

From: [Sammy Mullan](#)
To: [Kate Mignano](#); [Thanet Extension](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm - Deadline 1 Submission - Email 9
Date: 15 January 2019 21:43:25
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[D1_Appendix3_TEOW_SoCG_DDC_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix4_TEOW_SoCG_EA_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix5_TEOW_SoCG_ESL_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix6_TEOW_SoCG_HighwaysEngland_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix7_TEOW_SoCG_HE_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix8_TEOW_SoCG_KCC_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix9_TEOW_SoCG_IFCA_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix10_TEOW_SoCG_KWT_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix11_TEOW_SoCG_MCA_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix12_TEOW_SoCG_MMO_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix13_TEOW_SoCG_NationalTrust_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix14_TEOW_SoCG_NEOOrnithology_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix15_TEOW_SoCG_NETechnicalTopics_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix16_TEOW_SoCG_PortofLondon.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix17_TEOW_SoCF_RSP_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix18_TEOW_SoCG_RSPB_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix19_TEOW_SoCG_RYA_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix20_TEOW_SoCG_TFA_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix21_TEOW_SoCG_TDC_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix22_TEOW_SoCG_THLS_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix23_TEOW_SoCG_S&N_CoS_RevA.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix24_TEOW_SoCG_PoT_LG_Rev2.pdf](#)
[D1_Appendix33_TEOW_SoCG_Tracking_RevA.pdf](#)

Dear Kate,

Please find the yellow shaded documents, in the table below, attached to this email. These should be considered part of the Applicant's Deadline 1 Submission for Thanet Extension. Those shaded in green have been sent to PINS and will show the progress of the Applicant's submission to PINS throughout the email correspondence.

Kind Regards,
Sammy

Document Id No.	Document Name	Sent To PINS?
D1_1	Responses to Relevant Representations	Yes
D1_1A	Responses to Relevant Representations (Annexes A to G)	Yes
D1_2	Applicant's Summary of Relevant Representations	Yes
D1_3	Statement of Common Ground – Dover District Council (DDC)	Yes
D1_4	Statement of Common Ground – Environment Agency	Yes
D1_5	Statement of Common Ground – Estuary Services Limited	Yes
D1_6	Statement of Common Ground – Highways England (HE)	Yes
D1_7	Statement of Common Ground – Historic England	Yes
D1_8	Statement of Common Ground – Kent County Council	Yes
D1_9	Statement of Common Ground – Kent & Essex Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authority	Yes
D1_10	Statement of Common Ground – Kent Wildlife Trust	Yes
D1_11	Statement of Common Ground – Maritime & Coastguard Agency (MCA)	Yes
D1_12	Statement of Common Ground – Marine Management Organisation	Yes
D1_13	Statement of Common Ground – National Trust	Yes
D1_14	Statement of Common Ground – Natural England Offshore Ornithology	Yes
D1_15	Statement of Common Ground – Natural England Technical Topics (excluding Offshore Ornithology, Saltmarsh, and Site Selection)	Yes
D1_16	Statement of Common Ground – Port of London Authority	Yes
D1_17	Statement of Common Ground – Riveroak Strategic Partners Limited (RSP)	Yes
D1_18	Statement of Common Ground – Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Yes
D1_19	Statement of Common Ground – Royal Yachting Association	Yes
D1_20	Statement of Common Ground - Thanet Fishermen's Association	Yes
D1_21	Statement of Common Ground – Thanet District Council (TDC)	Yes
D1_22	Statement of Common Ground – Trinity House Lighthouse Service (THLS)	Yes
D1_23	Statement of Common Ground – Chamber of Shipping	Yes
D1_24	Statement of Common Ground – Port of Tilbury and London Gateway	Yes
D1_25	Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions – EXQ1	No

D1_25A	Figures related to designated sites for ease of reference	No
D1_25B	Natural England letter	No
D1_25C	ExQ1.3.5 Crown Land and Consent	No
D1_25D	ExQ1.3.6 Schedule of CA and TP Objections	No
D1_25E	ExQ1.3.7 PA2008 s127 Statutory Undertakers Land_Rights V1	No
D1_25F	ExQ1.3.8 PA2008 s138 Statutory Undertakers Apparatus V1	No
D1_25G	Vessel Traffic Analysis Plots -Dipping, anchoring and inshore route by draught, length and type	No
D1_25H	Gate Analysis Foxtrot	No
D1_25I	Consultation Matrix	No
D1_25J	Consultation Minutes and Correspondence	No
D1_25K	Pilot Transfer Bridge Simulation – Inception Report	No
D1_25L	Pilot Transfer Track Plots	No
D1_25M	Supplementary ExAQ 1.12.1	No
D1_25N	Supplementary ExAQ 1.12.3	No
D1_25O	Supplementary ExAQ 1.12.4	No
D1_25P	Supplementary ExAQ NRA	No
D1_25Q	Re-presented Hazard Log	No
D1_26	Response to ExA Action Points arising from Preliminary Meeting (Annexes A & B)	Yes
D1_27	Response to ExA Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 1	Yes
D1_28	Response to ExA Action Points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 2	No
D1_28A	Nautical Chart	No
D1_28B	NE Spit Searoom	No
D1_28C	safety zone figure(s)	No
D1_28D	Minutes with MCA from October 2018	No
D1_29	Preliminary Meeting Oral Summary	Yes
D1_30	Appendix 30 to Deadline 1: Written Summary of Vattenfall's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Annexes	Yes
D1_31	Appendix 31 to Deadline 1: Written Summary of Vattenfall's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing 2 and Annexes	Yes
D1_32	Draft Itinerary for Accompanied Site Inspections	Yes
D1_33	Request for Statements of Common Ground and Statement of Commonality	Yes
D1_34	Guide to the Application	No
D1_35	Revised Draft Development Consent Order	Yes
D1_35A	Revised Draft Development Consent Order - Tracked Changes	Yes
D1_35B	Log of Changes to the Draft Development Consent Order	Yes
D1_36	Statement of Reasons	Yes
D1_37	Book of Reference (Parts 1-5)	Yes
D1_38A	Land Plan (Offshore)	Yes
D1_38B	Land Plan (Onshore)	Yes
D1_38C	Special Category Land Plans	Yes
D1_38D	Works Plan (Offshore)	Yes
D1_38E	Works Plan (Offshore): RLB Comparison	Yes
D1_38F	Works Plans (Onshore)	Yes
D1_38G	Works Plan (Onshore) - Key Plan (Comparison)	Yes
D1_38H	Crown Land Plans	Yes
D1_39	Offshore Archaeology Draft Written Scheme of Investigation	Yes
D1_40	Onshore Archaeology Draft Written Scheme of Investigation	Yes
D1_41	Shipping and Navigation: Schedule of Mitigation	Yes
D1_42	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan	Yes
D1_43	Biogenic Reef Mitigation Plan	Yes
D1_44	Geophysical Investigation Report 3 of 3 - Geophysical Site Survey	Yes
N/A	Letter to PINS - Overarching D1	Yes
D1_45	Removal of Landfall Option 2	Yes
N/A	Nemo Link development consent and Environmental Statement documents for inclusion in the Examination Library	Yes

Sammy Mullan

Consultant



Mob: +44 (0) 7538 816585

Tel: +44 (0) 1626 323890

Fax: +44 (0) 1626 333264

Web: www.gobeconsultants.com

Address: 34 Devon Square, Newton Abbot, TQ12 2HH

The information contained in this email is intended only for the use of the intended recipient at the email address. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender and ask for the sender and then delete it immediately from your system.

Please note that neither GoBe Consultants Ltd nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan attachments (if any).

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm

Appendix 33 to Deadline 1 Submission: Requests for Statements of Common Ground and Statement of Commonality

Relevant Examination Deadline: 1

Submitted by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Date: January 2019

Revision A

Drafted By:	GoBe Consultants Ltd
Approved By:	Daniel Bates
Date of Approval:	January 2019
Revision:	A

Revision A	Original Document submitted to the Examining Authority
N/A	
N/A	
N/A	

Copyright © 2019 Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd
All pre-existing rights retained

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Statements of Common Ground.....	5
2.2	A – Natural environment and HRA.....	5
	Environment Agency.....	6
	Natural England	6
	Marine Management Organisation	6
	National Trust	6
	Kent Wildlife Trust	7
	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds.....	7
	Relevant local authorities	7
	Relevant overseas authorities (taken to be France as the only party of relevance).....	7
2.3	B – Access, highways and transportation effects	8
2.4	C – Other consequential onshore effects	8
2.5	D – Air Navigation.....	8
2.6	E – Ports, shipping and commercial sea navigation.....	9
2.7	F – Recreational sea use.....	10
2.8	G – Fishing and fisheries.....	10
2.9	H – Historic environment	11
2.10	I – Recreational use of the foreshore	11
2.11	J – Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment	12
2.12	K – Energy undertakers.....	13
2.13	L – Military affairs	14
3	Current status of SoCGs	15
4	Statement of Commonality.....	19
4.2	Site Selection and Alternatives	19
4.3	Ornithology (displacement buffer) matters.....	20
4.4	Adequacy of (Offshore) Project Description transcription	20
4.5	Shipping and Navigation matters.....	20

1 Introduction

- 1 Annex E (Agenda for the Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1): Procedural decisions made by the Examining Authority (ExA) Rule 6 letter (PINS Ref PD-006) notes at item 1 that the ExA requests that at Deadline 1 the Applicant provides it with a tracking list of a number of documents which include Statements of Common Ground and commercial side agreements.
- 2 This note specifically provides reference to the Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) requested, , notes for the benefit of the ExA where and why an SoCG has not been entered into (either for a given topic or with a stakeholder more broadly), and provides an update of the status of the SoCGs.
- 3 Section 3 provides a summary of the status of the SoCGs presented within the body of this document. Section 4 then presents a Statement of Commonality, identifying those themes of shared or common interest that developed through consideration of the relevant representations, and in turn Statements of Common Ground.

2 Statements of Common Ground

- 4 The following subsections present each category or topic area identified by the ExA for consideration within SoCGs. The approach taken by the Applicant in drafting SoCGs has been to, where possible, draft a single SoCG that captures all topics of interest or relevance. For ease of audit against the ExA SoCG request list the structure presented here however reflects topic areas, with a given relevant party appearing in each subsection.
- 5 Each section identifies the overarching topic area, the parties that the ExA has requested a SoCG to be drafted with, and as noted previously identifies any stakeholders or topic areas that have not been included when drafting SoCGs.

2.2 A – Natural environment and HRA

- 6 The ExA, in their Rule 8 letter dated 18th December 2018, requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- Environment Agency;
 - Natural England;
 - Marine Management Organisation;
 - National Trust;
 - Kent Wildlife Trust;
 - Royal Society for the Protection of Birds;
 - Relevant local authorities; and
 - Relevant overseas authorities (taken to be France as the only party of relevance).
- 7 The ExA, under the overarching title of Natural Environment and HRA, requested the following topics be included within the SoCGs:
- The adequacy of base data, impact assessment methodologies, construction, operational and decommissioning effects on or in respect of:
 - marine sediment characterisation, turbidity and water quality;
 - coastal processes;
 - marine fish stocks;
 - shellfish stocks;

- marine mammals;
- marine and terrestrial bird species, including the calculation of prospective bird strike mortality effects;
- the relevance of impacts in individual European Sites;
- the adequacy of specific assessments of impact on individual European Sites and the qualifying features / species contained in those sites;
- the need for and adequacy of particular approaches to impact mitigation and the mechanism for securing any mitigation through the draft DCO or Marine Licence;

Environment Agency

8 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with the Environment Agency on all topics, except for:

- characterisation/assessment - marine mammals; due to marine mammals being outwith the EA's remit; and
- characterisation/assessment - marine and terrestrial bird species; due to ornithology being outwith the EA's remit; and
- impacts to European sites; due to European sites being generally outwith the EA's remit, however relevant habitats and species that may form features of European designated sites are captured within the SoCG.

Natural England

9 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with Natural England on all matters identified under this topic area.

Marine Management Organisation

10 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with the MMO on all matters under this topic area.

National Trust

11 The Applicant considers that National Trust are not an appropriate party to seek a SoCG on the topic. During the development of the Project it is understood that National Trust have deferred to Kent Wildlife Trust on these matters. National Trust have not indicated to the Applicant that this approach has changed, and their relevant representation does not make reference to these matters. The Applicant has sought a SoCG with National Trust to clarify this position and their comments on recreational use of the foreshore as requested under (I).

Kent Wildlife Trust

12 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with Kent Wildlife Trust on all topics.

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

13 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with RSPB on topics of relevance to them, the exceptions being (due to falling outwith their area of interest):

- characterisation/assessment - marine sediment characterisation;
- characterisation/assessment - coastal processes;
- characterisation/assessment - marine fish stocks;
- characterisation/assessment - shellfish stocks;
- characterisation/assessment - marine mammals;

14 It should be noted that RSPB have informed the Applicant that due to limited resources they do not wish to be engaged further during the examination phase of this project. The Applicant has confirmed as of January 2019 that for the remaining matters for consideration identified within their relevant representation RSPB will defer to Natural England.

Relevant local authorities

15 The Applicant has drafted SoCGs with the relevant authorities (Dover District Council (DDC), Thanet District Council (TDC), and Kent County Council (KCC) as appropriate with the following exceptions (due to these not being technical areas of interest to the local authorities, and the local authorities therefore deferring to other relevant stakeholders (such as MMO)):

- characterisation/assessment - marine sediment characterisation; and
- characterisation/assessment - coastal processes.

Relevant overseas authorities (taken to be France as the only party of relevance)

16 The Applicant at the current time has not sought a SoCG from French Authorities. Following submission of the information requested by the ExA within the Action list for Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1), and any further feedback received from the French Authorities the Applicant will develop a SoCG as required.

2.3 B – Access, highways and transportation effects

- 17 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- Relevant local authorities;
- 18 On the following matters:
- the adequacy of access, highway, other transport provision for construction, maintenance and decommissioning
- 19 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with the relevant local authorities (KCC, TDC, DDC) which includes reference to these matters.
- 20 The Applicant has agreed a SoCG with Highways England in addition to seeking a SoCG with the relevant local highway authority (KCC).

2.4 C – Other consequential onshore effects

- 21 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter (PINS Ref: [likely to be PD-008 but currently not in the examination library]) requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- Relevant local authorities
- 22 On the following matters in relation to other onshore effects:
- Economic effects of the Project;
- 23 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with the relevant local authorities (KCC, TDC, DDC) which includes reference to these matters.

2.5 D – Air Navigation

- 24 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- River Oak Strategic Partners; and
 - And any other Interested/Statutory Party responsible for airport, airfield, air navigation or aviation services.
- 25 On the following matters in relation to air navigation:
- the degree to which air navigation and the integrity of navigation systems have been or can be adequately protected by the project;

- the need for and adequacy of particular approaches to impact mitigation;
 - effects on the proposed Manston Airport;
 - effects on any other relevant airport;
- 26 The Applicant has sought a SoCG with River Oak Strategic Partners.
- 27 To date there has been no response from the Civil Aviation Authority either during Section 42 consultation or at the relevant representations. Following the Preliminary Meeting the CAA have been contacted again regarding a SoCG. No response has been received to date.
- 28 The Applicant has engaged with NATS en route plc and received confirmation that the turbine array as submitted will not interfere with their operations. Evidence of this correspondence is submitted at Annex 1 of the document.

2.6 E – Ports, shipping and commercial sea navigation

- 29 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- Port Authorities and Operators;
 - UK Chamber of Shipping and Shipping Interests;
 - The MMO;
 - Trinity House;
 - The Maritime and Coastguard Agency;
 - Pilotage
 - Port of Tilbury London Ltd;
 - London Gateway Ltd; and
 - Any other interested/Statutory Party/ Other Person responsible for maritime navigation, safety and shipping services.
- 30 On the following matters in relation to ports, shipping and commercial sea navigation:
- the degree to which the operational needs of commercial ports and harbours have been adequately protected by the project;
 - the degree to which shipping channels, access to navigable rivers and canal navigations, anchorages, navigational aids and systems at sea have been adequately protected by the project;

- the effect of the project on commercial shipping movements during construction, operation and decommissioning;

31 The Applicant has sought SoCGs with the listed parties on all matters identified.

2.7 F – Recreational sea use

32 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:

- MMO;
- Trinity House;
- MCA;
- Any other Interested /Statutory Party.

33 On the following matters:

- the degree to which the needs of recreational sea use has been adequately protected by the project;
- the need for and adequacy of any particular approaches to impact mitigation;

34 To the extent that is has been assessed in the NRA and the ES, the Applicant is engaging with MCA and Trinity House regarding recreational sea use. The Applicant has consulted with the Royal Yachting Association at Section 42 and Section 56; no response was received. Prior to this RYA were also consulted as part of the Navigational Risk Assessment (PINS Ref APP-089 Application ref 6.4.10.1) with responses captured in Table 8 of that document noting concerns that have been considered within the assessment.

35 Notwithstanding this a draft SoCG has been submitted to the RYA in December 2018, with no response received to date.

2.8 G – Fishing and fisheries

36 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:

37 MMO;

38 Interested/Statutory Parties involved in fishing

39 The Applicant is seeking a SoCG with the Thanet Fishermen’s Association in addition to MMO.

2.9 H – Historic environment

- 40 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- Historic England;
 - English Heritage;
 - Relevant local authorities;
 - MMO;
 - Any other Interested/Statutory Party involved in the historic environment or archaeology;
- 41 On the following matters:
- the adequacy of base data, impact assessment methodologies, construction, operational and decommissioning effects on the historic marine environment;
 - the adequacy of base data, impact assessment methodologies, construction, operational and decommissioning effects on the setting of terrestrial heritage assets; and
 - the need for and adequacy of particular approaches to impact mitigation.
- 42 As confirmed at the Preliminary Meeting the Applicant has not consulted with English Heritage as the Project will not directly impact any property owned or managed by EH. The Applicant is seeking an SoCG with Historic England as the statutory body for heritage protection and this will cover any indirect effects on setting of all heritage assets including those managed by EH.
- 43 The Applicant has also included reference to the historic environment within the SoCG with the MMO and relevant local authorities (KCC, TDC, DDC).
- 44 There are no other Interested/Statutory Parties of relevance to consider with regards potential effects on the historic environment or archaeology.

2.10 I – Recreational use of the foreshore

- 36 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter (PINS Ref: [likely to be PD-008 but currently not in the examination library]) requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- National Trust;
 - Kent Wildlife Trust;
 - Relevant local authorities; and

- Any other Interested/Statutory Party involved in the management of Pegwell Bay and other foreshore areas.
- 45 On the following matters:
- the adequacy of base data, impact assessment methodologies, construction, operational and decommissioning effects on the foreshore and Country Park;
 - the need for and adequacy of particular approaches to impact mitigation.
- 46 The Applicant has included reference to the recreational use of the foreshore in the draft SoCGs with National Trust, KWT and relevant local authorities (KCC, TDC, DDC) on the matters identified.
- 47 There are no other Interested or Statutory Parties considered to be relevant to recreational use of the foreshore, though it is noted that other parties are represented on the Pegwell Bay steering group (the management authority for the National Nature Reserve). These parties are represented in other SoCGs with reference to their areas of direct expertise or interest – e.g. Natural England, RSPB, and Kent and Essex IFCA.

2.11 J – Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment

- 48 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- Relevant local authorities;
 - Natural England;
 - Historic England; and
 - Relevant representatives of Overseas Public Authorities.
- 49 On the following matters:
- Agreed approaches to seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment (SLVIA); and
 - The adequacy of mitigation.
- 50 The Applicant has included reference to SLVIA within the SoCGs with Historic England and the relevant local authorities (KCC, DDC, TDC).

- 51 The Applicant has not sought to include reference to SLVIA within the SoCG with Natural England as the project does not interact with any Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Reference to the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (PINS Ref: APP-142/ Application Ref: 8.7), which includes reference to management of onshore visual impacts (in addition to ecological matters) is however included within the SoCG with Natural England.
- 52 As discussed at the first Issue Specific Hearing (ISH1) the Applicant has not sought an SoCG with overseas public authorities, as there have to date been no representations received from overseas authorities on this matter. Should representations be received from overseas authorities the Applicant will draft an SoCG as appropriate.

2.12 K – Energy undertakers

- 53 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter requested that SoCGs be drafted with the following stakeholders:
- National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET);
 - National Grid Gas (NGG);
 - Nemo Link; and
 - Any other Interested/Statutory Party involved in energy transmission or distribution.
- 54 On the following matters:
- Effects of the proposed development on transmission and distribution infrastructure.
- 55 The Applicant is in ongoing discussions on crossing and proximity agreements with NGET, Nemolink, Thanet OFTO and UKPN and will provide an update on these as part of the tracker requested by the ExA for deadline 1. The Applicant expects to reach agreement with all of these parties prior to the end of examination. As such it is not currently intended to enter into SoCGs with these undertakers as the progress and expected agreement of commercial agreements and protective provisions will demonstrate the position of these stakeholders. NGG do not have any apparatus in proximity to the project and have not been approached.
- 56 There are no other Interested or Statutory Parties of relevance.

2.13 L – Military affairs

- 57 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter noted that the Ministry of Defence (MoD) does not object to the proposed development. The ExA further noted that in the context set by multiple Relevant Representations raising concerns about civil/ merchant shipping a statement of common ground could valuably be prepared to include:
- a review of actions necessary and agreed to safeguard military shipping;
 - consideration of actions (if any) necessary and agreed to safeguard military aviation;
- 58 The Applicant consulted with the Ministry of Defence at Section 42 to which the MoD responded stating the application should undertake UXO surveys prior to intrusive works. The relevant representation from the MoD confirms no objection on aviation matters. The MoD has therefore been consulted and has responded twice without raising any concerns regarding military shipping. However, as noted at the Preliminary Meeting the Applicant has sought to confirmation from the MoD regarding their position on military shipping and aviation.

3 Current status of SoCGs

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status
Chamber of Shipping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation 	draft received from CoS 150119
Dover District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> natural environment and HRA access/highways/transport Other consequential onshore effects Historic Environment SLVIA 	Sent on 02/11/18. Revised draft received and discussed with DDC 140119
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	Sent on 01/11/18. Response received 10 th December requesting clarification on regulator position (asking Applicant to include it). Revised draft received 150119
Highways England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access/highways/transport 	Signed copy received.
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment SLVIA 	Sent on 12/11/18. Revised draft received 150119
Kent County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> natural environment and HRA access/highways/transport Other consequential onshore effects Historic Environment Recreational use of the foreshore SLVIA 	Sent on 14/11/18. Revised draft received 121218
Kent IFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	Sent on 12/11/18. Receipt of written representation 150119

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status
Kent Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	Issued 181218, draft received 070119
MCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation Recreational boat use 	Sent on 09/11/18. No response received to date beyond confirmation that matters will be discussed at the ISH2 and following WRs
MMO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation Recreational boat use Fishing and Fisheries Historic Environment 	Sent on 27/11/18. revised draft received 100119
National Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	Draft issued 141218, revised draft received
Natural England - Ornith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	Sent on 16/11/18. Draft received following discussions and revisions 140119
Natural England - SS&A		To be confirmed following removal of landfall Option 2
Natural England - Topics		Sent on 16/11/18. Draft received following discussions and revisions 140119

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status
Port of London Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation 	Sent on 08/11/18. No response received to date.
River Oak Strategic Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air navigation 	Sent on 06/12/18. No response received to date.
RSPB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA 	Sent on 10/12/18. Response received notifying that RSPB no longer engaging in project. Understood to have been sent to PINS January 2019
RYA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational boat use 	Sent on 14/12/19
TFA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing and Fisheries 	Sent on 19/11/18. Advanced draft received 140119
Thanet District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • natural environment and HRA • access/highways/transport • Other consequential onshore effects • Historic Environment • SLVIA 	Sent on 16/11/18. Revised draft received 140119
THLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation • Recreational boat use 	Sent on 09/11/18. No response received to date beyond confirmation that matters will be discussed at

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status
		the ISH2 and following WRs
French Authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA • Fishing and Fisheries • SLVIA 	under consideration following Deadline 1.
Port of Tilbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation 	Issued for consideration on the 21/12/18, 1 st draft included at Deadline 1 subject to further discussion of received 'marked up pdf'
London Gateway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation 	Issued for consideration on the 21/12/18, 1 st draft included at Deadline 1 subject to further discussion of received 'marked up pdf'
MoD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military affairs 	Contacted on 4/1/19, receipt acknowledged and awaiting response.

4 Statement of Commonality

59 The following section describes the common themes or areas of commonality that have arisen through review of the relevant representations received.

4.2 Site Selection and Alternatives

60 An evident theme is the position on site selection and alternatives, in particular with reference to concerns raised with regards Landfall Option 2 and the potential for permanent loss of saltmarsh habitat. This theme is shared by:

- Natural England;
- Environment Agency;
- Kent Wildlife Trust;
- MMO;
- Kent and Essex IFCA;
- Local Authorities (KCC, DDC, and TDC)

61 In light of the concern raised, and as a result of further detailed design analysis as presented in Appendix 45 of this Deadline 1 submission detailing the removal of landfall Option 2, the Applicant has decided to withdraw Landfall Option 2 from the design envelope for the proposed project.

62 As noted within Appendix 45 this decision has been made in the absence of primary site investigation data. As such the Applicant is relying on the existing geotechnical data which provides details of the expected composition and stratigraphy of the landfill. There is an acknowledged risk to the project of uncovering more hazardous material which requires a more costly and lengthy process to remove and dispose of correctly, however given the concerns raised by stakeholders, particularly in respect of the permanent loss of saltmarsh, it is considered appropriate and necessary to make this decision at this time.

63 It should be noted that the site investigations proposed by the project are, in effect, pre-construction surveys that were being brought forward pre-consent to inform the design process. It is entirely common for projects to progress through to consent in the absence of full site investigation, including in areas of contaminated land where a risk-based approach is taken and suitable controls and mitigation identified.

4.3 Ornithology (displacement buffer) matters

64 An additional evident theme is the position on the displacement buffers applied by the Applicant when considering displacement of ornithological receptors as a result of the installation of the offshore infrastructure. This theme is shared by:

- Natural England;
- MMO; and
- RSPB

65 These matters have been the subject of additional clarification notes submitted by the Applicant to Natural England for consultation. Revised versions of these documents are submitted with the wider Deadline 1 submissions.

4.4 Adequacy of (Offshore) Project Description transcription

66 A further evident theme is the position on project description transcription within the offshore ES chapters, the draft DCO, and other supporting documents such as the disposal site characterisation and MCZ assessment. This theme is shared by:

- Natural England; and
- MMO;

67 These matters have been the subject of clarification and audit notes which have been drafted to provide a clear audit of the offshore Project Description parameters and the worst cases assessed. These documents are submitted with the wider Deadline 1 submissions at Annex B and B to Appendix 1.

4.5 Shipping and Navigation matters

68 An additional evident theme is the position on the findings of the NRA, specifically on the conclusion of the acceptability of the Order Limits presented within the NRA and associated ES chapter. This theme is shared by:

- MCA;
- Trinity House;
- Port of London Authority;
- London Gateway;
- Port of Tilbury;
- Estuary Services Limited;
- Chamber of Shipping; and

- London Pilots Association.

69 These matters have been the subject of additional clarification notes and ExA questions, responses to which are submitted by the Applicant with the wider Deadline 1 submissions.