithology Technical Report (Doc ref No. 7.5.5.1) of the Environmental Statement. Specifically, this comprises information from Furness (2015) in relation to appropriate population scales and from Johnston et al. (2014) in relation to flight height data used within</p> |



| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)                              | Document submitted post Application (Link) | Relevance of Document   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | <p>collision risk modelling.</p> <p>Appendix E of Deadline VI - Summary of kittiwake position between Natural England and the Applicant at Deadline VI – The note provides a summary of Project alone mortality positions, a summary of in-combination positions, and the consequence of mortality.</p> <p>Appendix F of Deadline VI – Kittiwake Collision Risk; Applicant’s position at Deadline VI provides updated collision risk modelling outputs for Kittiwake in lieu of the project envelope refinements; namely to drop the 5 MW turbine and to increase minimum blade tip height (relative to LAT) to 29.97m.</p> <p>Appendix B of Applicant’s submission of 4 December 201 – Collision Risk Modelling Note provides updated and final CRM outputs for all key species at both EIA and HRA levels to consider the implications of a refined project envelope that has 6 MW as the smallest turbine option, and 34.97 above LAT as the minimum blade tip height.</p> <p>Appendix Q of Deadline VII – MoU: sets out the final agreed positions, and statements of facts where there may be differences, between the Applicant and Natural England in relation to HRA/EIA conclusions.</p> |
| <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 Communications</a> | -  | -   |
| <a href="#">7.2.9 Marine Archaeology and Ordnance</a>       | -  | -   |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)                          | Document submitted post Application (Link)  | Relevance of Document  |
|---|---|--|
| <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>     | <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br><a href="#">Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a> | <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  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><a href="#">7.3.2 Hydrology and Flood Risk</a></p>        | <p><a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br/> <a href="#">Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></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> |
| <p><a href="#">7.3.3 Ecology and Nature Conservation</a></p> | <p><a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br/> <a href="#">Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br/> <a href="#">Updated Figure 2 of Annex 6.3.1 (see Appendix T to the Applicant's response to Deadline I)</a></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> <p>Updated Figure 2 (Protected Species Survey Findings) of Annex 6.3.1 provides the relevant missing data associated with great crested newt</p>  |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)   | Document submitted post Application (Link)  | Relevance of Document   |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | surveys from the original figure as submitted within the ES.  |
| <a href="#">7.3.4 Intertidal Ornithology</a>   | -   | -   |
| <a href="#">7.3.5 Landscape and Visual Resources Part 1 of 3</a><br><br><a href="#">Landscape and Visual Resources Part 2 of 3</a><br><br><a href="#">Landscape and Visual Resources Part 3 of 3</a> | <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a> | <p>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.</p> |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)   | Document submitted post Application (Link)  | Relevance of Document   |
|--|---|---|
| <a href="#">7.3.6</a> <a href="#">Historic Environment</a>                 | <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a><br><a href="#">Transition Joint Bays and Jointing Pits Clarification Note (see Appendix V to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a> | <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</a> <a href="#">Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation</a> | <a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a>   | <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 Errata List that the assessments were carried out on the basis of the correct dimensions listed in the Project Description and</p>   |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)                       | Document submitted post Application (Link) | Relevance of Document                  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | 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</p> <p><a href="#">Habitats Regulations Assessment Part 1 of 2</a></p> <p><a href="#">Habitats Regulations Assessment Part 2 of 2</a></p> | <p><a href="#">Errata List (see Schedule 2 of the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Monopile and Suspended Sediment and Deposition Assessment Clarification Note (see Appendix R to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Humber SAC Subtidal Benthic Habitat Disturbance Clarification Note (see Appendix U to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening and Integrity Matrices (Version 2) (see Appendix P to the Applicant's submission of 27 April 2015)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix K of the Applicant's response to Deadline II: Updated Ornithology Baseline Data Clarification Note (as previously submitted as Appendix L to the Applicant's response to Deadline I)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix M MacArthur Green PVA Report (as submitted at Deadline IIa)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix N Clarification Note - Apportioning of predicted gannet mortality to the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA population (as submitted at Deadline IIa)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix O Clarification Note - Apportioning of predicted guillemot mortality to the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA population (as submitted at Deadline IIa)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix P Clarification Note - Apportioning of predicted kittiwake mortality to the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA population (as submitted at Deadline IIa)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix Q Clarification Note - Apportioning of predicted puffin mortality to the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA population (as submitted at Deadline IIa)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix R Clarification Note - Apportioning of predicted razorbill mortality to the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA</a></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 Baseline Ornithology Clarification Note provides a full breakdown of the raw (i.e. unprocessed) ornithological baseline data collected through a two year programme of boat-based surveys for Hornsea Project Two. The document responds to requests made by Natural England in their Relevant Representation for Hornsea Project Two, specifically the Baseline data collection and analysis methodology section of Appendix 1. The Applicant can confirm that this Clarification Note does not affect the outcome of the conclusions drawn within the HRA.</p> <p>The MacArthur Green PVA Report provides updated PVA outputs with revised demographic outputs as advised by Natural England</p> <p>Appendices N-R of the Applicant's Deadline III submission explore the assumptions made regarding the spatial and numerical distribution of non-breeding (including immature) birds during the breeding season and features of the apportioning methodology applied in the post-breeding and pre-breeding seasons for the following species; gannet, kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill and puffin.</p> <p>Appendix L of the Applicant's response to Deadline III presents the variation in flight height recording observed at other offshore wind farm projects, demonstrating there is no "standard" approach to the recording of flight heights.</p> |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link) | Document submitted post Application (Link)  | Relevance of Document  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
|                                | <p><a href="#">population (as submitted at Deadline IIa)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix L - Comparison of Flight Height Recording Bands Appendix (as submitted at Deadline III)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix DD Kittiwake Collision Risk: Sensitivity of Parameters to Core Assumptions – submitted at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix FF Greater Wash pSPA Screening note – submitted at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix R Intertidal Clarification Note (as submitted at Deadline IV)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix Q Addendum to HRA: Consideration of SNS dSAC (as submitted at Deadline IV)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix BB Updated RIES screening and integrity matrices – submitted at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix EE to EOO16 at Deadline IV</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix E - Summary of kittiwake position between Natural England and the Applicant at Deadline VI</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix N - Possible Greater Wash SPA Shadow HRA Screening (Version 2) as submitted by the Applicant at Deadline VI</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix F – Kittiwake Collision Risk; Applicants Position at Deadline VI as submitted at Deadline VI</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix B – Collision Risk Modelling Note – 4<sup>th</sup> December as submitted by the Applicant on 4<sup>th</sup> December</a></p> <p><a href="#">Appendix Q – Memorandum of Understanding between the Applicant and Natural England as submitted at Deadline VII</a></p> | <p>Appendix DD Kittiwake Collision Risk: Sensitivity of Parameters to Core Assumptions The note further explores the impacts from the Project on the kittiwake feature of the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA and aims to address concerns raised by Natural England during the ISH and their Deadline 3 response.</p> <p>Appendix FF The Greater Wash pSPA Screening note determines the potential for the Project to have a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) on the Greater Wash pSPA.</p> <p>Appendix R “Intertidal Clarification Note” provides further clarification on the outstanding matters of concern raised by Natural England with regard to intertidal SAC and SPA matters. The Applicant can confirm that the information provided within this note does not change the predictions made within the HRA.</p> <p>Appendix Q “Addendum to HRA: Consideration of SNS dSAC” provides further consideration of the implications of the project with regard to the proposed Southern North Sea dSAC for harbour porpoise, in response to the Ex. A Question EOMM26. The HRA Addendum concludes that there will be no significant adverse effect on the dSAC from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project either alone or in-combination.</p> <p>Appendix BB provides an update to the RIES screening and integrity matrices. The updates relate to the consideration of The Greater Wash pSPA and the SNS dSAC.</p> <p>Appendix EE referred to in response to EOO16 provides a technical consideration of the points raised by Natural England in Appendix 2 of their Deadline III submission.</p> <p>Appendix E - Summary of kittiwake position between Natural England and the Applicant at Deadline VI – The note provides a summary of Project alone mortality positions, a summary of in-combination positions, and the consequence of mortality.</p> <p>Appendix N – Possible Greater Wash SPA Shadow HRA Screening (Version 2) (as submitted at Deadline VI) provides further screening clarification to address the specific queries raised by Natural England with</p> |



| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link) | Document submitted post Application (Link) | Relevance of Document  |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
|                                |  | <p>regard to the Project and its potential implications on the possible Greater Wash Special Protection Area (SPA) designation, and presents a “Shadow HRA screening” to determine whether there is potential for a Likely Significant Effects (LSE) to occur on the proposed designated features of this possible SPA.</p> <p>Appendix F – Kittiwake Collision Risk; Applicants position at Deadline VI provides updated collision risk modelling outputs for Kittiwake in lieu of the project envelope refinements; namely to drop the 5 MW turbine and to increase minimum blade tip height (relative to LAT) to 29.97m.</p> <p>Appendix B – Collision Risk Modelling Note (as submitted by the Applicant on 4<sup>th</sup> December) provides updated and final CRM outputs for all key species at both EIA and HRA levels to consider the implications of a refined project envelope that has 6 MW as the smallest turbine option, and 34.97 above LAT as the minimum blade tip height.</p> <p>Appendix Q of Deadline VII – MoU: sets out the final agreed positions, and statements of facts where there may be differences, between the Applicant and Natural England in relation to HRA/EIA conclusions.</p> |

| Relevant part of ES/HRA (Link)               | Document submitted post Application (Link)  | Relevance of Document   |
|--|---|---|
| 7.5.2.2 Water Framework Directive Assessment | <a href="#">Appendix C: Applicant's response to EA letter of 14.05.2015, as submitted within Appendix NN of the Applicant's response to Deadline I - SoCG between SMart Wind and the Environment Agency</a> | The clarification addressing outstanding concerns raised in relation to the WFD assessment within their Relevant Representation. The clarification has enabled the Applicant and the Environment Agency to reach agreement on these points. |