

Hornsea Offshore Wind Farm

Project Two

The Applicant's response to Natural England's submission to Deadline VI

Appendix N to the Response submitted for Deadline VII

Application Reference: EN010053

10 December 2015

smartwind.co.uk

The Applicant's comments on the Natural England's response to Deadline VI

Section A: EIA collision risk - cumulative

- 1.1 Natural England have noted that the cumulative collision risk numbers presented for lesser black-backed gull and great black-backed gull differ to those presented for the Dogger Bank Teesside A&B assessment (Forewind, 2014). The collision risk figures submitted by the Applicant in Appendix CC at Deadline IV have, where possible, been obtained from individual assessment documents of the projects considered cumulatively.
- 1.2 However, as stated by Natural England, any differences to the figures presented in Forewind (2014) **do not materially affect the conclusions of the EIA** assessment for lesser black-backed gull and great black-backed gull and it is agreed that there are no significant effects in EIA terms from the Project alone or cumulatively.

Section B – Natural England's response to the Applicant's submission at Deadline V regarding question EOO16

- 1.3 As noted by Natural England, the Applicant provided further information at Deadline V in response to the Examining authority's written question EOO16.
- 1.4 The Applicant considers that the 1987 count of kittiwake which underpins Natural England's evidence that the colony may be in decline is disputed. Natural England, in their submission for Deadline VI provide an excerpt of an email from JNCC to J.Coulson, which they state is evidence that the author of Coulson (2012) now accepts the accuracy of the 1987 counts. The Applicant disputes this conclusion and maintains that the 1987 counts are best categorised as being 'disputed'. However, it is likely that the veracity of the counts will never be determined, although as Coulson states in his correspondence with the Applicant (November 2015):
"the huge increase of a vast colony followed by a comparable decline in only a few year would be a first, and still questionable since neighbouring colonies did not show major changes and high mortality was not reported at Flamborough."
- 1.5 As noted in previous information (the Applicant's Appendices E and F to Deadline VI), the Applicant is of the opinion that in recent years the population has been relatively stable and likely to have been maintained at carrying capacity through compensatory population effects.