

8 Appendix III – EIA Evidence Plan Logs of Agreement/ Disagreements

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL - HRA

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 001	HRA Screening - Terms used	12/07/2017	3rd EP meeting	AF requested that definitive terms be used but confirmed that NE's comments would be collated and provided to the project.	NE	Addressed in the re-issue of the HRA screening report	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 002	HRA Screening	12/07/2017	3rd EP meeting	HRA screening report circulated to HRA EP	NE/KWT/MMO/Ce fas	comments on the document to be provided		email (15/06/17)	comments received and report ammended	No	Yes
HRA 003	HRA Screening		Email	HRA screening report re-issued with comments addressed	NE/KWT/MMO/Ce fas	sought agreement in EP meeting (2/10/17)	02/10/2017	email (28/09/17)		No	Yes
HRA 004	HRA Screening	12/07/2017	3rd EP meeting	TF suggested that gannets and kittiwakes should be screened in based on potential in-combination effects as opposed to awaiting CRM. However, he did note that it is likely that they will be screened out in the next step of the assessment.	NE	Addressed in the re-issue of the HRA screening report	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 005	HRA Screening	12/07/2017	3rd EP meeting	Outer Thames Estuary SPA to be screened in.	NE	This was screening into the sites.	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 006	HRA Screening	12/07/2017	3rd EP meeting	RTD - 100% disturbance for up to 4 km. On-going issue.	NE	On-going					No
HRA 007	HRA Screening	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	Agreed with NE to include screening as an appendix to he RIAA rather than repeat in the body of the text.	NE	This was agreed in the meeting. A table within the RIAA which will state any changes to the screening that may have occurred between screening and RIAA. Therefore, there will not be a requirement to repeat or reissue the screening report.	02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 008	HRA Screening	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	6.5 km vs 10 km RTD screening buffer	NE	agreed additional text to be incorporated into the RIAA and screening buffer applied to be clearly stated.	02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 009	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	RTD - 100% disturbance for up to 4 km. On-going issue	NE	On-going					No
HRA 010	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	The screening buffer is not equiavlent to the radius of LSE	NE	acknowledged in the meeting	02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	acknowledged in the meeting	No	Yes
HRA 011	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	RIAA to be effect based with relevant sites to be screened in against each effect	NE		02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 012	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	SK stated we cannot find the conservation objective (in English) for some of the sites and we propose to apply the Southern North Sea cSAC conservation objectives as proxy for the transboundary harbour porpoise site, with the standard definition of FCS for harbour and grey seal transboundary sites.	NE	CL confirmed that would be acceptable for (grey and harbour) seals and for harbour porpoises.	02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 013	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	In-combination screening is based on those plans and projects identified in the relevant ES chapters from each of the topics. Determination of LSE in-combination is proposed to take into account available information, effect-pathway-receptor and potential for a physical/temporal interaction. A tiering approach will be utilised, to take into account the different amounts of information available for new projects.	NE	NE agreed that the presented approach seemed reasonable.	02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 014	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	Effective Deterrent Radius (EDRs) agreed to provide spatial disturbance for piling (26 km), UXO (26 km) & Seismic surveys (5 km-10 km depending on information available/type of survey), during construction of the array.	NE	NE agreed that the presented approach seemed reasonable.	02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 015	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	IS confirmed that there will be an intertidal works restriction (October to March inclusive) in order to provide protection for overwintering birds.			02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 016	RIAA	02/10/2017	HRA EP mtg	UXO to be included in the HRA			02/10/2017	Meeting minutes (02/10/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
HRA 017	RIAA	30/04/2018	Email	RIAA circulated for consultation	whole panel		18/05/2018	Revision of RIAA			Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 018	RIAA - Sweetman II Ruling	21/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	The sweetman II case should be considered with respect to the screening of LSE.	Natural England	LSE screening has been revisited, with any effects previously screened out based on relevant mitigation screened back in (see Sections 7 and 8) and subsequently assessed for AEol in Sections 11 and 12 as appropriate.	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	LSE screening has been revisited	/	No	Yes
HRA 019	RIAA - Loss of Saltmarsh	21/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	NE noted that of the three landfall options, the decision on two of these relied upon additional data being collected and suggested that it would welcome the acquisition of such data as soon as possible. NE also noted that the permanent loss of saltmarsh habitat raised the potential for a LSE to occur on the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar (as a supporting habitat) and subsequently advised the Competent Authority that on this basis an Appropriate Assessment would therefore be required.	Natural England	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Additional comment to the quality of the saltmarsh has been added in paragraph 7.5.19. As highlighted in Table 6.1, a Saltmarsh Mitigation and Reinstatement Plan will be produced and submitted as part of the application and secured through the DCO.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 020	RIAA - Cable Route Selection	21/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	NE stated that the final landfall location seemed to have comparable interactions in terms of the number of designated sites with other options put forward, with more precaution afforded to options further east. It did not disagree that issues around designated sites have not been considered, however the options put forward seemed to be based on the number of site interactions rather than the actual sensitivity and recoverability of the features within the sites. NE require further justification and detail around the current landfall locations before agreement can be made.	Natural England	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	The RIAA summarises site selection and alternatives in section 5.3, drawing on Volume 1 Chapter 4 of the ES where these are considered in more detail. Final selection of the land fall option is dependant on site investigation works that are pending.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 021	RIAA - Core reef approach	21/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	NE questioned whether there is enough data to successfully identify where areas of core reef occur and what index would be appropriate to use to determine areas of core reef based on the available data. NE advised that the developers present their approach to it for comment as soon as possible. Without an agreed core reef approach any reef areas found in a pre-construction survey should be avoided. As per previous advice a core reef approach is more appropriate to permanent and on-going activities such as foundation locations. For short term activities such as cable laying it may be more appropriate to avoid reef that is found in a recent survey.	Natural England	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Please note that Sabellaria reef is not a feature of any of the designated sites included within the RIAA. However, the biogenic reef mitigation plan, as referenced in Table 6.1 and will be developed in consultation with stakeholders and submitted with the DCO, will also take account of any chalk reef, should any be identified during pre-construction surveys. Additional reference has been added to table 6.1 to highlight this.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 022	RIAA - Cablinf in Thanet SAC	21/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	NE raised concerns about the potential interaction of cabling operations within the Thanet SAC and the sites associated features, primarily the chalk habitat. As has been noted the cable corridor impinges only slightly on the SAC, and there have been discussions stating that there is no chalk habitat in the vicinity of the cable corridor. NE require further evidence regarding this and advise that cabling and associated cable protection should be avoided within this site. Without this further evidence NE can currently not agree there will be no likely significant effect (LSE) to the site.	Natural England	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Please note that Thanet SAC (chalk reefs) has been screened in for LSE on a number of issues, with these assessed further. Specifically regarding habitat loss and disturbance, the issue is assessed during construction/decommissioning in 13.2.12 et seq and for O&M in 13.2.55 et seq. It can be confirmed that the site specific surveys carried out did not identify the presence of the designated chalk reef feature. As stated in both the construction/decommissioning and O&M sections, should any designated chalk reef feature be identified during the preconstruction surveys, then appropriate measures will be taken to ensure no direct loss of the designated chalk reef (micrositing). The commitment is provided for through the biogenic reef mitigation plan, as referenced in section 13.2 but also in Table 6.1.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 023	RIAA - signposting	21/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	NE highlighted that throughout the [draft] RIAA references are made to documents that supposedly provide more evidence or contain further information on potential mitigation measures. NE have not seen the vast majority of these documents and assume they are associated with the environmental statement which is yet to be submitted. As a result, NE cannot fully determine the conclusions of LSE without this further evidence and mitigation options	Natural England	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	It is acknowledged that the draft RIAA referenced documents that have not yet been provided. However, it is also noted that these documents will be prepared (where relevant) in consultation with statutory bodies, including Natural England (where relevant). The documents will be available at the time of application (unless specifically stated). The RIAA is clear where these documents are held and (where relevant) how they will be secured. It is not the intention of the RIAA to reproduce all supporting documents, to avoid unnecessary repetition.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 024	RIAA - Conclusion on LSE	21/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Overall, NE determine that the application should move to the AA stage. Several conclusions of no LSE and Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEoI) have been made without sufficient evidence currently being presented, furthermore sufficient information on mitigation plans have not yet been developed nor agreed. On the latter point, and as stated above, the Sweetman II judgement has now determined that any mitigation measures have now got to be taken forward to be considered at the AA stage.	Natural England	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	The RIAA, or Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment, is intended to provide the competent authority with the information necessary to undertake an Appropriate Assessment. It is therefore considered that an AA will follow (as stated here). Consideration of the Sweetman II judgement has been incorporated in the assessment. It is noted that of the comments provided, there is comment on the consideration of LSE and AEoI. It is intended that the responses provided to the general comments will address these concerns.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and)	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 025	RIAA - permanent loss of saltmarsh	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Paragraphs 4-6 – stated that RSPB is content that the permanent loss of saltmarsh is screened out in respect of the qualifying features for Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA, Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Ramsar and Sandwich Bay SAC. Stated that RSPB is content that permanent or temporary loss of habitat used by non-breeding European golden plover is screened out. Also content that the loss of breeding habitat for little tern and temporary increase in SSC is screened out.	RSPB	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	We note and welcome RSPB agreement to the screening out of these effects.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 026	RIAA - ornithological baseline	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Sought information and results from the full 24 months of aerial survey.	RSPB	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	This is provided in the Baseline Technical report that accompanies the ES (Volume 4, Annex 4.1: Offshore Ornithology – Baseline Technical Report (Document Ref 6.4.4.1)).	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 027	RIAA - ornithology screening criteria	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Had concerns over the application of screening criteria for small numbers of birds recorded in surveys in the absence of the information and results from the full 24 months of aerial survey.	RSPB	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	The provision of the aerial survey results in the Baseline Technical report that accompanies the ES (Volume 4, Annex 4.1: Offshore Ornithology – Baseline Technical Report (Document Ref 6.4.4.1)) will allow the RSPB to verify the application of the screening criteria.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 028	RIAA - CRM	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Sought information on the effects on collision predictions of the levels of uncertainty in CRM parameters.	RSPB	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	This detailed information is provided in the CRM AppendixAnnex to the ES Offshore Ornithology Chapter (Volume 4, Annex 4.2: Offshore Ornithology – Collision Risk Modelling (Document Ref 6.4.4.2)).	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 029	RIAA - displacement	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Sought that the assessment was carried out following the SNCB standard displacement approach with generic buffers applied for red-throated diver (4 km) and auks (2 km) and generic rates of displacement (100%).	RSPB	Document has not been revised - disagreement	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	The site based evidence from the construction and operation of the Thanet OWF was applied in the displacement assessment of red-throated diver and auks with the size of buffer and rate of displacement based on that evidence (Section 11).	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 030	RIAA - cumulative projects	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Noted that floating wind farm schemes in Scottish waters have not been included in Table 8.4.	RSPB	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	The two floating wind schemes (Hywind and Kincardine) have been added in to Table 8.4.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 031	RIAA - incombination effects	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Noted that there has been no assessment of the potential in-combination effects of displacement on guillemot or razorbill.	RSPB	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Guillemot and razorbill were screened out because of the non-significant contribution to the in-combination effect (for instance <2 guillemot mortalities attributed to the Flamborough and Filey Coast pSPA (Section 8).	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 032	RIAA - Distribution	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	KWT noted that the RIAA document should have been circulated to interested parties and stakeholders to ensure transparency in the process and a better level of understanding of the project for those involved.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	VWPL have consulted with the Evidence Plan throughout with regards the RIAA and confirm that the RIAA will be available for review with the wider application documents following submission of the application.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 033	RIAA - signposting	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	KWT noted issues inherent in directing readers to other documents, identifying some of these were not available for review.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	VWPL are aware that readers are referenced to more detailed documents for specific information at key points in the RIAA. This is partly to ensure that the RIAA remains at a manageable size but also to avoid overburdening consultees by presenting the same information multiple times. Please note that ES chapters do build on the PEIR, which is already available, with the HRA Screening Report having been issued for consultation in 2017. All the documents referred to in the RIAA will be available with the final application (unless specifically noted to follow). Please note that paragraph 5.3.3 of the RIAA (within section 5.3 Consideration of Alternatives) references the ES chapter and not the PEIR chapter.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 034	RIAA - TCR	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Onshore Cable replacement; request for additional information on the reasons for the Thanet Cable Replacement Project being cancelled.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Further consideration of Thanet Cable Replacement (beyond identification of the withdrawal of the project and therefore its removal from consideration within the Thanet Extension RIAA) is not considered relevant to this document or Application. No further update or information is therefore available or provided here.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 035	RIAA - site selection	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Onshore consideration of alternatives. Issues and questions raised relating to site selection and highlighting that KWT consider that alternatives should be considered prior to instigating mitigation to reduce effects on an option selected that does interact with designated sites.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Please note that 3 options remain for the landfall option. Reference to where site selection and alternatives is addressed has been added to the Natural England comment. Regards Section 5.3 of the RIAA, this section is not intended to present the results of consultation (or the position of individual consultees), with that information presented in Table 4.1. The purpose of this section is to summarise the process followed and who has been involved. Regarding the designations mentioned at the landfall, please note that the RIAA is only concerned with the SAC, SPA and Ramsar. All designations are addressed within the ES. As regards consideration of site selection and alternatives, this is presented in the PEIR and has been updated within the main ES chapter as referenced here (volume 1 chapter 4).	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 036	RIAA - onshore habitat loss	43238	Consultation - RIAA response	<p>Onshore habitat loss – welcomed the inclusion of certain wetland invertebrate species in the RIAA but suggested that other species and assemblages should also be included, including the plant species tansy (Tanacetum vulgare) which supports an assemblage of nationally rare invertebrates.</p> <p>Disagreed that habitat loss for breeding little tern should be screened out and noted that substantial efforts to encourage little terns to return to breed in the SPA were ongoing.</p>	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	<p>Natural England has confirmed that the wetland invertebrate assemblage qualifying feature for the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Ramsar Site refers only to the 14 species listed in Section 22 (page 6) of the Ramsar Information Sheet. Of these species, only three species (Eluma caelata, Alysson lunicornis and Ectemnius ruficornis) could potentially be present within Stonelees based on their habitat requirements (see ES Volume 5, Annex 5-6: Invertebrate Assessment (Document Ref: 6.5.5.6)). The other invertebrate species and assemblages referred to, including invertebrates associated with tansy, are therefore not relevant to the RIAA. An assessment of effects on invertebrates not forming part of the Ramsar wetland invertebrate assemblage is provided in the ES, Volume 3, Chapter 5: Onshore Biodiversity (Document Ref: 6.3.5). As set out in Section 7.5 of the RIAA, little tern has not bred at Pegwell Bay for a number of years. Furthermore, the former breeding site was located to the east of the River Stour, which will not be affected by the proposed development. Both Natural England and RSPB have agreed that LSE relating to habitat loss for little tern can be screened out.</p>	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 037	RIAA - offshore habitat loss	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Further detail requested on the increase in subtidal benthic habitat loss (since PEIR) and the habitats affected. KWT questioned the loss of chalk reef as a 'temporary' impact. Anchoring on chalk seabed identified as being highly damaging to the habitat and should not be permitted during construction or O&M activities.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Further detail on this is provided within the relevant chapter of the ES (Volume 2, Chapter 5: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology), which updates that of the PEIR. The RIAA takes account of offshore habitat loss as it relates to the relevant designated sites only, with the ES addressing all habitat loss. The comment regarding chalk reef in the Thanet Coast SAC - is presumed to relate to Table 7.3. Potential for habitat loss or disturbance is considered during construction/decommissioning (with any such effects being temporary) and in O&M (with any such effects being permanent). Please note that this table relates to issues screened in for LSE - ie the issues carried forward to subsequent sections of the RIAA. The comment regarding vessel anchoring has been deleted. Regarding chalk reefs, please note the commitment to micro-siting referenced in Table 6.1.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 038	RIAA - micro-siting/micro-routing	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	KWT queried the potential to avoid the Thanet Coast SAC and MCZ entirely and if not possible then micro-routeing should be adopted to avoid key features. The potential for Sabellaria reefs to form in the area was also highlighted.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Please note that the MCZ is addressed separately and is not within the RIAA. Please see Table 6.1 for confirmation of micro-siting. Please note that Sabellaria spinulosa reef are not included as a feature within any of the designated sites assessed and therefore have not been assessed within the RIAA. Biogenic reefs are addressed within the ES.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HRA 039	RIAA - mitigation	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	Requests made that the principles underpinning the Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan would commence with avoidance as a first step, with mitigation brought in where this is not possible. Information was also sought on the timings of UXO clearance as well as the opportunity to see details of the mitigation plans associated with the project as and when these become available.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Regarding the biogenic reef mitigation plan, we would refer you to Table 6.1 where it references the plan including that it will be developed and agreed with the relevant stakeholders prior to construction and secured through the DCO. Please note that the MCZ is not part of the RIAA but is considered within the ES. Consultation on the MMMPs (piling and UXO) will follow. The various mitigation plans will be issued as noted in Section 8.5.	N/A	No	Yes
HRA 040	RIAA - MCZ	18/05/2018	Consultation - RIAA response	MCZ assessment; KWT noted its enthusiasm to review the MCZ assessment, raising the need to include the Goodwin Sands rMCZ.	KWT	Revise RIAA document	N/A - RIAA revised prior to application	Please note that the MCZ assessment is outwith the RIAA.	N/A	No	Yes

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL - MARINE ECOLOGY

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
BE 001	Intertidal survey	28/02/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	suitability of proposed intertidal characterisation survey	Review panel	submission of survey scope	28/02/17 evidence plan meeting	document submitted for review	survey scope agreed via email correspondence and agreed within the 2nd Review panel minutes	No	Yes
BE 002	Scope of EIA - benthic ecology	01/03/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	Scope of benthic ecology EIA - consideration of EMF assessment should be carried through subject to minimum cable burial	Review panel/EIA team	scope of EIA discussed during meeting - uncertainties focussed on	28/02/17 evidence plan meeting	EIA scoping log presented and discussed	Scope of EIA discussed at review panel meeting	No	Yes
BE 003	Scope of EIA - fish and shellfish ecology	02/03/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	Scope of fish and shellfish ecology EIA - consideration of EMF assessment should be carried through subject to minimum cable burial	Review panel/EIA team	scope of EIA discussed during meeting - uncertainties focussed on	28/02/17 evidence plan meeting	EIA scoping log presented and discussed	Scope of EIA discussed at review panel meeting	No	Yes
BE 004	Scope of EIA - marine mammal ecology	03/03/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	Scope of marine mammal ecology EIA - consideration of operational noise discussed and discounted	Review panel/EIA team	scope of EIA discussed during meeting - uncertainties focussed on	28/02/17 evidence plan meeting	EIA scoping log presented and discussed	Scope of EIA discussed at review panel meeting	No	Yes
BE 005	Adequacy of data	14/02/2017	Scoping opinion	It is agreed that the data sources described in the Scoping Report (TEOWFL January 2017) are adequate to inform the assessment of effects on physical processes.	NE/ MMO/Cefas	None required	28/02/17 evidence plan meeting	Meeting notes (28/02/17)	N/A	No	Yes
BE 006	Impacts scoped out of EIA	14/02/2017	Scoping opinion	It is agreed the following are scoped out of the EIA: Impacts on geology below max burial depth; and Change in bed levels from elevations in suspended sediment levels.	NE/ MMO/Cefas	None required	28/02/17 evidence plan meeting	Meeting notes (28/02/17)	N/A	No	Yes
BE 007	Desk based approach	14/02/2017	Scoping opinion	Desk based approach to assessment of sediment plumes etc needs clarification	NE/ MMO/Cefas	Submission of clarification note to RP	28/02/17 evidence plan meeting	Meeting notes (28/02/17)	submit document for validation	Yes - Document submitted 05/04/17; agreed as adequate on 21/06/17 at 2nd RP meeting; agreement logged; MMO letter sent confirming	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
BE 008	Marine Mammals methodology	22/05/2017	Correspondence	Scope and assessment methods for assessing underwater noise on marine mammals	Review panel/EIA team	Submission of clarification note to RP	26/05/2017	Meeting notes (26/05/17)	submitted methodology document for agreement	Yes - document submitted 22/05/17. Updated briefing note to be circulated and	yes
BE 009	Marine Mammal species of interested	26/05/2017	2nd Evidence Plan meeting	It was proposed that the main species of interest are harbour porpoise, harbour seals and grey seals and that all other species of cetacean should be scoped out.	NE/ MMO/Cefas	None required	26/05/2017	Meeting minutes (26/05/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 010	Marine Mammal reference populations	26/05/2017	2nd Evidence Plan meeting	Proposed reference populations for harbour seals and grey seals were presented for agreement.	NE/ MMO/Cefas	BN to be circulated summarising reference populations, data sources, methodology & thresholds for assessment	26/05/2017	Meeting minutes (26/05/17)	submitted methodology document for agreement	Yes - BN agreed via email	Yes
BE 011	Marine Mammal threshold for population modelling	26/05/2017	2nd Evidence Plan meeting	Proposed using a threshold of 5% of the reference population affected by disturbance as a level to trigger the need for a population modelling based assessment of the long term impacts of such disturbance.	NE/ MMO/Cefas	BN to be circulated summarising reference populations, data sources, methodology & thresholds for assessment.	26/05/2017	Meeting minutes (26/05/17); minutes agreed on 03/07/17	submitted methodology document for agreement	Yes - BN agreed via email	Yes
BE 012	Fish noise assessment thresholds	26/05/2017	2nd Evidence Plan meeting	Proposed that all thresholds will be unweighted. PTS will be assessed against Popper (2014) and behavioural will be against McCauley (2000). GG confirmed that it was reasonable to not include the 135 threshold for herring as this paper was based on a different environment (loch vs coastal waters).	NE/ MMO/Cefas	None required	26/05/2017	Meeting minutes (26/05/17); minutes agreed on 03/07/17	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 013	WFD assessment	26/05/2017	2nd Evidence Plan meeting	Proposed that the WFD assessment should be a standalone document and include priority habitats (including saltmarsh). Sediment disturbance and potential impacts on BWs may need to be assessed.	EA	None required	26/05/2017	Meeting minutes (26/05/17); minutes agreed on 03/07/17	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 014	Anchoring impacts	26/05/2017	2nd Evidence Plan meeting	The impacts of emergency anchoring issues.	EA	Confirmed that it will be assessed in the shipping and navigation assessment.	26/05/2017	Meeting minutes (26/05/17); minutes agreed on 03/07/17	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 015	Biodiversity of saltmarsh	26/05/2017	2nd Evidence Plan meeting	IH, BC and HM agreed that the saltmarsh to the south of the existing cables is more stable but has lower biodiversity to than to the north of the cables. Therefore, if the cable were to go through the south this would be less damaging and therefore a preferred approach when compared to the more diverse habitat to the north.	EA/KWT/NE	None required	26/05/2017	Meeting minutes (26/05/17); minutes agreed on 03/07/17	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 016	Marine Mammals Tech Baseline	04/07/2017	Correspondence	Technical baseline report was circulated for agreement	NE/ MMO/Cefas	report circulated for agreement/comment	26/05/2017	report circulated 23/06/17	agreement reached through email		Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
BE 017	Data coverage in the OECC	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	SL explained that an additional 'elbow' had been added in to the offshore export cable to provide an option to route south in order to provide an option for cable crossings and potentially to avoid high densities of magnetometer hits. Some of the Nemo data will be used to characterise the baseline but there will be an area without data. The baseline, for the area without data, will be characterised by interpreting the data in proximity of the area. AF noted a project risk but confirmed in the absence of data that the approach seemed sensible.	NE	Full details to be provided in PEIR of data used in the assessment and highlighting areas of uncertainty.	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 018	TCR	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	Ensure TCR is considered cumulatively in assessments		Assessment to be included in the ES	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	Yes - for ES	Yes
BE 019	Species for inclusions in Marine Mammals assessment	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	Inclusions of harbour porpoises, grey seals and harbour seals. All of species will be scoped out. This was agreed by CL	NE	Species agreed by NE (CL).	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 020	Noise threshold for marine mammals	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	CL explained the NE guidance is to undertake a comparative assessment between the 'traditional' noise thresholds and the NOAA guidance.	NE	Agreed that this is consistent with the methodologies being applied for the assessments	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 021	PCoD	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	CL requested that an PCoD assessment is considered.	NE	CS confirmed this would be considered but is dependent on available and consistent data/information	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 022	Indirect effects on marine mammals	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	Indirect effects on marine mammals will be considered in the marine mammals assessment	NE	Agreed that this is consistent with the methodologies being applied for the assessments	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 023	MCZ	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	Request for an MCZ specific assessment	EA	SM confirmed that the MCZ assessment will be a standalone chapter/document.	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 024	INNS	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	IH has requested that non-native species are considered in the assessment, in particular the stepping stone effect from North to South Kent.	EA	SL confirmed that they will be assessed where appropriate, including in the WFD assessment.	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	agreement reached in meeting	No	Yes
BE 025	Core Reefs - data requirements	12/07/2017	3rd Evidence Plan meeting	Would require multiple surveys of the array, over several years, similar to the Wash to be able to apply a biogenic reef management plan. EA requested video drop downs would be preferable.	NE/EA	SL confirmed that appropriate ground truthing would accompany any pre-construction survey, as had been undertaken for the characterisation survey.	12/07/2017	Meeting minutes (12/07/17)	Additional email correspondence	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
BE 026	Saltmarsh	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	SL presented the two different TJB options being taken forwards into PEI. Both will result in a permanent loss of saltmarsh. It was noted that it is not a designated feature of the sites.	NE/ES/RSPB	On-going		Reduced footprint following ES design and provision of saltmarsh plan in the application			Yes
BE 027	Intertidal	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	concerns raised over cable pulling on the intertidal	EA	On-going	04/10/2017			SL confirmed that as part of post-consent it could be conditioned to move only at high water. To be included in	Yes
BE 028	Migratory fish and eels	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	IH requested whether migratory fish and eels have been considered/ assessed.	EA	To be included in the PEI chapter	04/10/2017	Meeting minutes (04/10/17)		No	Yes
BE 029	INNS	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	IH requested that Invasive Non Native Species (INNS) are considered in the RIAA, WFD and benthic ecology assessments.	EA	SL confirmed that they are covered in each of the documents. SL also confirmed that an in-principle biosecurity plan will be developed, post-PEIR which will aim to contextualise the risk of introduction of INNS based on the proposed activities, this will include Ramsgate Harbour.	04/10/2017	Meeting minutes (04/10/17)		No	Yes
BE 030	Marine Mammals	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	UXO will be included in the ES and a place holder will be included in the PEI.	NE					No	Yes
BE 031	Marine Mammals	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	CS presented a four tiered approach for the cumulative assessment based on the certainty of available information. A quantitative assessment will be undertaken for tiers 1 and 2 which will provide the number of animals disturbed at a management unite level.	NE	agreed in the meeting	04/10/2017	Meeting minutes (04/10/17)		No	Yes
BE 032	Marine Mammals	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	CS proposed for seismic surveys to use the previous 2-3 years as a proxy for a baseline, as information on forthcoming surveys is not available.	NE	agreed in the meeting	04/10/2017	Meeting minutes (04/10/17)		No	Yes
BE 033	Marine Mammals	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	Hornsea P1 to be moved to tier 1 for the assessment. Forth and Tay OWFs to be classifieds as tier 2, using information from their consents.	NE	agreed in the meeting	04/10/2017	Meeting minutes (04/10/17)		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
BE 034	O&M activities	04/10/2017	4th EP mtg	MT requested that O&M activities are defined clearly in the PEIR.	MMO	SL confirmed that the working assumptions will be presented including vessel movements and types. An O&M plan will be developed for the application.	04/10/2017	Meeting minutes (04/10/17)		No	Yes
BE 035	Marine Mammal	07/02/2018	Email : TTS meeting	NE confirmed that they were happy to remove the Southall PTS assessment and just keep the NOAA PTS thresholds in the ES assessment.	NE	Update ES assessment	07/02/2018	Email		No	Yes
BE 036	CIA Tiering (all assessments)	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Agreed to maintain 3 tier approach with some additional justification provided within the ES in particular for those topics with additional tiers.	NE	agreed in the meeting	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 037	Underwater Noise	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	TM confirmed that the impact ranges for SELcum are smaller than SELs. This is because the Popper threshold is high (> 200 dB SEL) and so the spatial range at which these are achieved is low as they are reached quickly.	MMO	Update ES annex with additional justification and note to be circulated to the EP panel.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 038	Underwater Noise	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	The MMO queried, in their S42 response, how SPLpeak had been derived from the model. TM explained that the model is semi-empirical and had been calibrated on data for both SEL and SPL. Therefore, the model is able to be used to predict SPL.	MMO	Update the ES annex with additional text about the model and clarifying it is not an energy flux model.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 039	Underwater Noise	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	The sound exposure level (SEL) source levels were not provided in the PEIR.	MMO	Update the ES annex to provide the SEL source levels.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 040	Underwater Noise	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	TM clarified that weighting had not been applied in the assessment for SPLpeak. The information was provided to be illustrative to demonstrate the effect of weighting.	MMO	Update ES annex to provide clarification.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 041	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Agreed to apply only NOAA for PTS in the ES assessment (i.e. remove Southall).	NE & Cefas	Update ES assessment	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 042	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Impact ranges for possible avoidance in the ES to present both the mean and maximum to provide clarity.	MMO/Cefas	Update ES assessment	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 043	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	The presentation of TTS in the ES assessment	NE & Cefas	Teleconference held 13/2/18. Position paper to be provided to consultees.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 044	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Dose response curves to be applied in the ES	NE	Position paper was circulated by SM for agreement on 31/01/18	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 045	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Use of the English MU only for grey seals	NE	Update ES assessment	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 046	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Acknowledgement that the cSAC harbour porpoise data were formed of high quality data	NE	Update ES assessment	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
BE 047	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Natural England query whether there are further data sets regarding turbidity within the Thames Estuary in relation to confidence in the assumption that porpoise can be detected in the top two meters of water.	NE	Additional data has been provided by the EA and Cefas with regard to turbidity in the region. This will be analysed and incorporated as appropriate into the ES assessment.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 048	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	The requirement for mitigation for the cumulative impact of Moderate. CS highlighted that mitigation would not reduce the impact as it would be Moderate without Thanet Extension's contribution.	NE	RIAA to be circulated to the technical panel. Additional text/justification to be added to the ES assessment.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 049	Marine Mammals	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Additional information was requested as to why most of the marine mammal sightings were of insufficient quality to identify the species. CS clarified that the sightings were likely to be porpoise but they could not be identified with certainty and didn't want to underestimate dolphins.	NE	The ES is to be updated with additional text about the surveys and photographs.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 050	rMCZ	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Inclusion of Goodwin Sands rMCZ in the MCZ assessment to future proof the project.	NE	SL stated that we would consider the sensitivity and the habitats but would not want to draw pressures from other sites.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		Yes - discussed approach in May EP meeting with NE.	Yes
BE 051	Benthic	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Inclusion of an assessment of vehicles on the saltmarsh during construction.	NE	To be included in the ES chapter	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 052	Benthic	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Saltmarsh quality at the landfall	NE	see May EP mtg mins.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		Yes - provision of saltmarsh plan in the application	No - to be included in the application
BE 053	Benthic	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Chalk reef assessment. NE and MMO do not agree with the 'reefiness' assessment undertaken in the PEI. Subtidal chalk needs to be recognised as present and as a BAP habitat. Video is no appropriate to classify reef.	NE & MMO	ES chapters and RIAA updated accordingly.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 054	Benthic	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Further discussions for pre-construction survey methodology for sabellaria need to be undertaken.	NE	Noted	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 055	Fish and Shellfish	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Mitigation for herring and sand eel spawning/nurse areas to be considered.	NE	Use the sediment type data to produce habitat maps for herring and sand eel. The project may then consider mitigation prior to application.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
BE 056	Fish and Shellfish	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	The MMO highlighted uncertainty in the fish survey data in terms of temporal nature.	Cefas	Use the sediment type data to produce habitat maps for herring and sand eel. The project may then consider mitigation prior to application.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 057	PEMP	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	The project proposed to not provide an draft PEMP with the application. Both NE and MMO requested that it be provided to detail monitoring of habitats and species.	NE & MMO	Briefing note has been circulated for agreement on the proposed approach.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		Yes - circulate	Yes
BE 058	Physical Processes	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	To consider the change in particle size and winnowing as a result of project infrastructure.	MMO	The MESL data to be used to consider this effect in the ES chapter	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 059	Benthic	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	Core reef approach discussions		Document to be circulated to the EP as to why the project feels the use of a core reef and micro-siting infrastructure is appropriate. The note will compare the datasets and identify areas where reef is consistently identified and detail the proposed datasets.	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		Yes - circulate	No - to be included in the application
BE 060	General	26/01/2018	5th EP mtg	UXO	MMO	To be included in all relevant ES assessments	26/01/2018	Meeting Minutes (26/01/18)		No	Yes
BE 061	Cable burial	17/04/2018	6th EP mtg	AF would like to ensure that the assessment is realistic (on the basis of TOWF). It would be useful to understand the types habitats where protection might be required. Nemo have had to use cable protection in Goodwin Sands so could result this could result in cumulative issues.	NE	There will be no cable protection in the intertidal area or in European sites. MCZ assessment to present cable burial considerations.	17/04/2018	Meeting Minutes (17/04/18)		No	Yes
BE 062	Core Reefs - data requirements	17/04/2018	6th EP mtg	AF notes that project specific discussions need to be held before agreement can be reached on the application of a core reef approach.	NE	Biogenic reef plan provided information on available datasets and proposed approach.	17/04/2018	Meeting Minutes (17/04/18)		Biogenic reef plan to be made available to NE	No - to be included in the application

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL - OFFSHORE ORNITHOLOGY

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 001	Offshore Ornithology Survey Methodology	01/03/2016		NE raised with Vattenfall that they expected data to be collected for offshore ornithology using the latest aerial digital survey methods and not boat-based methods.	NE	Vattenfall to pursue contracting aerial digital surveys programme.	2016	Vattenfall contracted 24 months of aerial digital surveys through APEM Ltd.		No	Yes
OO 002	Data availability for PEIR	09/12/2016	First ETG Meeting	Discussion on data availability for Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and ES Chapter modelling, reporting and assessments.	NE & RSPB	Once the submission deadline is agreed then the data available for use in the PEIR and ES Chapter assessments will be reviewed.	09/12/2016 - Throughout ETG1 Minutes.	Action to be reviewed on receipt of revised project programme.		See reference OO 005.	Yes
OO 003	Use of historic data	09/12/2016	First ETG Meeting	NE and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) raised the possibility of using historical data in order to verify any months of the current survey programme without two years of data available.	NE & RSPB	Agreement that use of historic data would be used in final ES Chapter baseline.	09/12/2016 - Throughout ETG1 Minutes.	Ongoing		No longer an issue as all 24 months used in final ES Chapter assessments.	Yes
OO 004	CRM Methodology	09/12/2016	First ETG Meeting	CRM methodology was discussed and it was agreed that the Masden (2015) model would be the most suitable for assessments. NE suggested that the Masden (2015) was a good step forward from the Band (2012) model, though it would require additional details on the input parameters.	NE	Agreement that this CRM would be used in PEIR.	09/12/2016 - ETG1 Minutes – Section 5.	Masden CRM used in PEIR assessments of collision risk.		No (see OO 007)	Yes
OO 005	Data availability for PEIR	28/02/2017	Second ETG Meeting	Confirmation that the PEIR modelling, reporting and assessments would be based on 13 months of aerial digital survey data collected between March 2016 and March 2017.	NE & RSPB	NE and RSPB agreed that this would be appropriate for use at the PEIR stage.	ETG2 Minutes – Section 3.2.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 006	Data availability for final ES Chapter	28/02/2017	Second ETG Meeting	NE confirmed that their preference for data collection for use in the final ES Chapter would be from survey coverage over a 24 month period.	NE & RSPB	Should this not be possible and the use of existing sources of data from historic surveys is to be used then NE requested a clear description as to how these data would be incorporated.	ETG2 Minutes – Section 3.2.	To be reviewed as per programme at final ES Chapter stage.		No longer an issue as all 24 months used in final ES Chapter assessments.	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 007	CRM Methodology at PEIR Stage	28/02/2017	Second ETG Meeting	NE confirmed again that the most appropriate model to use for CRM is the Masden (2015) model. Following discussion between APEM and NE regarding research projects led by NE and Marine Scotland there may be additional guidance on the use of the Masden (2015) model.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed that depending on the timing of the release of any new guidance this may not be able to be incorporated into the CRM at the PEIR stage.	ETG2 Minutes – Section 3.3.	n/a		No (see 004 and 015)	Yes
OO 008	Species specific non-breeding bio-seasons	28/02/2017	Second ETG Meeting	It was agreed that the definition of non-breeding bio-seasons as defined in the Furness (2015) paper was most appropriate, though where site-specific evidence can be provided changes may be applied.	NE & RSPB	Should any site-specific evidence be available then it may be incorporated into the final bio-seasons.	ETG2 Minutes – Section 3.4.	Pending review of data		No	Yes
OO 009	Displacement Guidance	28/02/2017	Second ETG Meeting	Discussion on the assessment of disturbance and displacement with regards to auks and divers.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed between that the latest guidance on disturbance and displacement (SNCBs, 2017) would be used in the PEIR assessments.	ETG2 Minutes – Section 3.4.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 010	EIA Methods	28/02/2017	Second ETG Meeting	Discussion on proposed EIA methodology.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed that the proposed EIA methodologies detailed in the Scoping Report were appropriate for use.	ETG2 Minutes – Section 5.2.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 011	Focus of Baseline Technical Report	20/04/2017	Third ETG Meeting	Discussion around focus of Baseline Technical Report for PEIR only being on the key species. Any species only recorded once would not be included in the reporting.		NE agreed in principle, but requested that this be reviewed again for the ES Chapter baseline reporting, when additional data would be available.	ETG3 Minutes – Section 3.1.	Ongoing		No	Yes
OO 012	Apportionment of Unidentified birds	20/04/2017	Third ETG Meeting	Discussion on method used to apportion unidentified birds for abundance estimates.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed that the method used to apportion unidentified birds for abundance estimates was appropriate. This was confirmed to follow the previously agreed methods applied to APEM's aerial digital survey data for the East Anglia THREE project.	ETG3 Minutes – Section 3.2.	n/a		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 013	Correction Factor for Availability Bias of auks	20/04/2017	Third ETG Meeting	Discussion on method used to account for availability bias of diving auks from aerial digital surveys to allow for a correction factor to be applied to abundance estimates.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed that the method used to correct for availability (the use of a correction factor) for auks (razorbill and guillemot) was appropriate, though NE requested that the method was re-submitted as part of the PEIR reporting. This was confirmed to follow the previously agreed correction factor applied to APEM's aerial digital survey data on auks in the East Anglia ONE and THREE projects.	ETG3 Minutes – Section 3.3.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 014	Cumulative and In-Combination CRM	20/04/2017	Third ETG Meeting	Discussion on most appropriate starting point for cumulative and in-combination CRM assessments for seabirds.	NE	It was agreed that the most appropriate starting point for cumulative and in-combination CRM assessments for seabirds would be based upon the latest agreed figures from NE – that which was agreed during the examination period for East Anglia THREE. These would require review and revisions as appropriate to account for the tiered approach.	ETG3 Minutes – Section 4.	Ongoing		No	Yes
OO 015	CRM Methodology	20/04/2017	Third ETG Meeting	NE provided an update on their contracted project work on the Masden (2015) CRM model. Subsequent to previous advice, due to a number of uncertainties within the model identified through their contract, NE now advise the use of Band (2012) model for CRM assessments.	NE	Agreed to accommodate this request for the final ES Chapter stage, as too late for PEIR.	ETG3 Minutes – Section 5.	n/a		No (see 004 and 007)	Yes
OO 016	Background Mortality Rates	13/06/2017	Fourth ETG Meeting	Discussion on background mortality rates for use in the assessment of seabirds.	NE	It was agreed that the use of background mortality rates based upon the Horswill & Robinson (2015) and presented in the last Offshore Wind Farm (OWF) development application (East Anglia THREE) were appropriate.	ETG4 Minutes – Section 7.1.	n/a		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 017	Species subject to CRM	13/06/2017	Fourth ETG Meeting	Discussion on the species selected for CRM, following initial assessment of the baseline and the risk to species known to reside within the site.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed that only five seabirds would be subject to CRM for the PEIR (gannet, kittiwake, herring gull, great black-backed gull and lesser black-backed gull). Fulmar would not be assessed due to very low numbers recorded in the Thanet Extension site and their low risk of collision mortality due to their typical flight height being close to sea level.	ETG4 Minutes – Section 7.1.	n/a		Yes, dependant upon review of final data set for ES Chapter.	Yes
OO 018	Cumulative Assessment	12/07/2017	Fifth ETG Meeting	Discussion on how to approach the cumulative assessments for displacement and collision risk.	NE & RSPB	NE and RSPB agreed that cumulative impact assessments for disturbance and displacement as well as collision risk would follow current recommended practice and use a 5 Teir' approach.	ETG5 Minutes – Section 4.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 019	Offshore Ornithology Survey Methodology	12/07/2017	Fifth ETG Meeting	Discussion on data collection and the most appropriate method for offshore ornithology.	NE & RSPB	NE and RSPB agreed that the change from boat-based surveys to aerial digital surveys for the collection of baseline data was the best method and in keeping with all other current offshore wind farm projects.	ETG5 Minutes – Section 5.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 020	Collision Risk Modelling	12/07/2017	Fifth ETG Meeting	Discussion on how best to undertake collision risk modelling for the final ES Chapter, considering that the Masden approach is now not recommended due to technical issues for users.	NE & RSPB	NE and RSPB agreed that the Band CRM model (Band, 2012) would be used in the final ES Chapter, with upper and lower confidence intervals for key parameters, where possible (akin to Hornsea P2).	ETG5 Minutes – Section 5.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 021	Collision Risk Modelling	04/10/2017	Sixth ETG Meeting	Discussion on species to carry through the assessment of CRM for this project.	NE & RSPB	NE and RSPB agreed that fulmar could be screened out of collision risk assessment on the basis of low densities at Thanet Extension and its tendency to fly close to the water surface.	ETG6 Minutes – Section 8.	n/a		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 022	Collision Risk Modelling	04/10/2017	Sixth ETG Meeting	Discussion on what the worst case CRM would be for ES Chapter.	NE & RSPB	NE and RSPB agreed that 34 10 MW turbines was the worst case scenario for CRM in the stochastic (Masden, 2015) model runs and that this was the only array design to be re-run in the Band Model for the final ES Chapter.	ETG6 Minutes – Section 8.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 023	Cumulative Displacement for RTD	04/10/2017	Sixth ETG Meeting	Discussion and presentation of proposed new method to approach cumulative assessment of displacement for red-throated diver.	NE & RSPB	A proposed approach for understanding Thanet Extension’s contribution to cumulative effects on red-throated diver was agreed with NE and RSPB. This included applying a diver density distribution from a single source and applying a 4 km distance within which displacement could be predicted to occur to varying degrees. It was agreed as an appropriate methodology with the use of density data held in SeaMaST (Seabird Mapping and Sensitivity Tool) agreed as a suitable source, with confirmation that this approach would be undertaken for the final ES Chapter but would not be in the PEIR.	ETG6 Minutes – Section 8.	Method to be refined and discussed at next meeting.		Yes.	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 024	Use of site-specific data on disturbance and displacement	04/10/2017	Sixth ETG Meeting	Discussion on the preference of project team to use site-specific evidence in displacement assessments, particularly to identify the most appropriate buffer sizes to use.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed that locally collected data should be considered in the assessment of disturbance and displacement. However, NE and RSPB requested more standardised approaches to presenting data with reference to generic displacement rates and distances (buffer zones) should be taken from the most recent SNCB guidance note (SNCBs, 2017). It was agreed that information on generic displacement rates and distances (buffer zones) would be completed in standard matrices, though those that differ from site-specific survey data would only be presented in an annex.	ETG6 Minutes – Section 8.	n/a		No	Yes
OO 025	Annual Displacement Estimates	12/12/2017	Seventh ETG Meeting	Discussion on the presentation of an annual figure for displacement for all species assessed.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed that the final ES Chapter would include the provision of annual displacement rates for species during the construction and operational phases of Thanet Extension.	ETG7 Minutes – Section 3.	To be included in final ES Chapter		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 026	Use of site-specific data on disturbance and displacement	12/12/2017	Seventh ETG Meeting	Presentation and discussion on use of site-specific evidence collected for key species for use in displacement assessments.	NE & RSPB	APEM and Vattenfall provided NE and RSPB with information relating to the site-specific evidence based displacement rates being applied within the ES Chapter. These rates being those found within the final post-construction monitoring report for TOWF (Royal HaskoningDHV, 2013). NE and RSPB expressed their desire for displacement rates to be calculated using SNCB guidance (SNCBs, 2017), for which APEM and Vattenfall agreed to provide additional displacement matrices using SNCB displacement rates in a separate annex to the main ES Chapter.	ETG7 Minutes – Section 3.	To be included in final ES Chapter. However, it must be noted that NE and RSPB both prefer the use of generic data for displacement estimates to be calculated from.		No	Yes
OO 027	Collision Risk Modelling	12/12/2017	Seventh ETG Meeting	Discussion on availability of ORJIP data to inform CRM	NE & RSPB	APEM confirmed to the attendees that data on bird flights from the ORJIP project had been received. It was explained that due to a number of uncertainties within that dataset and how it could be most appropriately used in the Band CRM model it would not be relying on the outputs. Accordingly, if any CRM outputs using ORJIP data are to be calculated, they would be presented within an annex to the main ES Chapter.	ETG7 Minutes – Section 3.	ORJIP data to be considered for use in CRM, but due to a number of uncertainties will not be used as the basis of assessments.		No	Yes
OO 028	Bio-season mean peaks	12/12/2017	Seventh ETG Meeting	Discussion on use of data to compile bio-season abundances.	NE & RSPB	It was agreed with NE and RSPB that mean peaks would be presented for the bio-season abundance estimates, based on the mean of the peaks from year and year two of each survey year.	ETG7 Minutes – Section 5.	To be completed in revised Baseline.		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
OO 029	Cumulative Displacement for RTD	12/12/2017	Seventh ETG Meeting	Presentation and discussion of more detailed approach to assess red-throated diver displacement across wider region.	NE & RSPB	<p>APEM provided a a brief run through the paper “Red-throated Diver Cumulative (EIA) and In-combination (HRA) Assessment – Proposed Methodology” that had been circulated before the meeting. The key points from the paper were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “ Placing the ‘alone’ contribution of Thanet Extension in context, relative to all other proposed, consented or constructed offshore wind farms, mitigating the false confidence that can arise when considering absolute numbers derived from uncertain sources. • Applying a single source of red-throated diver density across all the offshore wind farms included in the assessment. • Applying, where relevant, the as-built layout of the array rather than the worst case design for the array as assessed in the application. • Considering the two ends of the range of scenarios over which standardised displacement matrices are prepared. For the HRA, apportioning a percentage of birds to the relevant SPA where the wind farm is located outside the SPA.” 	ETG7 Minutes – Section 5.	See cumulative section of ES for more details.		No	Yes
OO 030	Cumulative Displacement for RTD	12/12/2017	Seventh ETG Meeting	Further discussion on approach to cumulative red-throated diver assessment of displacement.	NE & RSPB	<p>The key points from the red-throated diver cumulative / in-combination assessment discussion were:</p> <p>NE welcomed the approach of using a single source for red-throated diver distribution and density from which to undertake cumulative / in-combination assessments. The assumptions underlying the methodology would need to be explained in the assessment. Re-emphasised that NE and RSPB will base their views on an assessment using the SNCB parameters of 100% displacement up to 4 km.</p>	ETG7 Minutes – Section 5.	See cumulative section of ES for more details.		No	Yes

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL - TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
TE 001	Terrestrial & Avian Ecology: review of scoping opinion	27/02/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	General: Key biodiversity contacts and communication paths were agreed. A review of scoping opinion comments from consultees was discussed. (EA and NE present). HRA to be dealt with at separate EP meetings (holistic for on and offshore)	Review panel	RP to consider HRA meeting approach	27/02/17 evidence plan meeting		SL to note HRA approach comments	No	Yes
TE 002	Consultee roles	27/02/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	CG requested that EA & NE agree clear consultation boundaries - i.e. which consultee would comment on areas of potential crossover, such as water vole.	Review panel	EA & NE to agree and respond	correspondence from NE/EA 13/3/17	NE's standing advice on survey applies to all species. Licensing would be NE responsibility. EA would deal with other aspects for priority sps. NE and EA defer to KWT on shining rams horn. Details in note supplied.	Noted and agreed	No	Yes
TE 003	Terrestrial & Avian Ecology survey scope	27/02/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	General scope and approach to survey: outlined by IS and CG. Relevant biodiversity comments and responses received in the scoping opinion were detailed by AFW and discussed by the group. Key biodiversity buffer zones were detailed and discussed, no current issues in relation to proposed ecological survey areas. All issues were positively addressed or would be addressed within the PEIR/ES and ongoing assessment process.	Review panel	AFW to submit scope document for review by consultees	Outline agreed 27/2/17, written scope to follow from AFW	AFW issued scope of biodiversity assessment to EA, NE, KWT, KCC, DCC and Thanet C on 5/4/17. Thanet and Kent chased 24/5.	survey scope agreed via email correspondence Dover CC (24/4, all ok, though noting comments on area of study (n/a as onshore interest remains at 500m), EA 25/4 (all ok), NE (All ok subject to minor queries, responded to by AFW 23/5/17), KWT (26/4/17, all ok)	yes	Yes
TE 004	Data availability	27/02/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	EA was asked to establish an WCC records and confirm if they have a coastal model in GIS available for the study area (latter on behalf of hydrology, see that tab hereafter).	Review panel	EA to action and respond	EA confirmed they do hold records 6/3/17	Follow up on 13/3 - EA scoped out WCC from further assessment.	noted.	no	yes
TE 005	Data availability	27/02/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	NE was asked for any data available on natterjack toads and sand lizards	Review panel	NE to respond (should KWT not have records)	27/02/2017			Dtaa no available	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
TE 006	EPS survey approach	27/02/2017	1st Evidence Plan meeting	AFW/NE discussed approach to great crested newt surveys – details to be discussed further in expert 2 expert telecom	review panel	AFW to arrange con call and NE to arrange appropriate contact in WL	Notes of call (16/3 sent to NE), NE response (31/3/17), AFW final comments and agreement (5/4/17)	2 con calls and agreed approach recorded in e mails, regarding GCN sampling in line with new NE policies.	agreed subject to conditions therein regarding non direct/limited impacts	No (other than to re examine if conditions change significantly/)	yes
TE 007	Ornithology:	27/02/2017	1st evidence plan meeting	Concerns raised regarding overwintering bird data were discussed and AFW confirmed that survey were ongoing and that the results of the current NE golden plover surveys would provide valuable detailed data to aid the assessment process	NE	AFW to update NE with data once completed/reported.	27/02/2017	Provided in PEI	N/A	No	Yes
TE 008	Data availability	27/02/2017	E mail correspondence following the 1st evidence plan meeting when they were raised	KWT asked regarding natterjack and sand lizard records	Review panel	AFW e mailed KWT 2/5/17. KWT to investigate and respond	AFW correspondence 4/5/17 and 23/5/17.	KWT is still trying to establish these records (19/5/17)	awaiting response - chased 16/8, 22/9 and May 2018.	yes	No
TE 009	Assessment Scope		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Raised concerns regarding the location of the substation within the SSSI.	Environment Agency	Project Design change	N/A	The substation location has since been moved and is no longer within the SSSI (see Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives).	N/A	No	Yes
TE 010	Assessment Scope		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Requested further consultation if Eurasian beaver, shining ramshorn or otter are recorded.	Environment Agency	Noted	N/A	There were no records of Eurasian beaver, shining ramshorn or otter during surveys carried out in 2017 (see section 5.7).	N/A	No	Yes
TE 012	Assessment Scope		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Satisfied with and agreed to the scope of species and habitat surveys to be conducted. Confirmed that white clawed crayfish need not be considered.	Environment Agency	Noted	N/A	Noted	N/A	No	Yes
TE 013	SSA		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Expressed concerns regarding the location of the substation within the SSSI and also requested full consideration of both route options.	Natural England	Project Design change	N/A	The substation location has since been moved and is no longer within the SSSI. The southern route no longer forms part of the proposed development (see Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives) and has therefore not been assessed.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
TE 014	Surveys		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Satisfied with and agreed to the scope of species and habitat surveys to be conducted. Noted that assessment of air quality effects should extend to 200m for designated sites.	Natural England	ES amended	N/A	The assessment of dust impacts is included in Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air Quality and is cross referenced within this chapter as appropriate. The assessment includes consideration of ecological receptors in designated sites within 200 m.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 015	Assessment Scope		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Ground contamination to be considered given proximity to designated sites. Noted that contamination or pollution incidents could affect bird species as well as other ecological receptors, particularly in terms of affecting their sources of food.	Natural England	ES amended	N/A	The assessment of potential contamination impacts is included in Volume 3, Chapter 6: Ground Conditions, Flood Risk and Land Use and is cross referenced within this chapter as appropriate.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 016	Monitoring		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Stated that pre- and post-construction monitoring of saltmarsh and mudflats is required to inform the EIA and HRA.	Natural England	Noted	N/A	Saltmarsh and mudflats are addressed in Volume 2 Chapter 5: Benthic Subtidal and Intertidal Ecology and in the RIAA.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 017	Cumulative assessment		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	The Nemo Link project should be included in the cumulative assessment.	Natural England	Noted	N/A	Potential effects on birds using saltmarsh and mudflat habitats are assessed in sections 5.10-5.13 of this chapter and in the RIAA.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 018	Assessment Scope		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Noted that nitrogen rates and dust will need to be considered in the ecological assessment of European sites. Also noted that noise effects on protected species/ sites or other wildlife should be considered.	TDC	ES amended	N/A	The assessment of air quality and dust impacts is included in Volume 3, Chapter 9: Air Quality and is cross referenced within this chapter as appropriate. Noise impacts on faunal species are assessed in sections 5.10-5.13 of this chapter and in the RIAA.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 019	Surveys		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Requested clarification of the area of interest for the study and potential buffers.	DDC	Further discussion	N/A	Study areas have been discussed and agreed through the EP process (see Evidence Plan Report, Document ref: 8.5) and are defined in section 5.4 of this chapter.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
TE 020	Surveys		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Stated that up to date survey information should be used.	DDC	Noted	N/A	A range of surveys were undertaken between 2016 and 2018 to inform the EIA. Details are provided in section 5.7 with further information included in Annexes 5-1 to 5-12.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 021	Surveys		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Satisfied with and agreed to the scope of species and habitat surveys to be conducted.	DDC	Noted	N/A	Noted.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 022	Surveys		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Requested data collection and full assessment to be presented in the ES for Option 2 (the southern route).	KCC	Noted	N/A	The southern route no longer forms part of the proposed development (see Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives) and has therefore not been assessed.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 023	Surveys		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Stated that all surveys reports should be appended to ES.	KCC	Noted	N/A	All survey reports are appended to the ES (Volume 5, Annexes 5-1 to 5-12).	N/A	No	Yes
TE 024	Assessment Scope		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Requested use of BS 42020:2013 Biodiversity - Code of Practice for Planning and Development.	KCC	Noted	N/A	The relevant provisions of BS 42020:2013 have been taken into account.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 025	OLEMP		OLEMP EP Meeting	Outline LEMP welcomed. Noted that net gains for biodiversity should be secured.	KCC	Noted	N/A	OLEMP to be provided in the application	N/A	No	Yes
TE 026	Objection		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Object in principle to the proposed development in the NNR.	KWT	Noted	N/A	Objection noted. The site selection process is detailed in Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives. Embedded mitigation is proposed to minimise negative impacts within the NNR (see Table 5.11).	N/A	No	Yes
TE 027	Disagreement	04/12/2017	email - 'RE: Thanet Extension - Evidence Plan - Onshore Technical Review Groups'	VE would like it recorded that agreement could not be reached over the minutes. In particular, with respect to the introduction of an additional route option through discussions with KWT.	KWT	No action - recorded in the minutes	N/A	minutes have been updated to reflect that agreement could not be reached.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
TE 028	Surveys		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Satisfied with and agreed to the scope of species and habitat surveys to be conducted.	KWT	Noted	N/A	Survey data collected for the project have been provided to KWT in the requested format.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 030	Disagreement		EP meetings in 02/2017, 07/2017 and 10/2017	Discussed route of the cable through the NNR and potential mitigation in line with KWT site objectives.	KWT	Noted	N/A	Consultee views were taken into account in site selection and routeing (see Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Alternatives) and development of embedded mitigation measures.	N/A	No	Yes
TE 031	Surveys		03/10/2017	Satisfied with and agreed to the scope of surveys and ornithological study area.	RSPB	Noted	N/A	Noted	N/A	No	Yes
TE 032	LEMP	17/04/2018	EP meeting - 17/04/18	CR notes that the outline plan will be useful to inform the discussions with LEMP. WH requested that the OLEMP is provided as soon as possible and is open to the idea of providing comments post submission but prior to examination (subject to staff availability).	NE	OLEMP to be provided with application	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Yes
TE 033	Bat survey	17/04/2018	EP meeting - 17/04/18	NE agreed that the approach taken to the bat surveys sounded reasonable.	NE	No action - recorded in the minutes	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Yes
TE 034	Invertebrate Survey	17/04/2018	EP meeting - 17/04/18	To be undertaken pre-construction	NE	The project would like to consider undertaking these in summer 2018 but this will be access dependent.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	Yes
TE 035	Saltmarsh	17/04/2018	EP meeting - 17/04/18	From an SPA designation, the nature of the saltmarsh habitat isn't considered to be functional for the qualifying bird species. We note that the saltmarsh is important however in terms of the SSSI.	NE	DW noted the differences between the upper and lower (below MHWS) in terms of habitat suitability for golden plover. DW would not consider the upper saltmarsh to be suitable for roosting given the density and height of the vegetation and so not a functional habitat for the qualifying species. NE highlighted the Sweetman Ruling.	N/A	AF noted that the arguments (as to why this habitat is unlikely to become potential habitat for Golden Plover due to the high position on the shore) should be drawn out.	N/A	No	Yes

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL - Historic Environment

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HE 001	Scope of geophysical survey	28/02/2017	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - Evidence Plan Review Panel kick off meeting	Discussion of scope of marine geophysics assessment.	Review panel/EIA team	Confirm scope of marine geophysics assessment once technical reports are available	28/02/2017	Technical reports submitted to HE for review.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 002	Provision of technical reports	28/02/2017	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - Evidence Plan Review Panel kick off meeting	Discussion concerning possibility that PEI would need to be submitted before completion of technical reports.	Review panel/EIA team	Provide completed technical baseline report to HE and relevant Local Authority Stakeholders on completion (rather than incomplete prior to PEI deadline).	28/02/2017	Technical reports were both complete prior to the PEI deadline, and were therefore included in the PEI.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 003	Study Area	28/02/2017	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - Evidence Plan Review Panel kick off meeting	WA set out extent of marine study area from Mean High Water to extent of offshore array, overlapping with the onshore heritage assessment.	Review panel/EIA team	No changes required to normal practice	28/02/2017	Study area approved	N/A	No	Yes
HE 004	Suitability of geophysical survey data	28/02/2017	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - Evidence Plan Review Panel kick off meeting	A data audit of geophysics datasets will confirm suitable resolution for archaeological assessment. Scope of survey was reviewed by WA ahead of survey.	Review panel/EIA team	Data audit will be conducted. Scope of survey was reviewed by WA prior to survey commencing.	28/02/2017	Data audit completed	N/A	No	Yes
HE 005	Approach to Setting	28/02/2017	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - Evidence Plan Review Panel kick off meeting	WA and HE discussed extent of Setting assessment and was agreed that onshore Consultant was best placed to undertake that assessment for onshore receptors (as is normal practice). Scope of offshore receptors to have Settings impacts was not relevant.	Review panel/EIA team	Setting of onshore assets undertaken by onshore Consultant. Following further discussions with HE (07/07/2017), setting of offshore assets has been included.	28/02/2017	Setting included in technical report and PEI, as per discussion 07/07/2017	N/A	No	Yes
HE 006	Approach to HSC	28/02/2017	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - Evidence Plan Review Panel kick off meeting	HSC will be included in offshore baseline as is normal approach.	Review panel/EIA team	HSC assessment included in technical report	28/02/2017	HSC included in technical report	N/A	No	Yes
HE 007	Concern about proximity to Goodwin Sands	28/02/2017	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - Evidence Plan Review Panel kick off meeting	Proximity of Goodwin Sands discussed. Seabed Processes to be reviewed for potential impact.	Review panel/EIA team	Confirm potential for indirect physical effects upon seabed features of high archaeological potential (ie: sandbanks)	28/02/2017	Potential for indirect impacts to features within Goodwin Sands assessed in PEI	N/A	No	Yes
HE 008	Seamless approach to Offshore and Onshore historic environment	05/05/2017	Conference call - GoBe, Offshore and Onshore Historic Environment Consultants	Discussion to ensure seamless approach to historic environment. Everything below Mean High Water to be covered by Offshore Consultants.	Historic Environment curators	Confirmation of approach and study areas	05/05/2017	Approach formed basis for intertidal area in technical reports	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HE 009	Extent of Cumulative Impact Assessment	31/05/2017	E-mail discussion	Discussion of recent approaches to Cumulative Impact Assessment study area		HE agreed that normal approach could be taken	01/06/2017	Cumulative Impact Assessment study area of 100 km implemented	N/A	No	Yes
HE 010	Visibility of on-shore assets from onshore	29/06/2017	E-mail discussion	Discussion regarding whether this issue would be incorporated into the Onshore or Offshore historic environment PEI chapter.	Historic Environment curators	Issue to be included in onshore chapter	29/06/2017	No action for Offshore Consultant	N/A	No	Yes
HE 011	Use of NEMO data, gaps	29/06/2017	E-mail discussion	Although the NEMO covers much of the Thanet Extension cable route, there remains a small gap. In addition, the pre-consent NEMO data was acquired at a lower resolution than the recent Thanet Extension data, and therefore less anomalies of archaeological potential have been identified.	Wessex Archaeology	Face to face meeting to discuss in more detail. Meeting attended 07/07/2017	07/07/2017	New study area incorporated into technical reports and PEI	N/A	No	Yes
HE 012	Amendments to cable route and adjustments to study area	07/07/2017	Meeting between WA and HE	Discussion regarding amendments to cable route study area and integration of NEMO geophysical survey data and additional data searches to fill gaps.	Contractors and curators	HE agreed with the approach	07/07/2017	New study area incorporated into technical reports and PEI	N/A	No	Yes
HE 013	Location of Boeing B-17 Second World War crash site (NRHE UID 1602379), methodology for walkover survey	07/07/2017	Meeting between WA and HE	Discussion about location of site. NRHE position places it within the study area, however, surveys undertaken during the 1990s indicate that the wreck is further to the south in Sandwich Flats.	Contractors and curators	WA will undertake intertidal fieldwork to confirm the location. HE agreed methodology.	07/07/2017	Fieldwork undertaken July 25-26.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 014	Offshore setting	07/07/2017	Meeting between WA and HE	Discussion about importance of setting of offshore heritage assets. Discussion about methodology to be applied - physical surroundings and views, and non-visual factors.	Contractors and curators	HE agreed with methodology	07/07/2017	Assessment of setting of offshore assets included in technical report and PEI	N/A	No	Yes
HE 015	Transboundary effects	07/07/2017	Meeting between WA and HE	Discussion about importance of considering transboundary effects	Curator	Transboundary effects to be included in PEI	07/07/2017	Transboundary effects included in PEI	N/A	No	Yes
HE 016	Aircraft material discovered in NEMO cable route	10/07/2017	E-mail correspondence	Discovery of aircraft material in NEMO cable route area. GoBe alerted to its presence	Contractor	To be included in next draft of PEI/ES	18/08/2017	Location to be included in ES	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HE 017	Indirect effects on Goodwin Sands	12/07/2017	Project update across various offshore technical review panels	Discussion about how indirect effects such as on Goodwin Sands would be addressed.	Curator	PEIR will cross reference to other chapters such as Physical Process to determine the potential for indirect effects	12/07/2017	Indirect effects included in PEIR	N/A	No	Yes
HE 018	Methodology for setting	12/07/2017	Project update across various offshore technical review panels	Discussion about methodology for setting	Curator	PEIR will include a methodology, baseline and assessment for setting	12/07/2017	Methodology for assessment of setting set out in technical report and PEIR	N/A	No	Yes
HE 019	Data gap due to change in export cable corridor	12/07/2017	Project update across various offshore technical review panels	Discussion about how data gap due to change in export cable corridor would be addressed.	Curator	Additional data has been requested from UKHO and NRHE, in addition, data from Nemo will be used. The gap in the geophysical assessment will be addressed through pre-construction surveys.	12/07/2017	The PEIR includes a figure to illustrate the location of the data gap. Where the data gap could be filled with data from the UKHO, NRHE and Nemo geophysical survey data, the information has been included in the PEIR.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 020	Uncertainties	12/07/2017	Project update across various offshore technical review panels	Discussion about uncertainties regarding data and impacts on features, anthropogenic items and unknowns	Curator	Data uncertainty will be reviewed in the technical reports and the PEIR	12/07/2017	Data uncertainty has been reviewed in the technical reports and the PEIR	N/A	No	Yes
HE 021	Location of Boeing B-17 bomber to be submitted to NRHE	04/10/2017	Offshore Technical Panel Meeting	Location of Boeing B-17 to be submitted to NRHE to ensure location is available for future research/ projects, etc.	Curator	NRHE to be notified of location	04/10/2017	Location has been provided to NRHE for their database	N/A	No	Yes
HE 022	Requirement for a WSI, and inclusion of appropriate mitigation	04/10/2017	Offshore Technical Panel Meeting	Discussion regarding requirement for WSI as mitigation. WSI can be considered as embedded mitigation and should be submitted after design freeze, along with ES chapter. WSI must include appropriate mitigation, based on standard practice, including ROVs, Geophys, Geotech, cameras, etc.	Curator	WSI to be prepared for submission with ES	04/10/2017	WSI will be prepared for submission with ES	N/A	No	Yes
HE 023	Both negative and positive effects should be presented in the PEIR	04/10/2017	Offshore Technical Panel Meeting	Discussion regarding inclusion of both positive and negative effects in PEIR.	Curator	PEIR to include both positive and negative effects	04/10/2017	PEIR reviewed to ensure both positive and negative effects have been included.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 024	Consultation during survey planning and post-consent surveys	04/10/2017	Offshore Technical Panel Meeting	HE have requested that they are consulted during the survey planning and scoping for any post-consent surveys	Curator	ES and WSI to include that HE will be consulted during survey planning and scoping for any post-consent surveys	04/10/2017	ES and WSI will include this request.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HE 025	UXO assessment	04/10/2017	Offshore Technical Panel Meeting	An assessment of proposed UXO clearance will be available soon. It should be included in the ES	Curator, Client	ES will include reference to UXO clearance report, WSI will provide detailed methodology for archaeological inclusion in UXO survey and archaeological assessment of survey data	04/10/2017	ES and WSI will include reference to UXO clearance	N/A	No	Yes
HE 026	Offshore historic environment liaison with SLVIA	04/10/2017	Offshore Technical Panel Meeting	Concerns raised with regards to LVIA results and historic environment	Curator	LVIA and historic environment to hold meeting/telecon to be held prior to PEI submission	04/10/2017	As of 14/11/2017 meeting has not yet been undertaken. Postpone meeting to prior to ES submission	N/A	No	Yes
HE 027	Status and archaeological potential of existing geoarchaeological vibrocores.	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Update for Curator regarding status of existing vibrocores and limitations for further assessment, as well as inclusion in WSI of consideration for archaeological input at planning stages of any further geotechnical surveys.	Curator	WSI will include reference to archaeological input in future geotechnical survey plans.	31/01/2018	WSI includes archaeological considerations in future geotechnical surveys.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 028	Curator requested to review outline draft WSI prior to submission of ES	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Programme and submission dates discussed. WSI to be prepared for early submission.	Curator	WSI to be prepared for review ahead of submission with ES	31/01/2018	WSI produced, reviewed by Client. To be submitted to Archaeological Curator(s) prior to submission of ES.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 029	Concerns with adequacy of geotechnical work	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Discussion regarding current status of project, many concerns will be addressed through the WSI.	Curator	WSI to discuss further geotechnical work.	31/01/2018	WSI includes discussion of archaeological input into any further geotechnical survey work, and archaeological assessment of results..	N/A	No	Yes
HE 030	Need for dedicated archaeological cores	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Discussion noting that the WSI would allow the retained archaeologist to develop suitable methodologies, working with the geotechnical contractor, to ensure any further cores of archaeological potential can undergo archaeological assessment first. The WSI needs to minimise risk, to alleviate any potential problems with communication breakdown.	Curator	WSI to provide detailed recommended options for further geotechnical survey. It clearly states archaeological objectives for recovered cores.	31/01/2018	WSI provides details regarding further geotechnical survey and archaeological requirements for recovered cores.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and)	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HE 031	Need for archaeologist on board during geoarchaeological survey, if needed	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Discussion noting this would be of value if cores are being reviewed on-board, however, if cores are recovered to lab facilities onshore, an archaeologist would not need to be present. The archaeologist is needed to ensure material is retrieved so it can be sampled and reviewed.	Curator	WSI to provide clarity regarding whether review of cores is undertaken on-board or on land.	31/01/2018	WSI provides options regarding whether core review is undertaken on-board or on land, and what the archaeological requirements would be for each option. The WSI notes that communication at an early stage is key.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 032	Need for WSI to be specific with regard to VCs or BHs	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Discussion regarding VCs and BHs	Curator	WSI to provide specific methodologies	31/01/2018	WSI provides specific methodologies regarding VCs and BHs.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 033	Curator requested complete and thorough survey of Pegwell Bay in areas where no geophysical survey data presently exists	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Discussion about geophysical survey data coverage. Any areas still outstanding will likely be covered by further surveys, for example in combination with a UXO survey. Any future post-consent survey coverage will be dictated and confined by areas of potential impact from construction activities.	Curator	WSI to discuss areas of survey gap and provide recommendations for coverage.	31/01/2018	WSI discusses areas of survey gap and provides recommendations for archaeological assessment of survey data once it is acquired.	N/A	No	Yes
HE 034	Curator recommended liaison between foreshore/intertidal work regarding geophysics/geotechnical work undertaken by offshore and onshore archaeologists. In addition, there should be liaison with terrestrial	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Discussion about benefits of liaison, and potential liaison meeting.	Curator	WSI to include potential for stakeholder liaison.	31/01/2018	WSI includes section regarding potential stakeholder liaison.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HE 035	Curator requested workshop prior to ES submission.	31/01/2018	Offshore Archaeology Meeting - liaison meeting requested by Historic England post-PEIR to discuss development of WSI.	Discussion about potential for workshop and timescales. It was agreed a workshop would be beneficial.	Curator	Wessex Archaeology to facilitate meeting. Curator to ensure Science Advisor can attend or provide feedback.	31/01/2018	Discussions with onshore archaeologists indicated that a liaison meeting would not be necessary at this stage. Notes regarding the discussions are included below (Reference HE 036)	N/A	No	Yes
HE 036	Liaison between offshore and onshore archaeologists	09/02/2018	Conference call - Offshore and Onshore Historic Environment Consultants	While a joined up approach has been beneficial in many other locations around the coast, in this particular area there are limitations. The majority of terrestrial works are expected to be shallow (1-2 m), and therefore will have limited impact on deposits of geoarchaeological significance onshore. Offshore, the intertidal geology comprises mainly chalk, with a thin layer of modern seabed over top, which therefore provides low potential for the discovery of palaeogeographical features of archaeological interest. Further offshore, there is material of interest, however it represents very different material to the deeper deposits known in the wider terrestrial area. Therefore, the utility of liaison work could be limited, although the WSI will include the possibility of liaison work if material of interest to stakeholders is discovered.	Curator	E-mail covering email discussions forwarded to Curator	08/03/2018	WSI includes potential for liaison with terrestrial stakeholders, if required.	N/A	No	Yes

Historic Environment REVIEW PANEL - Historic Environment

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HE 001	500m buffer area does not include Sandwich Conservation Area	14/02/2017	Scoping opinion	DDC raised concerns over potential effects of cabling, both direct and indirect on the Sandwich Conservation Area	SoS/DDC	Receptors in Sandwich have been considered for inclusion in assessment of indirect effects. Present cable route would not directly affect the conservation area.	Stakeholder meetings 28/3/17		To confirm when design is further advanced (HE 028)	No - Pegwell Bay cable route would not give rise to adverse effects on heritage assets in Sandwich	Yes
HE 002	KCC HER	14/02/2017	Scoping Opinion	KCC noted that their Historic Environment Record (HER is an incomplete record and noted that this would need to be considered in the assessment	SoS/KCC	The archaeological desk-based assessment uses the KCC HER among other sources as contextual material allowing an assessment of the potential survival of archaeological remains within the study area. Effects will be considered on known heritage assets and on as yet unrecorded heritage assets that may be observed during construction. DBA to be submitted.	n/a	DBA which considered HER data in the context of other information to develop an understanding of the potential for previously unknown remains to be present has been submitted with PEI.	DBA considers potential for previously unknown heritage assets to be affected	To confirm following PEI submission. See note HE040	Yes
HE 003	Potential Cable failure	14/02/2017	Scoping Opinion	KCC noted that no advice had been provided for action required in the event of cable failure - the concern is that where a consent has been granted on the basis that adverse effects can be avoided by HDD, failure of the HDD would lead to a requirement for direct cable burial which would not have been considered acceptable.	SoS/KCC	Cable failure is considered a very unlikely eventuality. Assessment of effects on areas where HDD is planned will also consider the potential worst case in the event of cable failure.	n/a	Procedure to be determined when extent and location of HDD is more clearly understood.	To confirm when design is further advanced (HE 025)	No - use of HDD is limited in extent and is used to cross areas which would not be accessible to open trenching methods	Yes
HE 004	Direct effects on archaeological remains during decommissioning	14/02/2017	Scoping Opinion	SoS requested justification of the scoping out of direct effects on archaeological remains during decommissioning	SoS	Justification will be provided in the PEI/ES	n/a	justification provided in PEI/ES	Decommissioning would affect only previously disturbed ground	No - disturbance during decommissioning would be confined to previously	Yes
HE 005	Assessment of settings on on-shore heritage assets	14/02/2017	Scoping opinion	SoS requested cross-referencing of LVIA and historic environment viewpoints	SoS	Initial viewpoint list has been discussed with the consultees. Cross referencing to be included in PEI	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17	Visualisations to be cross-referenced in the ES text	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HE 006	Clarification of onshore area of influence	02/02/2017	Scoping response	DDC requested clarification of the extent of the area of onshore influence	DDC	Area of influence has been discussed at meetings and confirmed in subsequent correspondence	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17, Technical notes 39080-CGos004 11/4/17 and 39080-CGos014 6/6/17	Response to Tech note 39080-CGos004 received from DDC 22/5/17. Acceptability of scope presented in PEI confirmed in DDC s42 response	No	Yes
HE 007	Omission of some heritage assets form plan submitted with scoping	02/02/2017	Scoping response	DDC noted absence of heritage assets outside 500m area of influence defined at scoping from drawings	DDC	Area of influence has been discussed at meetings and confirmed in subsequent correspondence	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17, Technical notes 39080-CGos004 11/4/17 and 6/6/17	Response to Tech note 39080-CGos004 received from KCC 22/5/17. Acceptability of scope presented in PEI confirmed in DDC s42 response	No	Yes
HE 008	Reference to KCC Archaeologist	02/02/2017	Scoping response	DDC requested reference be made to the KCC archaeologist in setting out the archaeological effects of the scheme	DDC	KCC Archaeologist has been engaged and a desk-based assessment will be submitted	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17	ongoing - DBA has been submitted at PEI (HE 026)	No - KCC confirmed acceptance of results of DBA in s42 response	Yes
HE 009	Richborough Castle	02/02/2017	Scoping response	DDC requested consideration of effects arising through change to setting of Richborough Castle	DDC	Richborough Castle will be included within scope of assessment	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17, Technical notes 39080-CGos004 11/4/17 (response 22/5/17) and 6/6/17	Response to Tech note 39080-CGos004 received from DDC 22/5/17.	Effects on Richborough Castle will be considered in ES	Yes
HE 010	Consideration of indirect effects of onshore elements of the development	02/02/2017	Scoping response	HE requested that the assessment consider change to setting caused by construction and operation of the onshore elements of the proposed development	HE	These effects will be considered	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 17/5/17, Technical notes 11/4/17 and 6/6/17.	Issue discussed at stakeholder meeting 17/5/17	Construction and operational effects of the scheme will be considered in the ES to scope agreed with KCC DDC, TDC and HE.	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HE 011	Effects arising through change to setting be considered as a discrete assessment and not as part of the SLVIA	02/02/2017	Scoping response	HE requested that effects arising through change to setting arising from the proposed turbines and other elements of development be considered as a discrete assessment and not as part of the SLVIA	HE	Change to setting will be considered as part of the onshore historic environment assessment	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 17/5/17, Technical note 39080-CGos004 11/4/17.	Issue discussed at stakeholder meeting 17/5/17	Specific historic environment assessment has been carried out within the PEI and will be presented in the ES	Yes
HE 012	Viewpoint location	02/02/2017	Scoping response	HE requested agreement of viewpoint locations	HE	Viewpoint locations to be confirmed with HE following initial assessment	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 17/5/17, Technical notes 39080-CGos004 11/4/17 and 6/6/17.	Issue discussed at stakeholder meeting 17/5/17	Ongoing - No further visualisations requested by HE. PEI visualisations will be updated to reflect final scheme design for ES.	Yes
HE 013	Agreement of potential receptors on indirect effects	02/02/2017	Scoping response	HE requested agreement of potential receptors of indirect effects in advance of the ES	HE	List of potential receptors has been produced and circulated to consultees	n/a	Stakeholder meetings 28/3/17 and 17/5/17, Technical note 6/6/17	Issue discussed at stakeholder meeting 17/5/17	Complete - anticipate further comments post PEI submission. Comments arising from s42 responses have been incorporated into ES.	Yes
HE014	KCC identify a number of potential receptors of direct effects and sources of information	01/02/2017	Scoping response	KCC identify a number of potential receptors of direct effects	KCC	noted. These will be considered as appropriate following design iterations - several relate to the Sandwich Bay landfall option.	n/a	considered in PEI as appropriate	Most receptors relate to Sandwich Bay landfall and have consequently not been considered further. Receptors relevant to the Pegwell Bay landfall have been considered in the PEI and ES.	No	Yes
HE015	Effect of construction compounds/ancillary works	01/02/2017	Scoping response	KCC request that potential effects of construction compounds and ancillary works is considered	KCC	noted. These will be considered as appropriate following design iterations.	n/a	considered in PEI as appropriate	All development within the RLB is considered in the ES	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HE 016	Richborough Castle	01/02/2017	Scoping response	KCC requested consideration of effects arising through change to setting of Richborough Castle	KCC	Richborough Castle will be included within scope of assessment	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17, Technical notes 39080-CGos004 11/4/17 (response 22/5/17) and 6/6/17	Change will be very limited	Effects on Richborough Castle will be considered in ES	Yes
HE 017	The Abbots Wall	01/02/2017	Scoping response	KCC requested consideration of effects arising through change to setting of The Abbots Wall	KCC	The Abbots Wall will be included within scope of assessment	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17, Technical notes 11/4/17 (response 22/5/17) and 6/6/17	Change will be very limited	Effects on The Abbot's Wall will be considered in ES	Yes
HE 018	Enclosure at Ebbsfleet/Weatherlees Hill	01/02/2017	Scoping response	KCC requested consideration of effects arising through change to setting of the enclosure at Ebbsfleet/Weatherlees Hill	KCC	The Enclosure at Ebbsfleet/Weatherlees Hill will be included within scope of assessment	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17, Technical notes 39080-CGos004 11/4/17 (response 22/5/17) and 6/6/17	Change will be very limited - this is the Caesarian 'invasion port' that has recently been reported publicly. See also HE035	KCC have clarified that this site is located at Ebbsfleet Hill and more detail has become public since the PEI submission. These effects are considered in the ES.	Yes
HE 019	Effect on listed buildings within Thanet	01/02/2017	Scoping response	Applicant is requested to provide concise and proportionate assessment scope	TDC	Noted	n/a	Stakeholder meeting 28/3/17, Technical notes 11/4/17 (response) and 6/6/17 (response 12/6/17)	Scope has been agreed through technotes included as appendices to the PEI and ES.	Scope has been agreed through post-scoping discussion, and s42 responses	Yes
HE 020	Indirect effects on heritage assets	28/03/2017	Stakeholder meeting	Amec Foster Wheeler to provide scoping criteria for indirect effects assessment		Amec FW to produce technical note for discussion/agreement	28/03/2017	Technote 39080-CGos004 issued 11/4/17. Responses received from TDC (11/4/17, DDC 22/5/17 and KCC 22/5/17)	Scope has been agreed through technotes included as appendices to the PEI and ES.	No	Yes
HE 021	Indirect effects on heritage assets	17/05/2017	Stakeholder meeting	Amec Foster Wheeler to review scoping and Historic England response to identify any heritage assets specified for inclusion in the indirect effects assessment	HE	Scoping and response reviewed - no specific assets identified.	17/05/2017	Technote 39080-CGos014 identifies that all assets identified as potentially affected have been included in the scope	Scope has been agreed through technotes included as appendices to the PEI and ES.	No	Yes
HE 022	Indirect effects on heritage assets	17/05/2017	Stakeholder meeting	Amec Foster Wheeler to clarify whether views from offshore would be considered within the assessment	HE	clarification requested from GoBe/OpEn	17/05/2017	Views from sea to land considered within PEI	These have been considered but are generally of minimal concern	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description)	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP)	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
HE 023	Indirect effects on heritage assets	17/05/2017	Stakeholder meeting	Amec FW to supply further details of the substation to Historic England	HE	outline design parameters supplied. More detail to be supplied in PEI project description	17/05/2017	email from Amy Roberts with minutes of meeting 22/5/17	Done	Further details to be supplied in ES project description	Yes
HE 024	Indirect effects on heritage assets	17/05/2017	Stakeholder meeting	Amec Foster Wheeler to produce detailed scope of assessment for agreement	HE	Technical note issued	17/05/2017	Technical note issued 6/6/17	Produced as tech note attached as appendix to PEI and ES	Scope agreed in principle pre submission of PEI. Modified slightly in ES in response to s42 comments from HE and TDC	Yes
HE 025	Effect of HDD failure	17/05/2017	PEI	HDD will be used only to cross Ramsgate Road or within area of landfill which has previously been disturbed and no effects are anticipated.	KCC	to include in PEI submission	n/a	considered in PEI as appropriate	Limited extent of HDD means this is not a significant concern	No	Yes
HE 026	Continuing engagement with KCC archaeologist	17/05/2017		Amec FW to submit DBA with or before PEI submission		to include with PEI submission	n/a	DBA included as annex to ES Chapter	DBA provided as PEI and ESappendix	No	Yes
HE 027	Provision of heritage-specific viewpoints/cross referencing to SLVIA VPs	17/05/2017		Anticipate further comments post PEI submission. Draft viewpoints will be needed in advance of PEI production		to include with PEI submission	n/a	Viewpoints included with PEI - cross-referenced to LVIA and LVIA chapters	Viewpoints all agreed with consultees	No further visualisations requested	Yes
HE 028	Assessment of heritage assets in Sandwich	17/05/2017		Stakeholder meeting noted that Receptors in Sandwich except for St Peter's Church had not been considered following selection of the Pegwell Bay Landfall.	DDC	For information. No further action	16/11/2017	n/a	Scope agreed with consultees	No	Yes

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL - Ground Conditions, Hydrology & Flood Risk and Land Use

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 001	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Cross referencing	02/02/2017	Natural England Scoping Opinion	Natural England advise that Ground Conditions and Contamination section in the ES is cross-referenced with the sections on onshore ecology and onshore ornithology and considers the potential for the mobilisation of contaminants to impact on sensitive receptors.	Natural England	A cross-reference has been made in section 6.1.1 and inter-related effects are covered in section 6.14 of the PEIR/ ES.				No	Yes
HUM 002	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Cross referencing	02/02/2017	Natural England Scoping Opinion	Natural England advise that Ground Conditions and Contamination section in the ES is cross-referenced with the sections on onshore ecology and onshore ornithology and considers the potential for the mobilisation of contaminants to impact on sensitive receptors.	Natural England	A cross-reference has been made in section 6.1.1 and inter-related effects are covered in section 6.14 of the PEIR/ ES.				No	Yes
HUM 003	Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment Scope	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	The Secretary of State (SoS) noted the proposal for a FRA and a WFD compliance assessment. SoS requested these assessments be discussed and agreed with the EA, the relevant internal drainage boards and local planning authorities. Amec Foster Wheeler (AFW) has discussed the scope with the EA and Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs) for the FRA. The scope of the WFD assessment has been provided for transitional and coastal waters and discussed with the EA (and presented in Volume 4 of the PEIR).	SoS	AFW has discussed the scope with the EA and LLFAs for the FRA, and details have been included in the PEIR/ ES chapter and Annex 6.2. The scope of the WFD assessment has been provided for transitional and coastal waters and discussed with the EA (and presented in Volume 4 of the PEIR). No further action required.	Further consultation meetings below on 28/06/2017, 11/07/2017			No	Yes
HUM 004	FRA climate change (CC) allowances	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	The SoS requested the FRA considers the most up-to-date climate change allowances and cover tidal flood risk as well as fluvial impacts under present and projected sea level scenarios.	SoS	AFW has discussed and agreed a CC allowance of 20% (increase in flow) within the FRA provided the site is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 and that the FRA will cover all flood risk sources. No further action required.	Correspondence on 05/06/2017 confirmed this			No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 005	Flood defence consents	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS advised that Flood Defence Consents that may be required for working in/ over/ adjacent to watercourses have been replaced by Flood Risk Activity Permits (FRAP) under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Amendment (no 2) Regulations 2016.	SoS	AFW has since discussed and agreed FRAP requirements with EA. The need for consents has been taken into account within embedded measures in the PEIR/ ES chapter. No further action required.	Consultation on 28/06/17 and 11/07/17 has confirmed requirements			No	Yes
HUM 006	Ground Conditions and Contamination - ALC Maps	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS identified Figure 3.5 (In Scoping Report) was based on the 'Provisional Series' of ALC maps which were designed at a 1:250,000 scale, but these maps are not sufficiently accurate for use in assessment at individual development level.	SoS	A review of publicly available data based on ALC Grades - Post 1988 Survey has been undertaken for the ALC of the site and its surroundings in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 007	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Approach to Assessment	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	Requested inter - related effects with hydrogeology are considered.	SoS	Inter - related effects on hydrogeology are dealt with in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 008	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Approach to Mitigation	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	A Soil and Drainage Management Plan is proposed, and the Applicant is requested to consider whether this plan may overlap between mitigation for impacts on ground conditions. The use of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) alongside the CoCP should also be considered along with the interaction with other topic chapters in the ES.	SoS	The PEIR/ ES chapter combined assessment of ground conditions, flood risk and land use to avoid overlapping of the mitigation measures. Cross referencing to other chapters ensures consistency. Whilst the CoCP will be submitted with the application, detailed mitigation measures will be incorporated into the CEMP post-DCO.				Yes - whilst the CoCP will be submitted with the application, the CEMP with detailed mitigation measures is to be submitted post-DCO.	Yes
HUM 009	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Assessment Methodology	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS noted the assessment methodology and details of any guidance used to support the assessment should be presented within the ES. (In Scoping Report) no reference is made to factors to be taken into account or the methodology to be employed to determine the significance of effect.	SoS	The assessment methodology including the significance of effects matrix is described within the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 010	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Baseline Environment	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS requested information on the baseline environment should be accompanied by figures showing the location of the features described.	SoS	Features described and figures presented in the PEIR/ ES chapter and Geo-environmental Desk Study.				No	Yes
HUM 011	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Data Gathering	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS requested that information on data gathering/ scoping be presented in the ES. SoS noted the relative age of the previous scoping data (dating back to 2005).	PINS	The approach to data gathering and scoping is presented in the PEIR/ ES Chapter. More up-to-date data have been gathered from the regulators and Landmark (Envirocheck) and has been used in the Chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 012	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Hazardous Contamination	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, Public Health England)	Public Health England requested details of any hazardous contamination present on-site (including ground gas) as part of the site condition report. Advised that emissions to and from the ground should be considered in terms of the previous history of the site and the potential of the site, once operational, to give rise to issues. Public health impacts associated with ground contamination and/ or the migration of material off-site should be assessed and the potential impact on nearby receptors.	Public Health England	Potential existing contamination sources and ground gases, and potential effects, have been detailed in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 013	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Historical Landfill Sites	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	Requested that specific reference is made to the identified historical landfill sites, including during the characterisation of baseline conditions and effects of Thanet Extension.	SoS	Reference to historical landfill sites is made throughout the PEIR/ ES chapter and Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 014	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Modelling	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS noted the Scoping Report does not set out the intention to undertake site specific modelling to inform the assessment of potential impacts, nor does it explain how, in the absence of this information, the assessment will be undertaken. The SoS reminds the Applicant of the need to ensure there is sufficient information to inform an adequate assessment of the likely significant effects.	SoS	The approach to the assessment and data gathering are described in the Scope and Methodology Section of the PEIR/ ES chapter. The assessment is based on previous investigation reports available for the development area, notably a DQRA carried out for controlled waters at the former Richborough Power Station.				No	Yes
HUM 015	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Risks and Mitigation	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS requested that the ES establishes what the risks are with regards the mobilisation of contaminants during excavation works, and is specific with regard to the mitigation necessary in the CoCP. Requested a draft of the CoCP to be included as part of the application.	PINS	These risks and associated mitigation measures are provided within the PEIR/ ES chapter. The CoCP will be submitted with the application, but the detailed measures will be incorporated in a post-DCO CEMP.				Yes - whilst the CoCP will be submitted with the application, the CEMP with detailed mitigation measures is to be submitted post-DCO.	Yes
HUM 016	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Scope	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, TDC)	TDC noted that an assessment of the operational impact of the development is proposed to be scoped out of the EIA. This is deemed acceptable given the nature and operational function of the proposed onshore development, i.e. no ground excavation or soil/ spoil handling, and all infrastructure is to remain in situ.	TDC	An assessment has been carried out for the remaining potential effects from maintenance works during the O&M phase in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 017	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS identified that no site surveys are proposed to be undertaken to inform the baseline, and considers that this approach should be discussed and agreed with relevant consultees and kept under review, for example, should potential contamination be identified through the desk studies, noting the presence of landfill sites within the onshore area of interest.	SoS	The need to complete a site investigation will be secured by a DCO requirement and is proposed in Mitigation Section of the PEIR/ ES Chapter, and Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study.	The scope of the site investigation was subsequently discussed (but not fully defined) with relevant regulators as requested by the EA during the meeting of 28/06/2017.			No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 018	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Study Area	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS notes that Scoping Report does not provide any justification for a 500 m cable and 1 km substation study area; but this should be included in the ES. T The study area for the consideration of cumulative impacts is defined as "within 1 km of the Onshore Area of Interest" and this should be further justified in the ES and agreed with relevant statutory bodies.	SoS	Given the proximity to the coast and on the assumption that embedded mitigation is carried out, the 500 m and 1 km study areas are considered sufficient for the Ground Conditions and Land Quality Receptors. Justification for the study area is provided within the PEIR/ES Chapter.	Statutory bodies reviewed the rationale for the study areas as part of the Section 42 Consultation process and provided no further comment.			No	Yes
HUM 019	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Baseline Environment	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS requested information on the baseline environment should be accompanied by figures showing the location of the features described.	SoS	Features described and figures presented in the PEIR/ ES chapter and Geo-environmental Desk Study.				No	Yes
HUM 020	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Approach to Assessment	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	Requested inter - related effects with hydrogeology are considered.	SoS	Inter - related effects on hydrogeology are dealt with in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 021	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Historical Landfill Sites	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	Requested that specific reference is made to the identified historical landfill sites, including during the characterisation of baseline conditions and effects of Thanet Extension.	SoS	Reference to historical landfill sites is made throughout the PEIR/ ES chapter and Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study.				No	Yes
HUM 022	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS identified that no site surveys are proposed to be undertaken to inform the baseline, and considers that this approach should be discussed and agreed with relevant consultees and kept under review, for example, should potential contamination be identified through the desk studies, noting the presence of landfill sites within the onshore area of interest.	SoS	The need to complete a site investigation will be secured by a DCO requirement and is proposed in Mitigation Section of the PEIR/ ES Chapter, and Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study.	The scope of the site investigation was subsequently discussed (but not fully defined) with relevant regulators as requested by the EA during the meeting of 28/06/2017.			No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 023	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Data Gathering	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS requested that information on data gathering/ scoping be presented in the ES. SoS noted the relative age of the previous scoping data (dating back to 2005).	PINS	The approach to data gathering and scoping is presented in the PEIR/ ES Chapter. More up-to-date data have been gathered from the regulators and Landmark (Envirocheck) and has been used in the Chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 024	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Modelling	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS noted the Scoping Report does not set out the intention to undertake site specific modelling to inform the assessment of potential impacts, nor does it explain how, in the absence of this information, the assessment will be undertaken. The SoS reminds the Applicant of the need to ensure there is sufficient information to inform an adequate assessment of the likely significant effects.	SoS	The approach to the assessment and data gathering are described in the Scope and Methodology Section of the PEIR/ ES chapter. The assessment is based on previous investigation reports available for the development area, notably a DQRA carried out for controlled waters at the former Richborough Power Station.				No	Yes
HUM 025	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Risks and Mitigation	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS requested that the ES establishes what the risks are with regards the mobilisation of contaminants during excavation works, and is specific with regard to the mitigation necessary in the CoCP. Requested a draft of the CoCP to be included as part of the application.	PINS	These risks and associated mitigation measures are provided within the PEIR/ ES chapter. The CoCP will be submitted with the application, but the detailed measures will be incorporated in a post-DCO CEMP.				Yes - whilst the CoCP will be submitted with the application, the CEMP with detailed mitigation measures is to be submitted post-DCO.	No
HUM 026	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Study Area	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS notes that Scoping Report does not provide any justification for a 500 m cable and 1 km substation study area; but this should be included in the ES. T The study area for the consideration of cumulative impacts is defined as "within 1 km of the Onshore Area of Interest" and this should be further justified in the ES and agreed with relevant statutory bodies.	SoS	Given the proximity to the coast and on the assumption that embedded mitigation is carried out, the 500 m and 1 km study areas are considered sufficient for the Ground Conditions and Land Quality Receptors. Justification for the study area is provided within the PEIR/ES Chapter.	Statutory bodies reviewed the rationale for the study areas as part of the Section 42 Consultation process and provided no further comment.			No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 027	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Assessment Methodology	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS noted the assessment methodology and details of any guidance used to support the assessment should be presented within the ES. (In Scoping Report) no reference is made to factors to be taken into account or the methodology to be employed to determine the significance of effect.	SoS	The assessment methodology including the significance of effects matrix is described within the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 028	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Approach to Mitigation	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	A Soil and Drainage Management Plan is proposed, and the Applicant is requested to consider whether this plan may overlap between mitigation for impacts on ground conditions. The use of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) alongside the CoCP should also be considered along with the interaction with other topic chapters in the ES.	SoS	The PEIR/ ES chapter combined assessment of ground conditions, flood risk and land use to avoid overlapping of the mitigation measures. Cross referencing to other chapters ensures consistency. Whilst the CoCP will be submitted with the application, detailed mitigation measures will be incorporated into the CEMP post-DCO.				Yes - whilst the CoCP will be submitted with the application, the CEMP with detailed mitigation measures is to be submitted post-DCO.	No
HUM 029	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Hazardous Contamination	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, Public Health England)	Public Health England requested details of any hazardous contamination present on-site (including ground gas) as part of the site condition report. Advised that emissions to and from the ground should be considered in terms of the previous history of the site and the potential of the site, once operational, to give rise to issues. Public health impacts associated with ground contamination and/ or the migration of material off-site should be assessed and the potential impact on nearby receptors.	Public Health England	Potential existing contamination sources and ground gases, and potential effects, have been detailed in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 030	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Scope	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, TDC)	TDC noted that an assessment of the operational impact of the development is proposed to be scoped out of the EIA. This is deemed acceptable given the nature and operational function of the proposed onshore development, i.e. no ground excavation or soil/ spoil handling, and all infrastructure is to remain in situ.	TDC	An assessment has been carried out for the remaining potential effects from maintenance works during the O&M phase in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 031	Ground Conditions and Contamination - ALC Maps	20/02/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, PINS)	SoS identified Figure 3.5 (In Scoping Report) was based on the 'Provisional Series' of ALC maps which were designed at a 1:250,000 scale, but these maps are not sufficiently accurate for use in assessment at individual development level.	SoS	A review of publicly available data based on ALC Grades - Post 1988 Survey has been undertaken for the ALC of the site and its surroundings in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 032	Water resource data search for the study site from the Environment Agency (EA)	03/03/2017	email	The EA confirmed that there are no licenses and authorisations for which application has been made but not given. It also confirmed that the site is not an SPZ and that superficial and bedrock secondary aquifers underlie the site. The EA also confirmed that the abstraction wells in the area are for agricultural and/ or commercial purposes.	EA	Information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 033	Water resource data search for the study site from Thanet District Council (TDC)	03/03/2017	email	TDC confirms that there are no private water supplies in proximity to the site, and that Pegwell Bay has a number of designations, including status as a SSSI and Ramsar site.	TDC	Information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 034	Substation/Construction Compound Levels	03/03/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, EA)	EA noted that in general, there is a need for the Substation and other essential infrastructure to be raised above the flood level.	EA	The PEIR/ ES chapter and FRA both identified that the Substation and Construction Compound are not at risk of flooding during the project. The need for drainage strategies to be included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been put forward within the Draft FRA in Tables 8.1 and 8.2. On this basis, the flood risk to these locations are considered to be low, requiring no further mitigation.	Consultation with EA on 28/06/17 and 11/07/17 has confirmed these assumptions to be correct			No	Yes
HUM 035	Flood Defence Consents	03/03/2017	Consultation (Scoping, EA)	Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 a permit may be required for any activities between the mean low water mark and sixteen metres of the landward toe of the flood defence with some activities excluded or exempt.	EA	Further consultation with EA and TDC (28/06/2017) has identified that the existing sea defence at Pegwell Bay Country Park is the responsibility of TDC. No permits will be required from the EA but may be a requirement from TDC for a permit in the vicinity of sea defence, as noted within the FRA.	Consultation with EA, TDC on 28/06/17 and 11/07/17			No	Yes
HUM 036	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Chalk Aquifer	03/03/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, EA)	EA noted that the onshore area of this proposal overlies a Chalk aquifer, and any pathways for contamination must be strictly controlled to avoid pollution of the principal and secondary aquifers from any historic contamination identified on the site from previous uses.	EA	Effects on the Chalk aquifer have been assessed in the PEIR/ ES chapter, and associated mitigation measures have been provided to avoid pollution.				No	Yes
HUM 037	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental data request submitted to DDC	03/03/2017	Email Contaminated land / environmental data request - Dover area	DDC was not able to undertake the environmental data request search because the search covers a vast area and identifies a number of sites that would require researching and seeking advice on. Therefore gathering it together would involve a significant cost and diversion of resources from the Department's other work.	DDC	None, this statement has been incorporated into the PEIR/ES chapter.	Email request for Contaminated land / environmental search 24/08/17 - Dover area	Another request for a smaller area was sent and data received from DDC was incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 038	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental data request submitted to TDC	03/03/2017	Email and letter Ref. Request for Information regarding Sandwich Road, Ramsgate, Kent – WK/201709089	Environmental information about the site and its surroundings was received via email on 04/05/2017. TDC advised that an investigation has been conducted in liaison with the EA at the Pegwell Bay PFS located off-site to the north, within the study site. Based on the information gathered from previous reports supporting planning applications within the study area, intrusive and remediation works were carried out at the Pegwell Bay PFS following free-phase hydrocarbon products being encountered in groundwater during an investigation conducted at an adjacent lay-by. According to the EA, remediation works were successful and the adjacent site did not show evidence of significant impact beyond the corner of the site first identified. A request for further information was sent by Amec Foster Wheeler to the EA and the information received is collated above. TDC has no record of pollution	TDC advised to contact the EA re. an investigation carried out at the Pegwell Bay petrol filling station.	1/ Information request about Pegwell Bay PFS sent to the EA. 2/Information request to provide information on former Ramsgate international hoverport sent to TDC. TDC has requested the EA to provide additional information on former Ramsgate international hoverport. The information has since been addressed by the EA below in HUM025	1/ information request sent to EA Groundwater & Contaminated Land manager (Jonathan Atkinson) per email on 05/05/2017. 2/ Phone call with TDC EPM Morgan Sproates and follow-up email on 05/05/2017. Request sent to EA on 05/05/2017. Information from the EA received per email on 22/05/2017.			No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 039	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental data request submitted to the EA	03/03/2017	Email Ref. KSL 41161 TT Thanet - Environmental data search	Environmental information about the site and its surroundings was received on 03/04/2017. The EA confirmed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they hold no records of any contravention of licence or authorisation terms and any enforcement actions taken; • there are permits for a radioactive waste treatment facility, a waste water treatment facility, and a combined heat and power biomass plant, all located at Sandwich, i.e. off-site to the south; • no planning liaison or development control issues have been reported by the EA; and • the pollution incidents that are recorded are of category 4, i.e. no impact, or category 3, i.e. minor impact, on land and water. 	EA	This information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes
HUM 040	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Pollution to Controlled Waters	03/03/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, EA)	EA recommended that the requirements of the NPPF are followed. In completing any site investigations and risk assessments the Applicant should assess the risk to groundwater and surface waters from contamination which may be present and where necessary carry out appropriate remediation.	EA	Risks to controlled waters have been assessed in the PEIR/ ES chapter. The need to complete a site investigation will be secured by a DCO requirement and is proposed in the Mitigation section of the PEIR/ ES chapter.	The scope of the site investigation was subsequently discussed (but not fully defined) with relevant regulators as requested by the EA during the meetings of 28/06/2017 and 18/12/2017.			No	Yes
HUM 041	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Chalk Aquifer	03/03/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, EA)	EA noted that the onshore area of this proposal overlies a Chalk aquifer, and any pathways for contamination must be strictly controlled to avoid pollution of the principal and secondary aquifers from any historic contamination identified on the site from previous uses.	EA	Effects on the Chalk aquifer have been assessed in the PEIR/ ES chapter, and associated mitigation measures have been provided to avoid pollution.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 042	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Pollution to Controlled Waters	03/03/2017	Consultation (Scoping Opinion, EA)	EA recommended that the requirements of the NPPF are followed. In completing any site investigations and risk assessments the Applicant should assess the risk to groundwater and surface waters from contamination which may be present and where necessary carry out appropriate remediation.	EA	Risks to controlled waters have been assessed in the PEIR/ ES chapter. The need to complete a site investigation will be secured by a DCO requirement and is proposed in the Mitigation section of the PEIR/ ES chapter.	The scope of the site investigation was subsequently discussed (but not fully defined) with relevant regulators as requested by the EA during the meetings of 28/06/2017 and 18/12/2017.			No	Yes
HUM 043	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental data request submitted to the EA	03/03/2017	Email Ref. KSL 41161 TT Thanet - Environmental data search	Environmental information about the site and its surroundings was received on 03/04/2017. The EA confirmed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they hold no records of any contravention of licence or authorisation terms and any enforcement actions taken; • there are permits for a radioactive waste treatment facility, a waste water treatment facility, and a combined heat and power biomass plant, all located at Sandwich, i.e. off-site to the south; • no planning liaison or development control issues have been reported by the EA; and • the pollution incidents that are recorded are of category 4, i.e. no impact, or category 3, i.e. minor impact, on land and water. 	EA	This information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 044	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental data request submitted to DDC	03/03/2017	Email Contaminated land / environmental data request - Dover area	DDC was not able to undertake the environmental data request search because the search covers a vast area and identifies a number of sites that would require researching and seeking advice on. Therefore gathering it together would involve a significant cost and diversion of resources from the Department's other work.	DDC	None, this statement has been incorporated into the PEIR/ES chapter.	Email request for Contaminated land / environmental search 24/08/17 Dover area	Another request for a smaller area was sent and data received from DDC was incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study		No	Yes
HUM 045	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental data request submitted to TDC	42797	Email and letter Ref. Request for Information regarding Sandwich Road, Ramsgate, Kent – WK/201709089	Environmental information about the site and its surroundings was received via email on 04/05/2017. TDC advised that an investigation has been conducted in liaison with the EA at the Pegwell Bay PFS located off-site to the north, within the study site. Based on the information gathered from previous reports supporting planning applications within the study area, intrusive and remediation works were carried out at the Pegwell Bay PFS following free-phase hydrocarbon products being encountered in groundwater during an investigation conducted at an adjacent lay-by. According to the EA, remediation works were successful and the adjacent site did not show evidence of significant impact beyond the corner of the site first identified. A request for further information was sent by Amec Foster Wheeler to the EA and the information received is collated above. TDC has no record of pollution incidents at the site or surrounding sites.	TDC advised to contact the EA re. an investigation carried out at the Pegwell Bay petrol filling station.	1/ Information request about Pegwell Bay PFS sent to the EA. 2/Information request to provide information on former Ramsgate international hoverport sent to TDC. TDC has requested the EA to provide additional information on former Ramsgate international hoverport. The information has since been addressed by the EA below in HUM025	1/ information request sent to EA Groundwater & Contaminated Land manager (Jonathan Atkinson) per email on 05/05/2017. 2/ Phone call with TDC EPM Morgan Sproates and follow-up email on 05/05/2017. Request sent to EA on 05/05/2017. Information from the EA received per email on 22/05/2017.		No	Yes	
HUM 046	Flood modelling data request from EA	07/03/2017	email	Request from the EA for Product 4 data and historic flood information.	AFW	Further correspondence regarding Product 4 request (HFR010, 11, 12, 15).	Further correspondence regarding Product 4 request (HFR010, 11, 12, 15)			No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 047	Queries regarding flood modelling data request from EA	20/03/2017	email	EA asked how flood modelling data should be provided (either for 20 grid references along the cable route or full model output files). EA also indicated that the existing Lower Stour ABD and Hazard Mapping Study is being updated and is likely to be issued in summer 2017.	EA	Requested flood data to be provided by EA for 20 grid references and enquired whether AFW can use the results of the existing Lower Stour ABD and Hazard Mapping Study model.	Internal telecon response email to EA queries sent on 29/03/17			EA queries have been addressed in HFR010	Yes
HUM 048	Confirmation of flood modelling data output from EA	29/03/2017	email	Requested flood modelling data to be provided by the EA for 20 grid references along the cable route and enquired whether AFW can use the results of the existing Lower Stour ABD and Hazard Mapping Study model.	AFW	EA had confirmed it is appropriate to use the existing Lower Stour ABD and Hazard Mapping Study model at the time. No further action required.	EA confirmation received by email on 05/06/2017			No	Yes
HUM 049	Flood modelling data from EA	10/04/2017	email	Product 4 data provided by the EA (for 20 grid references along the cable route).	EA	Requested reissue of Product 4 data showing land slightly more north and shown in different colour grades.	Internal telecon			Further data request from EA addressed in HFR015	Yes
HUM 050	Confirmation of FRA approach with EA	05/05/2017	email	Request for confirmation by the EA of approach for CC allowance and enquired whether it is appropriate to use the existing fluvial and tidal Lower Stour Model.	AFW	Response received confirmation of the approach taken. No further action required.	EA confirmed CC allowance approach on 05/06/2017			No	Yes
HUM 051	Flood information request from KCC	05/05/2017	email	Request for historical flood information and supplementary guidance on drainage.	AFW	Response received on 09/05/17. Data provided and no further action required.				No	Yes
HUM 052	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental Data on PFS	05/05/2017	Email to EA	The following information was received from EA on 22nd May 2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The investigations carried out at the PFS showed no significant ongoing issues and only limited historic impacts; Remediation works and monitoring were carried out following the leak that occurred at the Pfizer Sports Ground. There are limited residual contaminants that are stable and reducing. 		Freedom-of-information (Fol) requests were subsequently sent on 22/05/2017 by AFW to the EA and the Petroleum Officer at KCC Trading Standards to be provided with the reports for both sites. KCC responded that it does not hold any records. The EA responded that its retention of records schedule for this type of record is four years. It advised that AFW contact the consultancies (AECOM and SLR Consulting Ltd) that carried out the investigations. Requests sent on 04/07/2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response has been received from SLR Consulting Ltd to date; and Authorisation from AECOM's client to provide the reports is still pending. 	Response received from AECOM on 14/11/2017: "Pfizer are not able to supply the report to third parties given that they no longer own the property in question."			No - This information is not available from the client, so a general site investigation will be carried out.	No

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and)	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 053	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Environmental Data on PFS	05/05/2017	Email to EA	The following information was received from EA on 22nd May 2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The investigations carried out at the PFS showed no significant ongoing issues and only limited historic impacts; Remediation works and monitoring were carried out following the leak that occurred at the Pfizer Sports Ground. There are limited residual contaminants that are stable and reducing. 		Freedom-of-information (Fol) requests were subsequently sent on 22/05/2017 by AFW to the EA and the Petroleum Officer at KCC Trading Standards to be provided with the reports for both sites. KCC responded that it does not hold any records. The EA responded that its retention of records schedule for this type of record is four years. It advised that AFW contact the consultancies (AECOM and SLR Consulting Ltd) that carried out the investigations. Requests sent on 04/07/2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response has been received from SLR Consulting Ltd to date; and Authorisation from AECOM's client to provide the reports is still pending. 	Response received from AECOM on 14/11/2017: "Pfizer are not able to supply the report to third parties given that they no longer own the property in question."			No - This information is not available from the client, so a general site investigation will be carried out.	No
HUM 054	Response from KCC regarding flood information request	09/05/2017	email	KCC has advised that it will charge for pre-application advice.	KCC	Following discussion with GoBe PM it was agreed to pay KCC pre-application charge advice as part of consultation meeting at EA Canterbury Office (28/06/17).	Internal telcon	Emails sent to KCC (06/06/17 and 08/06/07) confirming payment of pre-application advice as part of consultation meeting at EA Canterbury Office (28/06/17)		No	Yes
HUM 055	Request for re-issue of EA's Product 4 Information	25/05/2017	email	Requested re-issue the Product 4 information showing land slightly more to the north and if possible using different colour grades.	AFW	Response received from EA on 01/06/17 requesting clarification on model data output area. Following internal discussions it was agreed to use the current Product 4 data (covering both cable routes) in the PEIR and then, if required for the ES, request re-issue of the Product 4 data zooming in on the northern route and using different colour grades. No further action required.	Internal telecon			No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 056	Confirmation of FRA approach and model with EA	05/06/2017	email	EA agreed and confirmed that the 20% climate change allowance is correct, provided the site was in Flood Risk Zone 1. It also reiterated that the updated model was anticipated during summer 2017, but that the draft FRA could be completed using the existing Lower Stour Model ABD and Hazard Mapping Study model. Correspondence in 2018 has confirmed that the release date of the updated model has been postponed (until at least Spring 2018) and that the existing model remains applicable.	EA	Information has been incorporated into the FRA. No further action required.	Consultation on the model release by emails on 12/12/2018, 05/03/2018, and 05/03/2018, and telephone message on 15/03/2018.			No	Yes
HUM 057	Consultation on drainage on historical landfill	28/06/2017	Consultation Meeting at EA Canterbury Office	KCC advised that it would not be concerned with the impact of a raised bund on infiltration at the historical landfill (rainfall currently infiltrates into the landfill and the proposed bund would not significantly impact this).	KCC	Information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES Chapter. No further action required.				No	Yes
HUM 058	Consultation on Cable Route/Stockpiling in relation to Flood Zones (FZ)	28/06/2017	Consultation Meeting at EA Canterbury Office	AFW indicated that cables would be buried through the SSSI and FZ3 (at the southern end of landfill). EA stated that it would not be necessary to move temporary stockpiles from FZ3 to FZ1 given that it is a tidal flood zone. EA suggested that Vattenfall could consider avoiding the creation of temporary stockpiles in FZ3 on the basis that they could be washed away during tidal events.	AFW, EA	Information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter and FRA. No further action required.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 059	Consultation on Flood Risk Permit Activity (FRAP) and other Permits	28/06/2017	Consultation Meeting at EA Canterbury Office	EA advised that a FRAP might be needed for temporary stockpiling in FZ3 or within 16m of 'Main River'. KCC advised that there are no land drainage Byelaws within the Redline Boundary (RLB) and so consent would only be required for watercourses not covered by the EA (Main Rivers) or the IDB (within IDB District), both of whom have permitting distances from channels. EA confirmed that a FRAP would be required for the Minster Stream crossing (and any ground investigation at Minster Stream too). EA also confirmed that the 8m permitting distance applies to Minster Stream. EA advised that there would be requirement in the DCO to cover future culvert maintenance.	EA, KCC	Information has been taken into account within the FRA and PEIR/ES chapter. No further action required.				No	Yes
HUM 060	Consultation on location of Construction Compound	28/06/2017	Consultation Meeting at EA Canterbury Office	EA confirmed it is not concerned with the proposed temporary construction compound location being within Flood Zone 2.	EA	Information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ES/FRA. No further action required.				No	Yes
HUM 061	Consultation on flood risk model information	28/06/2017	Consultation Meeting at EA Canterbury Office	AFW noted that the EA Product 4 flood risk information indicates that: -the substation would be dry during all fluvial events (defended and undefended) for the agreed CC allowance (20%) -the Substation plot would be dry during the 0.5% AEP tidal event in 2070 (both defended and undefended), but would be 'wet' by 2115. The EA acknowledged this point, and added that the predicted flood levels are likely to be lower using the new model.	AFW/EA	The flood risk model information has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter and FRA. No further action required.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 062	Consultation on the jurisdiction of the sea	28/06/2017	Consultation Meeting at EA Canterbury Office	It was identified that there is a sea defence which is situated in the vicinity of the proposed landfall location, which will need to be re-engineered. This defence is the responsibility of TDC. EA advised that a FRAP would not be required but that a permit from TDC may be required. EA also noted that it would be interested in ongoing discussions. TDC was asked to provide a plan which showed where its defences start and end.	AFW	Although there was sufficient information to inform the PEIR/ ES chapter and FRA, the AFW project team is awaiting the plan from TDC to identify exact boundaries.				Yes, TDC still to provide defences plan, and EA and others to be involved in post-DCO discussions.	No
HUM 063	Consultation on surface water drainage for substation	28/06/2017	Consultation Meeting at EA Canterbury Office	KCC advised that surface water drainage measures would be required at the Substation site.	KCC	Surface water drainage measures have been incorporated within embedded measures in the PEIR/ ES chapter and FRA. These measures will be further detailed in the CEMP which will issued post- DCO.				Yes. These measures will be further detailed in the CEMP which will issued post-DCO	No
HUM 064	Ground Conditions and Contamination	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	EA advised that with respect to ground contamination issues, the substation should be treated as any other potentially contaminated site. For the cables onto Richborough Power Station any breaking of ground proposed would require appropriate level of site investigation.	AFW	An assessment of effects has been carried out for the substation within the PEIR/ ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study. The requirement for Site Investigation has been identified within embedded mitigation measures.				No	Yes
HUM 065	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	In relation to potential contamination sources, the EA advised that any breaking of ground at the road and the Energy Park (and also at the Sports Club (and pitches) and the car auction site) will need a desk study and a site investigation.	EA	AFW advised that a Phase 1 Desk Study had been prepared and is to be updated. Potential contamination sources were identified, including the landfills, a closed pollution incident at the Sports Club and past uses of the power station at Energy Park. The risk to maintenance workers and controlled waters have been identified.				A site investigation will be carried out prior to construction and is proposed in the Mitigation section of the PEIR and ES chapter. Its scope will be discussed with the EA, TDC	No

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 066	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	AFW asked whether any investigation, monitoring data and any details about the landfill's cap were available for the landfills.	AFW	EA subsequently responded with information on the data source holder.	The EA answered per email on 10th July 2017 that the historic information/ data monitoring for this site is held by KCC Estates and TDC for the Contaminated Land Files.	KCC provided limited additional information on the historic Cliffsend landfill per email (14/08/2017) and during a consultation meeting (23/08/2017). KCC also sent 2 further reports on 03/01/17 comprising Clayton Consultants SI report and Baptie Froup Topsoil Assessment Report. Information is incorporated in the ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study.		A site investigation will be carried out prior to construction to gather groundwater and gas monitoring data as well as information on the engineering of the landfill.	No
HUM 067	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	AFW advised that ground gas monitoring and water sampling could be carried out as part of the pre-construction site investigation, which would also comprise soil testing and waste classification testing. The EA advised that CL:AIRE Definition of Waste Code of Practice will have to be followed. Stockpiling of material may also need an environmental permit. The EA noted that it would like to be consulted on the scope of the site investigation.	EA	The pre-construction requirements for site investigation have been put forward in the embedded mitigation section of the PEIR/ ES chapter.				A site investigation will be carried out prior to construction and is proposed in the Mitigation section of the PEIR/ES chapter. Its scope will be discussed with the EA, TDC and KCC beforehand.	No

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 068	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation/Oil Pipeline	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	<p>AFW advised that there is a former oil pipeline (with its part within the Energy Park believed to having been decommissioned) present along the northern and eastern boundary of the substation site, and that the cable would cross this. The pipeline is above ground, and may need a couple of metres removed to enable crossing.</p> <p>The EA asked if AFW could get hold of reports to confirm that the pipeline has been decommissioned. If it has, the EA advised that it may be fine to do so, but that will need to be checked with the EA contamination team. The EA suggested that the Oil Pipeline Agency be contacted for advice. If the pipeline is to be removed/capped off then an investigation for leaks should also be carried out and remediated.</p>	AFW	The information has been detailed within the Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study. An assessment of the effects has been carried out and mitigation measures identified in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				In the ES it has been noted that information has been provided in the Phase 1 report, an assessment has been carried out in section 6.10 and mitigation measures identified in Table 6.12.	Yes
HUM 069	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	In relation to potential contamination sources, the EA advised that any breaking of ground at the road and the Energy Park (and also at the Sports Club (and pitches) and the car auction site) will need a desk study and a site investigation.	EA	AFW advised that a Phase 1 Desk Study had been prepared and is to be updated. Potential contamination sources were identified, including the landfills, a closed pollution incident at the Sports Club and past uses of the power station at Energy Park. The risk to maintenance workers and controlled waters have been identified.				A site investigation will be carried out prior to construction and is proposed in the Mitigation section of the PEIR and ES chapter. Its scope will be discussed with the EA, TDC	No

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 070	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	AFW asked whether any investigation, monitoring data and any details about the landfill's cap were available for the landfills.	AFW	EA subsequently responded with information on the data source holder.	The EA answered per email on 10th July 2017 that the historic information/ data monitoring for this site is held by KCC Estates and TDC for the Contaminated Land Files.	KCC provided limited additional information on the historic Cliffsend landfill per email (14/08/2017) and during a consultation meeting (23/08/2017). KCC also sent 2 further reports on 03/01/17 comprising Clayton Consultants SI report and Baptie Froup Topsoil Assessment Report. Information is incorporated in the ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-environmental Desk Study.		A site investigation will be carried out prior to construction to gather groundwater and gas monitoring data as well as information on the engineering of the landfill.	No
HUM 071	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	AFW advised that ground gas monitoring and water sampling could be carried out as part of the pre-construction site investigation, which would also comprise soil testing and waste classification testing. The EA advised that CL:AIRE Definition of Waste Code of Practice will have to be followed. Stockpiling of material may also need an environmental permit. The EA noted that it would like to be consulted on the scope of the site investigation.	EA	The pre-construction requirements for site investigation have been put forward in the embedded mitigation section of the PEIR/ ES chapter.				A site investigation will be carried out prior to construction and is proposed in the Mitigation section of the PEIR/ES chapter. Its scope will be discussed with the EA, TDC and KCC beforehand.	No

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 072	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation/Oil Pipeline	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	<p>AFW advised that there is a former oil pipeline (with its part within the Energy Park believed to having been decommissioned) present along the northern and eastern boundary of the substation site, and that the cable would cross this. The pipeline is above ground, and may need a couple of metres removed to enable crossing.</p> <p>The EA asked if AFW could get hold of reports to confirm that the pipeline has been decommissioned. If it has, the EA advised that it may be fine to do so, but that will need to be checked with the EA contamination team. The EA suggested that the Oil Pipeline Agency be contacted for advice. If the pipeline is to be removed/ capped off then an investigation for leaks should also be carried out and remediated.</p>	AFW	The information has been detailed within the Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study. An assessment of the effects has been carried out and mitigation measures identified in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				In the ES it has been noted that information has been provided in the Phase 1 report, an assessment has been carried out in section 6.10 and mitigation measures identified in Table 6.12.	Yes
HUM 073	Ground Conditions and Contamination	28/06/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Canterbury	EA advised that with respect to ground contamination issues, the substation should be treated as any other potentially contaminated site. For the cables onto Richborough Power Station any breaking of ground proposed would require appropriate level of site investigation.	AFW	An assessment of effects has been carried out for the substation within the PEIR/ ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study. The requirement for Site Investigation has been identified within embedded mitigation measures.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 074	Consultation on agreed scope of FRA and approaches	11/07/2017	Evidence Plan Meeting at Vattenfall Office	AFW presented an overview of the hydrology and flood risk elements of the project to stakeholders. AFW summarised confirmed areas of agreement as being: - Flood model data: use of existing Lower Stour tidal flood model as the best available data at present; - Drainage: no concerns from EA/KCC on impact of proposed final raised bund on infiltration into landfill; - Temporary works: no concerns from EA on temporary construction compounds located in FZ2 or temporary stockpiles in FZ3 –(no loss of flood plain as outside of fluvial flood extent); - Substation: flood model maps show no risk of flooding over its lifetime; - Requirement for FRAP for the (culverted) Minster Stream (main river) crossing; - Possible requirement for permit from TDC for works near sea defence.	AFW	None, areas of agreement were presented to stakeholders.				No	Yes
HUM 075	Consultation on Cumulative Assessment Approach	11/07/2017	Evidence Plan Meeting at Vattenfall Office	TDC commented that it would like to see live projects and the effects of existing discharges being considered. Existing developments have been included in the scope of the assessment as appropriate.	TDC	In the PEIR/ES chapters (Paragraph 6.13.1 and 6.3.12 respectively) a spatial Onshore Zone of Influence (ZOI) of 1 km for all live projects has been considered to assess cumulative effects on land quality, ground conditions and flood risk. This information will be reviewed by stakeholders (including TDC) as part of the chapter stakeholder review.				ES has been amended and modified to reflect this info.	Yes
HUM 076	Consultation on sea defence	20/07/2017	email	EA confirmed that the sea defence at Pegwell Bay Country Park is a matter for TDC .	EA	Information noted within the PEIR and ES chapter and FRA.				No	Yes
HUM 077	Consultation on FRAP and consenting process	23/08/2017	Consultation Meeting at Ramsgate	EA confirmed that there would be no need for a FRAP for any works adjacent to the Pegwell Bay Country Park defences.	EA	Information noted within the PEIR/ ES chapter.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 078	Noise and vibration - Introduction and Agree Survey Methodology	30/03/2017	Email with Fiona Runacre at DDC	Introduce to project and to agree the noise and vibration survey and assessment methodology, including the selection of noise sensitive receptors.	Comments provided on 05/04/2017, AFW response 12/04/2017, further DDC response 26/04/2017.	Agreed to include specific noise sensitive receptor as part of long-term noise surveys	Comments addressed		Yes - include matters raised in ES Chapter	No	Yes
HUM 079	Noise and vibration - Introduction and Agree Survey Methodology	30/03/2017	Email with Helen Johnson at TDC	Introduce to project and to agree the noise and vibration survey and assessment methodology, including the selection of noise sensitive receptors.	No response received.					No	Yes
HUM 080	Consultation on landfill sea defences	23/08/2017	Consultation Meeting at Ramsgate	All the engineering options for bringing the cabling ashore will require the construction of new rock armour defences to create an area in front of the landfill for the cables to be buried in order to rise onto the top of the country park; this will avoid the need for any excavation within the former landfill. This will require some land take from the saltmarsh, which is a SSSI. A concern for the EA would be the loss of the saltmarsh habitat. Vattenfall stated that engineering solution would look to reduce the land take within the salt-marsh as much as possible. The preference of the EA would be to keep the existing sea defences in place. TDC agreed to this position.	EA, TDC	The landfall and onshore cable options and mitigation measures are assessed in the PEIR/ ES chapter.				Yes. Landfall options presented in ES and further dialogue with consultees anticipated.	No

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 081	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Landfill gas build up	23/08/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Ramsgate	<p>TDC asked if there was any potential for a build-up of landfill gasses within the cable ducts and inspection pits that cross the landfill.</p> <p>AFW noted that if there were any pathway for the ingress of landfill gases into the sealed concrete cable ducts (e.g. broken seal) there is the potential for pooling/ concentration of denser gases in the inspection pits (i.e. CO2 – asphyxiant).</p> <p>VWPL stated that the ducts would be sealed plastic pipes within a sealed concrete box, therefore it would not be possible for gas to enter the ducts. AFW stated that the construction works and operational procedures for any maintenance works would include standard HSE protocols, such as a Confined Spaces Procedure, to mitigate any risks. KCC stated that it would like to see details of any planned site intrusive works for review and approval.</p>	TDC	Mitigation measures have been embedded in the design presented within the PEIR/ ES chapter. Other mitigation measures have been put forward such as the need for a method statement for any planned site intrusive works.				No	Yes
HUM 082	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Landfill Information	23/08/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Ramsgate	<p>AFW led a discussion on the landfill, which is now the Pegwell Bay Country Park. Information on the history of the landfill had been obtained from an Envirocheck data search, with additional information provided by KCC and TDC. The main concern for KCC was the lack of detailed knowledge of the landfill construction techniques. Information was provided by KCC regarding two surface watercourses/ drains that run beneath the landfill that are regularly sampled.</p>	AFW	Further information on the landfill construction techniques from the Project Description has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter. Information on the watercourses has been incorporated into the Geo-Environmental Phase 1 desk study.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 083	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Landfill Information	23/08/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Ramsgate	AFW led a discussion on the landfill, which is now the Pegwell Bay Country Park. Information on the history of the landfill had been obtained from an Envirocheck data search, with additional information provided by KCC and TDC. The main concern for KCC was the lack of detailed knowledge of the landfill construction techniques. Information was provided by KCC regarding two surface watercourses/ drains that run beneath the landfill that are regularly sampled.	AFW	Further information on the landfill construction techniques from the Project Description has been incorporated into the PEIR/ ES chapter. Information on the watercourses has been incorporated into the Geo-Environmental Phase 1 desk study.				No	Yes
HUM 084	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Landfill gas build up	23/08/2017	Stakeholder Consultation Meeting in Ramsgate	TDC asked if there was any potential for a build-up of landfill gasses within the cable ducts and inspection pits that cross the landfill. AFW noted that if there were any pathway for the ingress of landfill gases into the sealed concrete cable ducts (e.g. broken seal) there is the potential for pooling/ concentration of denser gases in the inspection pits (i.e. CO2 – asphyxiant). VWPL stated that the ducts would be sealed plastic pipes within a sealed concrete box, therefore it would not be possible for gas to enter the ducts. AFW stated that the construction works and operational procedures for any maintenance works would include standard HSE protocols, such as a Confined Spaces Procedure, to mitigate any risks. KCC stated that it would like to see details of any planned site intrusive works for review and approval.	TDC	Mitigation measures have been embedded in the design presented within the PEIR/ ES chapter. Other mitigation measures have been put forward such as the need for a method statement for any planned site intrusive works.				No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 085	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Data Gathering	02/10/2017	Email Contaminated land / environmental search - Dover area	AFW made a new data request which was submitted as the Redline Boundary changed and the request is now for a smaller search area. Data from DDC were received on 18th October 2017. Response received authorisations under the EPR 2016, and sites that may be potentially contaminated have been identified by DDC (including 5 sites prioritised out of 398 sites).	AFW	Information from DDC has been incorporated into the baseline environment section of the PEIR/ ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-environmental desk study.				No	Yes
HUM 086	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Data Gathering	02/10/2017	Email Contaminated land / environmental search - Dover area	AFW made a new data request which was submitted as the Redline Boundary changed and the request is now for a smaller search area. Data from DDC were received on 18th October 2017. Response received authorisations under the EPR 2016, and sites that may be potentially contaminated have been identified by DDC (including 5 sites prioritised out of 398 sites).	AFW	Information from DDC has been incorporated into the baseline environment section of the PEIR/ ES chapter and the Phase 1 Geo-environmental desk study.				No	Yes
HUM 087	Consultation on Culvert Proposals	18/12/2017	Teleconferences with EA	EA sought clarification on the proposed design and identified that its preference would be to retain the existing Minster Stream culvert and not to build new structures that would restrict flow in the watercourse.	EA	The assessment of effects in the ES chapter and FRA has been based on the worst case design scenario which would involve removal of the existing culvert and installation of a new structure. Mitigation measures have also been put forward which will be incorporated into the CEMP post-DCO.				Further discussion with EA required	No
HUM 088	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation and Mitigation for Leachates	08/12/2018 and 18/12/2018	Teleconferences with the EA and Natural England	It was noted that additional site investigation would be required prior to construction at the proposed landfill. Also, there are potential contamination issues associated with dewatering and discharge from the cofferdams.	EA and Natural England	Noted. The risk of leachate contamination is addressed in the ES.		The ES chapter assesses the maximum adverse scenario associated with the latest available landfill options. Mitigation measures for tankering and disposal off site of contaminated water from cofferdams will help mitigate against these issues		No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 089	Ground Conditions and Contamination - Site Investigation and Mitigation for Leachates	08/12/2018 and 18/12/2018	Teleconferences with the EA and Natural England	It was noted that additional site investigation would be required prior to construction at the proposed landfall. Also, there are potential contamination issues associated with dewatering and discharge from the cofferdams.	EA and Natural England	Noted. The risk of leachate contamination is addressed in the ES.		The ES chapter assesses the maximum adverse scenario associated with the latest available landfall options. Mitigation measures for tankering and disposal off site of contaminated water from cofferdams will help mitigate against these issues		No	Yes

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW PANEL - Human Environment (including air quality/traffic/noise)

REF	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 001	Noise and Vibration - receptors near the coast	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	The SoS considers that further assessment will be required as to the potential effects at residential populations along the coast during each of the phases of the development (but particularly that associated with cable laying/ pulling and landfall activities close to the shoreline). In this respect, Paragraph 932 of the scoping report states that "vessel or cable laying noise would be indistinguishable from background". The SoS considers that there is insufficient information provided to justify this conclusion.	Secretary of State	Cable laying activities are closest to the shoreline at landfall. The noisiest activities associated with cable laying at landfall are the excavation works required to construct the cable route which are likely to be noisier than cable laying itself. The assessment of significant construction noise effects in section 10.11 considers these types of noise sources at landfall and will therefore identify the worst-case construction noise effects from activities close to the shoreline.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes
HUM 002	Noise and vibration - spatial scope	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	The scoping report states that the spatial scope of the construction noise assessment would be "400 m from the cable corridor routes where significant activities could affect noise sensitive receptors". The Environmental Statement (ES) should clearly set out what 'significant activities' would comprise, and should include for potential recreational users of Public Rights of Way (PRoW). The SoS expects further explanation and justification be provided in the ES to support the 400 m distance used for the assessment.	Secretary of State	Significant construction activities in the context of noise are described in section 10.11. A discussion supporting the scoping out noise effects on users of PRoW from the assessment provided in section 10.4. A justification for the 400 m scoping distance for construction noise is provided in Volume 5, Annex 10.2: Noise and Vibration Supporting Information.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes
HUM 003	Noise and vibration - significance of traffic noise	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	The scoping report states that traffic routes subject to "significant changes in traffic flows" would be included in the ES for assessment. The ES should explain how a 'significant change' has been determined in accordance with relevant guidance, with cross reference to the Traffic and transport Chapter where appropriate.	Secretary of State	Section 10.5 describes how the assessment has used the impact criteria described in the DMRB to assess the significance of changes in traffic flows. DMRB states "In terms of permanent impacts, a change of 1dB(A) in the short-term (e.g. when a project is opened) is the smallest that is considered perceptible." The assessment presented in this PEIR/ES is consistent with DMRB.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes

REF	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and)	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 004	Noise and vibration - construction noise	01/02/2017	Dover District Council Scoping Opinion	The scoping report does not set out information regarding the types of vehicles and plant to be used during the construction phase. This information should be included in the ES. Furthermore, the assessment should consider a 'worst case' for receptors, i.e. that it reflects the impact of vehicles and plant at the closest possible point between works and the receptors (including for any limits of deviation which may be sought).	DDC	Significant construction activities in the context of noise are described in section 10.11. Here the types of vehicles, plant and equipment to be used are described. Furthermore detailed information is also provided in Volume 5, Annex 10.2 – Noise and Vibration Supporting Information.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes
HUM 005	Noise and vibration - definition of significant effects	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	SoS recommends that the ES clearly defines what constitutes a 'significant' effect to enable the methodology for the assessment to be understood. Furthermore, there is no inclusion of other construction techniques which may lead to impacts from vibration such as Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). The SoS is of the view that the ES should consider all potential sources of vibration, particularly those in proximity to residential and other sensitive receptors.	Secretary of State	Section 10.4 sets out how significant effects have been assessed. All potential sources of vibration are also discussed in section 10.4.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes
HUM 006	Noise and vibration - turbine noise	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	The SoS is content that noise from turbines during operation be scoped out of the onshore noise and vibration assessment.	Secretary of State	n/a				No	Yes
HUM 007	Noise and vibration - vibration effects	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	SoS also notes that the Applicant wishes to scope out vibration from all aspects of the proposed development's operation onshore (although without further justification beyond Paragraph 937 of the scoping report). In the absence of information provided to substantiate this, the SoS does not agree this can be scoped out at this stage.	Secretary of State	Further evidence and discussion around the reasons for scoping out operational vibration from the assessment are provided in section 10.4.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes
HUM 008	Noise and vibration - cumulative effects	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	The potential for cumulative vibration effects of the proposed development and other infrastructure at the Richborough Energy Park should also be considered.	Secretary of State	A cumulative impact assessment is provided in section 10.14 which includes other projects currently under construction and those consented but not yet implemented.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes
HUM 009	Noise and vibration - cumulative effects	01/02/2017	Secretary of State Scoping Opinion	SoS recognises the proposed level of activity at the Richborough Energy Park and therefore does not agree that cumulative operational noise can be scoped out on the basis of the justification provided.	Secretary of State	A cumulative impact assessment is provided in section 10.14 which includes other projects currently under construction and those consented but not yet implemented.	None - evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.	Evidence set out in PEIR and subsequent ES.		No	Yes

REF	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 010	Air Quality - Area of Interest is adjacent to Air Quality Management Area	01/02/2017	Addressed in PEIR / ES	Comment stated "The Scoping Opinion states at Paragraph 691 that the proposed development's onshore Area of Interest (Aoi) is adjacent to an AQMA. The SoS expects to see due consideration of this as part of the EIA process."	SoS in Scoping Opinion	Comment addressed in the ES. The Aoi is discussed in sections 9.7 and 9.10-9.12.	Addressed in PEIR / ES	No further action.			Yes
HUM 011	Air Quality - Ecological receptors within 200 m of construction activities to be considered	01/02/2017	Addressed in PEIR / ES	Comment stated "SoS and Natural England (NE) raise the "need to consider designated nature conservation sites with dust sensitive ecological receptors within 200 m of construction activities (not 50 m as is proposed at Paragraph 692 of the Scoping Report)." The SoS recommends that the distances to be used in the study area are justified and agreed with Statutory Consultees".	SoS and Natural England (NE)	The designated nature conservation sites considered are detailed in sections 9.10-9.12 of the ES.	Addressed in PEIR / ES	No further action.			Yes
HUM 012	Air Quality - Contribution of traffic during the construction phase on pollutant concentrations within the AQMA should be considered. When assessing the air quality impacts from construction traffic on designated nature conservation sites sensitive to such impacts a distance of 200 m from relevant roads is appropriate. When assessing the potential air quality impacts of construction traffic on sensitive	01/02/2017	Addressed in PEIR./ ES	Paragraph 3.142 of the Scoping Opinion states the following: "The ES should also consider how traffic and transport to and from the proposed development (particularly during construction) would contribute to air quality levels in the AQMA. When assessing the air quality impacts from construction traffic on designated nature conservation sites sensitive to such impacts a distance of 200 m from relevant roads is appropriate. We would consider relevant roads to be those which meet one or more of the criteria set out in Volume 11, Section 3 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) guidance which include roads where: • Daily traffic flows will change by 1,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) or more. • HGV flows will change by 200 AADT or more. Furthermore, when assessing the potential air quality impacts of construction traffic on sensitive ecological receptors we would advise that both critical levels and critical loads of all relevant nitrifying and acidifying compounds are assessed. We would encourage the applicant to make use of data available from the UK Air Pollution Information System (APIS) website.	Natural England	The air quality impacts from construction traffic on designated nature conservation sites is considered in section 9.10 of the PEIR. A comment is included in PEIR that dispersion modelling to assess the impact of construction traffic would be considered in the ES if construction traffic figures exceed the IAQM criteria for proceeding to detailed assessment, as per standard guidance.	Addressed in PEIR / ES	The air quality impacts from construction traffic on designated nature conservation sites is considered in sections 9.10-9.12 of the ES.			Yes

REF	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 013	Air Quality - Consideration of baseline environment and details of a methodology to assess the potential impacts of dust and road traffic emissions	01/02/2017	Addressed in PEIR / ES	Paragraph 3.143 of the Scoping Opinion states the following: The Scoping Report does not provide any information regarding the need for surveys in order to characterise the baseline environment or otherwise inform the Air Quality Impact Assessment. The Scoping Report does not contain details of a methodology to assess the potential impacts of dust and road traffic emissions although the Secretary of State expects this to be considered.	SoS	The baseline environment is assessed in section 9.7. The methodology to assess the potential impacts of dust and road traffic is addressed in section 9.4.	Addressed in PEIR / ES	The baseline environment is assessed in section 9.7 of the ES as a desk-based study. The methodology to assess the potential impacts of dust and road traffic is addressed in section 9.4 of the ES.			Yes
HUM 014	Air Quality - Justify scoping out operational impacts through provision of traffic figures.	01/02/2017	Addressed in PEIR / ES	Paragraph 3.144 of the Scoping Opinion states the following: The Scoping Report proposes to scope out operational air quality. Paragraph 698 states that "impacts during the operation..... and maintenance activities will not lead to a significant change in vehicle flows within the study area". This conclusion is not justified through the provision of vehicle movement figures. These figures are also not present in the traffic and transportation chapter. However, the SoS considers that having had regard to the likely numbers of movements associated with this activity the conclusion is reasonable and therefore agrees that onshore operational air quality can be scoped out of the assessment.	SoS	Conclusion is justified through the provision of vehicle movement figures in Table 9.20 in the PEIR.	Addressed in PEIR / ES	Operational traffic flows are presented in the ES, section 9.11.			Yes
HUM 015	Air Quality - Preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan	01/02/2017	Addressed in PEIR / ES	Paragraph 3.145 of the Scoping Opinion states the following: The SoS welcomes the commitment to the preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan as part of the CoCP. The Applicant should ensure that drafts of these documents, demonstrating the minimum measures relied upon as mitigation, are submitted with the ES and appropriately secured.	SoS	As part of the PEIR chapter embedded mitigation measures are summarised in Table 9.14 and highly recommended mitigation measures during the construction phase are summarised in Table 9.25	Addressed in PEIR / ES	Embedded mitigation measures are summarised in the ES, Table 9.16. An AQMP will be produced with the principles that will form the basis of the AQMP being presented in the Code of Construction Practce.			Yes
HUM 016	Transport - Introduction - Scoping	23/03/2017	Email	Contact made at Kent County Council (KCC) to introduce, establish contacts for baseline data (traffic & accident) and to determine if Transport Assessment (TA) required.	Transport Amec Foster Wheeler (AFW)	Email contact provided for Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data. No count sites on roads requested	42821			Yes- email accident data address (HUM002)	Yes
HUM 017	Transport - Request for Accident Data	29/03/2017	Email	Email to request accident data within study area. Includes Sandwich Road, A256, A299. Map sent	Transport AFW						Yes

REF	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 018	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	04/04/2017	Email	Adrian Simms (AFW) emailed KCC to determine if a TA is required as part of DCO submission.	Transport AFW	£750.00 fee agreed to cover costs of pre app for scoping exercise	42831	James Wraight (KCC) confirmed cost via email			Yes
HUM 019	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	10/04/2017	Email	At request of KCC can pre-app fee be added by Planning Performance Agreement (PPA)	Transport AFW	April Newing confirmed pre-app is undertaken separately to PPA	42846			Adrian Simms (AFW) to raise PO	Yes
HUM 020	Transport - Introduction - Scoping	10/04/2017	Email	Introduction from AFW to Highways England (HE).	Transport AFW	Will contact HE again once construction traffic is known and distribution so that impact on strategic Road Network (SRN) can be determined					Yes
HUM 021	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	11/05/2017	Email	KCC confirmed PO had been provided for £750 Pre application advice and that AFW must complete a pre-app form.	KCC	Adrian Simms (AFW) to send completed pre-app form to Richard Smith		As to submit pre-app form to Richard Smith @ KCC		Yes	Yes
HUM 022	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	12/05/2017	Email	Completed Pre-app form to KCC- still to determine what level of assessment is required. Is a TA needed in addition to the ES chapter	Transport AFW	Awaiting response from KCC to determine if TA required	43230				Yes
HUM 023	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	19/05/2017	Email	Response from KCC. Confirm cable route options. Initially no need to undertake Transport Assessment but would recommend a Construction Traffic Management Plan	KCC			Adrian Simms (AFW) to respond		Yes - supply KCC with construction numbers and vehicle routing when available See HUM 094.	Yes
HUM 024	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	02/06/2017	Email	Response to KCC from Adrian Simms (AFW). AFW to supply KCC with traffic numbers when available.	Transport AFW					See HUM 094.	Yes
HUM 025	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	13/06/2017	Email	Adrian Simms (AFW) emailed KCC to confirm and clarify scope of PEIR, methods of assessment using GEART, receptor sensitivity, magnitude of effect and data collection.	Transport AFW	AFW ask KCC to confirm KCC happy with approach					Yes
HUM 026	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	21/06/2017	Email	KCC state that they can only comment with regard to onshore surveys assessing highways in relation to TA (TA was previously stated may not be needed). Some confusion here? Ask that more details are provided on traffic numbers to help understand impact on Load Road Network (LRN), SRN	KCC	AFW to provide traffic numbers, routes etc		Adrian Simms (AFW) to ask GoBe/VF for greater detail on traffic numbers.			Yes

REF	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 027	Air Quality- Introduction and agree assessment methodology	07/08/2017	Email with Fiona Runacre at DDC	Proposed methodology was sent. Received the following questions: •Question is raised as to the justification for the scoping out of this during the construction. Para 3.142 states that the “ES should consider how traffic and transport to and from the site (particularly during construction) would contribute to air quality levels in the AQMA”. It is noted that the AQMA is within the TDC boundary . •Para 3.166 of the Scoping opinion states that “the SOS considers that the assessment of potential disturbance to protected species should take account of impacts from air quality (inc dust)”. In view of this and the change to the red line boundary which is now shown to extend through the Country Park, NNR , there is a heightened expectation that the inter-relationships at all stages between ecology, traffic and transport and air quality is assessed. Table 3.9 details a summary of impacts relating to onshore ecology and includes all three stages of the project, which also reinforces the question as to why emissions from the construction phase has been scoped out. •It is expected that details of the number will be provided. •It is expected that the cumulative impact during the operational stage will be assessed.	Response received from Fiona Runacre 08/09/17	Comment included in PEIR that dispersion modelling to assess the impact of construction traffic would be considered in the ES if construction traffic figures exceed the IAQM criteria for proceeding to detailed assessment, as per standard guidance.	Email 08/09/17	Traffic and transport to and from the site during construction has been assessed in full following confirmation of traffic data. Traffic data confirms that traffic flows during operation will be below generally accepted criteria for scoping out, so have been scoped out from detailed assessment. Impacts on ecological receptors from dust and from construction traffic have been assessed. Impacts during operational stage are below IAQM scoping-out thresholds and are expected to be negligible, so cumulative effects have not been assessed.			Yes
HUM 028	Air Quality- Introduction and agree assessment methodology	07/08/2017	Email with Amanda Berry & Helen Johnson at TDC	Proposed methodology was sent. Received response that the assessment methodology and justification for scoping out air quality impacts is accepted as in accordance with appropriate guidance.	Response received from Helen Johnson 16/08/17	Assessment methodology and justification for scoping out air quality impacts is accepted as in accordance with appropriate guidance.	Email 16/08/17	No further action.			Yes
HUM 029	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	04/09/2017	Email	Adrian Simms (AFW) provided KCC with initial details on traffic numbers. Two-way movements, impacts on relevant highway links. Reiterated methodology, and asked, based on data supplied, if TA is needed.	Transport AFW	KCC to respond		Details of traffic numbers provided in the ES chapter			Yes
HUM 030	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	05/09/2017	Email	Adrian Simms (AFW) provided Highways England with initial details on traffic numbers. Two-way movements, impacts on relevant highway links. Reiterated methodology, and asked, based on data supplied, if TA is needed.	Transport AFW	Highways England to respond					Yes

REF	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required? (if yes create new issue reference & cross refer)	Action closed
HUM 031	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	20/09/2017	Email	KCC ask to confirm cable route option (previously provided). Requested further breakdown of movements. Hour, times of day, trips of offshore works?	KCC	Adrian Simms (AFW) to provide greater detail on trip movements. Hours etc				Yes - speak with Vattenfall	Yes
HUM 032	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	21/09/2017	email	HE respond - only concerned with SRN. Interested in home locations and shift patterns. No concerns for operation movements on SRN.	Highways England						Yes
HUM 033	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	29/09/2017	Email	Adrian Simms (AFW) responds. Confirms working hours, cable route options. Shift patterns unknown. Construction traffic will avoid Cliffsend. Con call with Vattenfall on 02 Oct 2017. More detail to be given within the PEIR	Transport AFW					Yes - con call Vattenfall October 2017	Yes
HUM 034	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	19/10/2017	Email	AS Provides HE with new trip movements as agreed with VF as of mid October	Transport AFW						Yes
HUM 035	Transport - Scoping - Pre application advice	30/10/2017	Email	HE acknowledges trips have increased. Only concerned with staff movement on SRN during construction. Asks for evidence of when staff with travel (outside peak hours). AS provides email to discuss abnormal loads.	Highways England	Adrian Simms (AFW) to clarify operation trips. 100 HGV per year not day.				Yes - provide travel times. Yes - provide AIL details when available (seek confirmation of AIL specification and detail from Vattenfall)	Yes

TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL - LVIA

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
LV01	Consultation with MMO	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Highlighted that the MMO have also undertaken a regional character assessment as part of the Marine Plans process which should be requested from the MMO local officer. KCC also highlighted that this should fill any gaps in the KCC plan study area.	KCC	Engagement with MMO confirmed that they are in the process of creating a seascape character assessment for the South East Marine Plan Area, but at present there are no confirmed dates for the publication, apart from the draft marine plan which is to be published in summer 2019, within which the Seascape Character Assessment will sit.	1st EP Meeting	Consult with MMO	N/A	No	Yes
LV02	Viewpoints	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Confirmed that a viewpoint at Birchington, Greenham Bay (Viewpoint 15) was acceptable providing it was on the headland, and that the viewpoint suggested in the Scoping Opinion at Minnis Bay was therefore not required if Viewpoint 15 is included.	TDC	A viewpoint from Birchington (Viewpoint 15 – Figure 12.41) on the headland at Grenham Bay has been included in the SLVIA.	1st EP Meeting	Inclusion of viewpoint	N/A	No	Yes
LV03	Viewpoints	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	A viewpoint at Western Esplanade in Broadstairs (Dumpton Gap) was also suggested.	TDC	A viewpoint from Broadstairs, Dumpton Gap, has been included in the SLVIA (Viewpoint 17 – Figure 12.43).	1st EP Meeting	Inclusion of viewpoint	N/A	No	Yes
LV04	Landscape character	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Confirmed that the Thanet District Landscape Character Assessment was currently at draft stage and was likely to be going to members over the coming weeks. TDC took an action to update on this and provide a copy of the Thanet Landscape Character Assessment when available.	TDC	TDC provided a draft copy of the Thanet Landscape Character Assessment (2017) prior to publication of the PEIR. The Thanet District LCA has now been published (TDC, 2017).	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV05	Methodology	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Requested clarification if landscape and visual effects would be a key consideration in identifying the offshore WTG locations/ layout.	DDC	The worst-case seascape, landscape and visual effects have been assessed in the SLVIA.	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV06	Visualisations	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Requested that hard copies of the visualisations would be provided as they are much clearer than having to review on pdf/ screen.	DDC	Hard copies of the visualisations are provided in the photomontages in ES Volume 4, Figures 5.27 – 5.55.	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
LV07	Viewpoints	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Identified that Dover as an area has the North Downs dropping down into Sandwich Bay, with relevant viewpoint locations just above the coastal plain; and areas further inland where the Downs rise up may also be suitable locations for viewpoints. Identified 'dry valleys' in this area, which have 'framed views' aligned to the north-east towards the sea, potentially in proximity to the AONB.	DDC	Viewpoints agreed with stakeholders presented in Table 12.10 include viewpoint locations that reflect these characteristics of the Dover landscape, including viewpoints in Sandwich Bay (Viewpoints 8 and 18); locations above the coastal plan (Viewpoint 19 – Betteshanger Country Park); and from the more elevated arising rising towards the Kent Downs (Viewpoint 21 – Chillenden Mill and Viewpoint 22 – North Downs Way).	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV08	Viewpoints	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Identified Betteshanger Country Park (atop former colliery spoil mound) would also be a suitable viewpoint, with good elevation representing a view over the coastal plain.	DDC	A viewpoint from Betteshanger Country Park has been included in the SLVIA (Viewpoint 19 – Figure 12.45).	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV09	Viewpoints	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Suggested inclusion of a viewpoint on the English Coastal Path north of Sandwich Bay Estate, agreed as being appropriate near the golf course club house.	DDC	A viewpoint from the England Coast Path, further north than Sandwich Bay Estate, has been included in the SLVIA - Viewpoint 18 (Figure 12.44).	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV10	Viewpoints	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Viewpoint also suggested at St Peter's Church in Sandwich (at the top of the tower) due to large numbers of visitors; and also at Dover Castle Keep, and South Foreland Lighthouse.	DDC	Viewpoints from St Peter's Church in Sandwich (Viewpoint 20 – Figure 12.46), Dover Castle (Viewpoint 24 – Figure 12.50) and South Foreland Lighthouse (Viewpoint 23 – Figure 12.49) have been included in the SLVIA.	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV11	Viewpoints	28/03/2017	1st EP meeting	Suggested it may be appropriate to consider Goodwin Sands as a viewpoint due to it being a visited location, although it was agreed that this could be addressed with a wireline visualisation rather than photomontage.	DDC	A wireline visualisation has been included as an illustrative viewpoint from Goodwin Sands (Viewpoint 25 – Figure 5.55).	1st EP Meeting	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
LV12	Viewpoints	25/04/2017	Correspondence	Welcomed the proposed addition of a viewpoint from the North Downs Way in the Kent Downs AONB and considers the chosen site near Woolage Village to be an appropriate location.	Kent Downs AONB Unit	A viewpoint from the edge of the Kent Downs AONB on the Kent Downs Way, near Woolage Village, has been included in the SLVIA (Viewpoint 22 – Figure 12.48).	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV13	Methodology	30/05/2017	Correspondence	Confirmed that Kent Downs AONB Unit is happy with the proposed approach regarding the Rochdale Envelope parameters for the OWF layout that is assessed in the SLVIA.	Kent Downs AONB Unit	The SLVIA Rochdale envelope parameters are described in Section 12.8 of this SLVIA.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV14	Baseline information	05/06/2018	Correspondence	Confirmation that the new Thanet District Landscape Character Assessment will be available as a confidential draft on 9 June 2017, but that it is not yet adopted and the information contained should not be shared publicly until it is adopted, with the expectation that it would be adopted before ES submission.	Kent Downs AONB Unit	The final draft has been published and is available at: https://www.thanet.gov.uk/your-services/planning-policy/evidence-base/environment-and-quality-of-life/	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV15	Viewpoints	25/04/2017	Correspondence	Confirmation that the viewpoints for the SLVIA (issued to take account of comments from the Evidence Plan meeting on 28/03/2017) cover the viewpoints discussed.	DDC	Viewpoints agreed with stakeholders as part of Evidence Plan consultations are presented in Table 12.10 of this SLVIA.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV16	Consultation	31/05/2017	Correspondence	Confirmation that ECC wish to be actively engaged with this NSIP project. Given the nature of landscape and visual matters, which stretch to Clacton-on-sea in north Essex, recommended active engagement directly with the respective Essex coastal authorities within the two-tier area of Essex (from Rochford DC in the south to Tendring DC in the north) as well as Southend on Sea Borough Council and ECC.	EEC	Formal engagement with district councils (Rochford, Maldring and Tendring) within Essex County undertaken in June 2017. No comments were received at this stage.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
LV17	Viewpoints	02/06/2017	Correspondence	Viewpoints suggested do not include any views due west of the scheme from Swale e.g. the view from Reculver may be quite different from the view from Leysdown-on-sea/ Warden (notwithstanding the additional distance), due to the influence of landform (e.g. around Margate) on views. The view from East Sheppey (of significantly taller WTGs than those existing) would be uninterrupted.	Swale Borough Council	A wireline view from an illustrative viewpoint in Leysdown-on-sea, on the Isle of Sheppey (Viewpoint 26) has been included in the ES Volume 4, Figure 5.52.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV18	Consultation	13/06/2017	Correspondence	Highlighted the visibility and landscape character/ designation issues relevant to Swale Borough. Suggested further assessment of the OWF is undertaken from the eastern side of the Isle of Sheppey from Leysdown-on-sea and the area near the Dunkirk-Dargate road. Acknowledged likelihood that once this has been done, effects on Swale will be scoped out of the detailed assessment. Highlighted the cumulative impact of the arrays off the north coast of Kent – including Kentish Flats, London Array and the existing TOWF and the changing character of the seascape/ landscape. Suggested that the additional cumulative impact of the Offshore WTG Array in views out to sea from eastern Sheppey is considered. Agreed that Swale Borough Council would be included in the SLVIA Topic Group and will be updated at the next phase of the assessment.	Swale Borough Council	Preliminary assessment of landscape and visual receptors in Swale has been undertaken in Section 12.11 and 12.12 of this SLVIA. Effects on receptors in Swale Borough have largely been scoped out of the detailed assessment as not significant, due to the long distance and limited visibility of the Offshore WTG Array. A detailed assessment of the visual effects from Leysdown-on-Sea is provided in section 12.12 and as shown at Viewpoint 26.12.12).	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV19	Methodology	15/06/2017	Correspondence	Welcomed the circulation of the worst-case scenario OWF layout information. Noted the content of the document and understanding that this may be subject to change as the project progresses.	TDC	The SLVIA Rochdale envelope parameters are described in Section 12.8 of this SLVIA.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
LV20	ZTV	20/06/2017	Correspondence	Provided comments relating to the potential visual impact of the Offshore WTG Array on Shepway, using the ZTV provided. Making the assumption that the ZTV is based on topography and does not include vegetation, which makes a significant difference to views and visibility, the visual effect will lessen in reality with the screening offered by trees and vegetation. Clear visibility conditions that allow long distance views (over 42 km) are also rare. It is considered unlikely that there will be any points in the Shepway district from which the blades will be visible. The ZTV shows that the Offshore WTG Array will not be visible from the Shepway coastline, which is a product of the location of the wind farm and the line of the coast. It is not considered necessary that any additional viewpoints are required for interior locations within Shepway.	Swale Borough Council	Further to comments provided by Shepway District Council, the seascape, landscape and visual effects of the Offshore WTG Array on receptors within Shepway District have been scoped out of the assessment.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV21	Consulation	05/07/2017	Correspondence	Raised the need for formal engagement directly with the Essex coastal district authorities as the appropriate neighbouring Local Planning Authorities. The following Essex authorities (from South to North) were identified as being specifically affected - Rochford District Council, Maldon District Council and Tendring District Council.	EEC	Formal engagement with district councils (Rochford, Maldring and Tendring) within Essex County undertaken in June 2017. No comments were received at this stage.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes

Ref	Issue	Date raised	Consultation / correspondence / meeting Ref.	Notes / detail	Specific Stakeholder raising issue	Action / Agreed way forward (short description of activities and	Dates/meeting/correspondence at which action agreed)	Detail of action taken (short description including document references and dates submitted to RP	RP Comment	Further action required?	Action closed
LV22	Conclusions	05/07/2017	Correspondence	Thanet Extension appears not to have a significant impact and it is unlikely that views from the Essex coast will be affected by this development.	EEC	The seascape, landscape and visual effects of the Offshore WTG Array on receptors within Essex were scoped out of the PEIR assessment further to the ZTV analysis, preliminary assessment undertaken in the SLVIA and comments provided by Essex County Council.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV23	Viewpoints	05/07/2017	Correspondence	There remains the requirement to assess the views from the areas identified within the study area that falls within the county of Essex, to the west and north of the project and these should be included in the SLVIA report. There will also be the need to have regard to the cumulative landscape and visual impacts, given the existing OWFs.	EEC	Further written assessment is provided addressing effects on the Essex coastline in Section 12.12 in this SLVIA Chapter of the ES. Additional viewpoints at Foulness Point, Dengie Marshes and Clacton-on-sea are included in the ES with wirelines visualisations from these viewpoints shown in Figures 12.53, 12.54 and 12.55.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes
LV24	Consultation	05/07/2017	Correspondence	Formal engagement with district councils (Rochford, Maldring and Tendring) within Essex County undertaken in July 2017. No comments were received at this stage.	Rochford, Maldon and Tendring District Councils	VWPL endeavoured to engage further and formally.	Correspondence	No further information required.	N/A	No	Yes