

# Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm

# Appendix 23.5

## Consultation Responses

## Environmental Statement

### Volume 3

Applicant: Norfolk Vanguard Limited  
Document Reference: 6.1.23.5  
RHDHV Reference: PB4476-005-0235  
Pursuant to: APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)

Date: June 2018  
Revision: Version 1  
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

*Photo: Kentish Flats Offshore Wind Farm*



# Environmental Impact Assessment Environmental Statement

Document Reference: PB4476-005-0235

June 2018

For and on behalf of Norfolk Vanguard Limited

Approved by: Ruari Lean, Rebecca Sherwood

Signed: 

Date: 8<sup>th</sup> June 2018

For and on behalf of Royal HaskoningDHV

Drafted by: Gordon Campbell

Approved by: Jon Allen

Signed: 

Date: 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018



Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
20/04/18	01D	First draft for Norfolk Vanguard Limited review	GC	ST	JA
25/05/18	01F	Final for ES submission	GC	ST	JA

**Tables**

Table 23.1 Consultation Responses

1

## 23 APPENDIX 23.5

**Table 23.1 Consultation Responses**

Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
Natural England	Onshore Winter / Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report Response August 2016	It appears that some SSSIs and County Wildlife sites are missing from the report, we advise these are added.	These were included in the updated Onshore Winter / Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report (Appendix 23.1) and have been included in the onshore ornithology baseline (section 23.6) and considered where relevant to do so within the impact assessment (section 23.7 and 23.8).
Natural England	Onshore Winter / Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report Response August 2016	Natural England recommend that surveys start in October rather than the proposed November, to ensure the whole winter period is covered.	Details of the surveys undertaken, including starting the surveys in October, are detailed in the onshore ornithology baseline in section 23.6 and in appendix 23.1 Onshore Winter Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report.
Natural England	Onshore Winter / Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report Response August 2016	We would normally advise that at least two years of survey are undertaken to ensure that inter-annual variation is taken into account. However, we accept that there is limited value in a second year of winter surveys if the presence of geese and swans will be determined by the crop regime. We therefore advise that together with any survey and/or WeBS data, information about predicted crop patterns at the time of the proposed work are taken into account.	Consideration of crop patterns has been included in the impact assessment (section 23.7 and 23.8).
Norfolk County Council	Onshore Winter / Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report Response August 2016	Approach seems pragmatic and sensible, we broadly support the methodology. Include a reference to County Wildlife Sites Pits near Easthaugh (CWS 669) and Sparham Pools (CWS 673) along the Wensum SAC. We would not expect wintering survey at these sites. Surveys at Cawston and Marsham Heath SSSI not required (hen Harrier roost no longer active).	Designated sites which have specific interest features for onshore ornithology are assessed in section 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.

Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	The Secretary of State notes and welcomes the surveys proposed in Table 3.9 of the Scoping Report and advises that their scope and methodology be agreed with relevant stakeholders.	The methodology and scope has been agreed with stakeholders as set out in methodology section (section 23.4).
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	The Scoping Report has identified the need to consider indirect impacts on statutory and non-statutory designated sites for nature conservation through cable routing; however, direct impacts should also be considered if the cable route does not avoid such sites.	Direct impacts, where appropriate, are considered within section 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	The ES should identify the locations where there would be loss of important habitats for example, hedgerow and/or ancient woodland.	Loss of habitat is assessed in sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	The ES should set out the measures for reinstating habitats which are removed during construction.	Reinstatement is set out in sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	In accordance with EN-1, the Applicant should demonstrate the efforts made to ensure that activities will be confined to the minimum areas required for the works.	Activities will be confined to the minimum areas required for the works.
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	The Applicant should ensure that all mitigation measures proposed within the ES are secured and with this in mind the Secretary of State welcomes the proposal for a project specific Ecological Management Plan. A draft of the plan should be provided with the DCO application. Consideration should also be made to any potential overlapping objectives of ecological and landscaping mitigation measures that may be proposed and secured through management plans.	A draft Ecological Management Plan will be provided within the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy (OLEMS), to be submitted with the final DCO application, which will include the specific mitigation requirements for birds.
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	In terms of potential disturbance to protected species, the assessment should take account of impacts on noise, vibration and air quality (including dust); cross reference should be made to these specialist reports.	This has been considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	The ES should include a thorough assessment of the impact of the proposals on habitats and/or species listed as 'Habitats and Species of Principal	Habitats and Species of Principal Importance are considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8



Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
		Importance' within the England Biodiversity List.	of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
SoS	Scoping Opinion November 2016	The Secretary of State advises that the scope and methodology of all surveys are agreed with the relevant stakeholders and notes the intention to agree the recommendations of the 'Onshore Winter/Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report' with Norfolk County Council and Natural England. The outcomes of this report should be summarised within the ES and included in full as an appendix.	Recommendations of Onshore Winter/Passage Bird Survey Scoping Report were agreed with Natural England and Norfolk County Council in August 2016, and a methodology update agreed in March 2017. This report (and its findings) is summarised in section 23.6.
Hindolveston Parish Council	Scoping Opinion November 2016	It is requested that due care is taken to protect woodland (especially ancient woodland), meadows and areas that are habitats for wildlife, plants, insects even if these sites to not have special designations. For instance, this would include Roadside Nature Reserves (managed by Norfolk Wildlife Trust) e.g. at Brays Lane in Hindolveston and similar las near Guestwick leading to Wood Dalling.	Woodland and these named reserves are considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
Natural England	Scoping Opinion November 2016	Further sites that will need consideration along the route are Cawston and Marsham Heaths, Foxley Wood, Honeypot Wood and Beetley and Hoe Meadows SSSIs, all of which are designated as representative of rare habitats.	These sites are considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
Natural England	Scoping Opinion November 2016	We recommend that the Environmental Statement should include a full assessment of the direct and indirect effects of the development on the features of special interest within all designated sites that have potential to be affected by the cable route and should identify such mitigation measures as may be required in order to avoid, minimise or reduce any significant impacts.  Natural England advises that the Environmental Statement should consider any impacts upon local wildlife or geological sites and avoid these sites where possible, or mitigate for any impacts.	Designated and local sites of particular ornithological interest are considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
Natural England	Scoping Opinion November 2016	We recommend that the Environmental Statement should assess the impact of all	Protected species and Habitats and Species of

Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
		phases of the proposal on protected species... We recommend a thorough assessment of the impact of the proposals on habitats and/or species listed as 'Habitats and Species of Principal Importance'.	Principal Importance in relation to onshore ornithology are considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
Natural England	Scoping Opinion November 2016	<p>We advise that sites with breeding bird features are listed along with the sites identified with passage and wintering ornithological interest features.</p> <p>Table 3.14: Passage and over wintering birds are listed as red on BoCC 4 (Eaton <i>et al.</i>, 2015), along with their relative abundance (high, medium, low), which has been based on the data from the BTO UK Bird Atlas 2007-2011. We advise the inclusion of the same information for breeding birds for the scoping area.</p> <p>Table 3.15: When listing the UK bird species of principal importance (excluding BoCC red list species), which may be present within the onshore scoping area, we recommend the Applicant clarifies whether this list considers species that may be present during just the passage and wintering period, or whether it also includes species that may be present during the breeding season as well.</p> <p>We also recommend the inclusion of a list of UK habitats of principle importance recorded within the onshore scoping area which have suitability to support breeding and passage and wintering bird species.</p>	Details of the breeding bird receptors are set out in section 23.6 and assessed in section 23.7 and 23.8.
Norfolk County Council	January 2017 / Onshore Ecology and Ornithology ETG Minutes	Requested that those designated sites immediately outside of the survey area be considered within the assessment, e.g. Booton Common and Pigney's Wood (not yet designated).	These sites and others within 1km of the survey area have been considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
Natural England	February 2017 / Offshore Ornithology ETG Minutes	Disturbance of sand martin nesting at Happisburgh will need to be considered in relation to the onshore HDD works for landfall as well as access requirements to the landfall works (under the onshore ornithology impact assessment). The breeding bird survey should include this	Nesting sand martin are considered within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.



Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
		area. The breeding season is early summer and therefore, depending on locations, there could be seasonal constraints on the landfall HDD works to avoid breeding season.	
Natural England	Norfolk Vanguard - Onshore Wintering Bird Surveys Survey Methodology Approach Update Response March 2016	Agreement with the updated wintering bird survey methodology. In winter 2016/17 there may have been no birds because the areas they surveyed were not planted with crops the birds would feed on. However, in a different year, different crops may be grown in the survey area and birds may then use these fields. So, whilst we are not suggesting more than 1 year of survey, we advise considering this in assessments.	Consideration of crop patterns has been included in the impact assessment (section 23.7 and 23.8).
Natural England	Phase 2 Survey Scope Response April 2017	Natural England have no comment to make on the Phase 2 survey methodology, and are satisfied with the methodology as set out in the Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey report.	No action required.
Norfolk County Council	Phase 2 Survey Scope Response April 2017	I...can confirm that the Phase 2 methodologies seem appropriate and in line with best practice. So I am happy that the Phase 2 surveys can be undertaken as proposed and should provide appropriate evidence to inform the ecological baseline.	No action required.
Natural England	PEIR response November 2017	In terms of the HRA [Habitat Regulations Assessment] ...We are satisfied with the criteria for screening out Broadland SPA/Ramsar site.	No action required.
Natural England	PEIR response November 2017	Around the River Wensum crossing, and other areas, the timing of the work will be important in relation to disturbance of breeding or wintering birds.	Mitigation around the timing of the works to avoid sensitive periods for birds has been considered. Mitigation for potential impacts on birds is presented in sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
Norfolk County Council	PEIR response November 2017	Ecologists from the Natural Environment Team at the County Council have attended a number of Ecology Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings and have had the opportunity to comment on methodology and approaches for establishing and	Survey results are presented in section 23.6 of this chapter and detailed in full in Appendices 23.2 and 23.4.

Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
		assessing the ecological situation. Officers consider the approach is acceptable. The results of many of the ecology field surveys are not presented in the PEIR and it is understood that the County Council will not see the survey results until the Environmental Statement is produced.	
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	PEIR response November 2017	We note that the eastern section of the onshore cable route falls within land identified by Natural England as functionally-linked to the Broadland SPA for foraging pink-footed geese. While limited evidence of foraging pink-footed geese was recorded on the site surveys, given the known importance of this area for the species, we consider that mitigation measures should be included within the Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Strategy (OLEMS). These should include measures to ensure that any mitigation planned to deter breeding birds from using the area surrounding the cable route does not adversely affect pink-footed geese by reducing availability of foraging habitat. In order to ensure that sufficient habitat is available in the wider area during construction, it may be beneficial to secure appropriate cropping outside the area directly affected by the works, to act as a refuge.	Mitigation for potential impacts upon pink-footed geese is presented in sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
The Wildlife Trusts	PEIR response November 2017	We are pleased to see that the cable routes have been refined so that there are now fewer areas remaining with a choice of routes. In general, our comments on the onshore ecology section of the PEIR are made in relation to designated sites and habitats and not necessarily on impacts on each individual receptor, owing to the fact that much work still needs to be done to further refine routes and assess the best mitigation measures for each area of ecological value. We note with regard to species data that ecological information is at an early stage and that sufficient information may not be currently available to allow a planning decision to be made. We would expect that this information will be presented at the submission stage.	No action required.
North Norfolk	PEIR response	West of The Street, Ridlington (TG 34631	Undesignated habitat at

Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
District Council	November 2017	30520) – This area does not appear to have been surveyed in the field as part of the Water Vole, Breeding Birds or Extended Phase 1 survey, yet appears to be existing or former grazing pasture with possible reasonable habitat (semi-improved) and has an extensive ditch network and defined historical field pattern.	Ridlington Street is proposed to be crossed using trenching. Impact upon the potential bird species at the habitat by Ridlington Street are presented within sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
North Norfolk District Council	PEIR response November 2017	Breeding Birds Surveys – It is not clear within the reports if all features suitable to support breeding birds have been surveyed e.g. hedgerows and areas of scrub, semi-improved grassland. It appears that only the larger areas of habitat capable of supporting breeding birds have been subject to a BBS. This needs to be clarified.	All features capable of supporting breeding birds have not been surveyed. The bird surveys completed to date have focused on key sensitive areas as agreed during Expert Topic Group meetings (see Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology). Mitigation for common breeding birds using these habitats is provided in sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
North Norfolk District Council	PEIR response November 2017	Unable to comment on the results of many of the ecological surveys as the results have yet to be inputted into the PIER report.	Survey results are presented in section 23.6 of this chapter and detailed in full in Appendices 23.2 and 23.4.
Natural England	Review of baseline ecology reports February 2018	The data presented are clear and sufficiently detailed to have confidence in their accuracy, within the limitations expressed in the report. The report highlights limitations in the surveys and the recommendations given in the light of these should be undertaken to fully and accurately assess the impact of the project on breeding birds. The number and range of breeding bird species present at all sites highlights the importance of work methods and timing avoiding impacts to species and the full range of their associated habitats in all the areas. We wish to highlight that the floodplain grazing marsh adjacent to the	Mitigation around the timing of the works to avoid sensitive periods for birds has been considered. Mitigation for potential impacts on birds is presented in sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.

Consultee	Date /document	Comment	Response / where addressed in the ES
		River Wensum on the south side is managed under Countryside Stewardship to target wintering waders and wildfowl, so it should be presumed that these will be present from November to February inclusive.	
Natural England	Onshore Ornithology Baseline Report Review Meeting February 2018	Natural England would not prescribe a recommendation for a set size of area [to secure as habitat for pink-footed geese, if required], and that this would be up to Vattenfall's ecologists to determine. Mitigation would be dependant on the level of utilisation of this habitat recorded within the wintering / on passage bird survey results.	No action required.
Natural England	Onshore Ornithology Baseline Report Review Meeting February 2018	24hr working (i.e. works involving lighting) may be required for [the landfall] works, and that drills are noisy activities. Therefore, Natural England would expect further mitigation measures to minimise any effects of lighting or noise upon nesting sand martins. These would involve avoiding sensitive times of the sand martin nesting season, and directing lighting away from the nest sites.	Mitigation for potential impacts on birds is detailed in Chapter 25 Noise and Vibration and is presented in sections 23.7 and 23.8 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.
Natural England	Onshore Ornithology Baseline Report Review Meeting February 2018	Natural England agree with the recommendation to check desktop records to ensure that no significant species have been under represented due to the reduced access coverage at certain sites, lack of dawn/dusk surveys at all sites and also due to the lack of April surveys. We advise that there may be data from other surveys available, particularly for SSSIs and LNR. We also suggest considering local bird reports and at a broader scale the Atlas data and BTO Bird Track.	Additional desk-top records of bird observations have been obtained and are presented in section 23.6 of Chapter 23 Onshore Ornithology.