

Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm

Appendix 18 to Deadline 5 Submission: Requests for Statements of Common Ground and Statement of Commonality

Relevant Examination Deadline: 5

Submitted by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Date: April 2019

Revision C

Drafted By:	GoBe Consultants Ltd
Approved By:	Daniel Bates
Date of Approval:	April 2019
Revision:	C

Revision A	Original Document submitted to the Examining Authority
Revision B	Revised document submitted to the Examining Authority
Revision C	Revised document submitted to the Examining Authority
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).....	8
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	12
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.....	24
4.1	Site Selection and Alternatives	24
4.2	Ornithology (displacement buffer) matters.....	24
4.3	Adequacy of (Offshore) Project Description transcription	25
4.4	Shipping and Navigation matters.....	25

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 (SoCG) and commercial side agreements.
- 2 The ExA Rule 8 letter requested that an updated tracking lists and SoCG were to be submitted as part of the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submission. This note supersedes and provides an updated status from the revision previously submitted in Deadlines 1 and 3.
- 3 This note specifically provides reference to the SoCG requested and 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.
- 4 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 SoCG.

2 Statements of Common Ground

- 5 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.
- 6 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

- 7 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).
- 8 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; and

- 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; and
- 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

- 9 The Applicant has drafted a SoCG with the Environment Agency on all topics, except for:
- Characterisation/assessment - marine mammals; due to marine mammals being outwith the EA's remit;
 - 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

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

Marine Management Organisation

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

National Trust

- 12 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

- 13 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with Kent Wildlife Trust on all requested topics. At the time of writing (April 2019) the Applicant has not received Kent Wildlife Trust's position on the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (PINS Ref REP2-018 and REP2-019).

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

- 14 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; and
 - Characterisation/assessment - marine mammals.
- 15 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.
- 16 The RSPB submitted a letter to ExA on 21st January 2019 reaffirming that they did not wish to be engaged further in the examination phase of this project. Therefore, a SoCG has not been progressed further with RSPB by the Applicant.

Relevant local authorities

- 17 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)

18 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

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

- Relevant local authorities.

20 On the following matters:

- The adequacy of access, highway, other transport provision for construction, maintenance and decommissioning.

21 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with the relevant local authorities (KCC, TDC, DDC) which includes reference to these matters.

22 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

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

- Relevant local authorities.

24 On the following matters in relation to other onshore effects:

- Economic effects of the Project.

25 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

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

- River Oak Strategic Partners; and

- Any other Interested/Statutory Party responsible for airport, airfield, air navigation or aviation services.
- 27 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; and
 - Effects on any other relevant airport.
- 28 The Applicant has sought a SoCG with River Oak Strategic Partners.
- 29 To date there has been no response from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) 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.
- 30 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 A of the document.

2.6 E – Ports, shipping and commercial sea navigation

- 31 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.
- 32 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; and
- The effect of the project on commercial shipping movements during construction, operation and decommissioning.

33 The Applicant has sought SoCGs with the listed parties on all matters identified and continues to work with the listed parties following ISH8. The Applicant will present progressed and final SoCGs at Deadline 6.

2.7 F – Recreational sea use

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

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

35 On the following matters:

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

36 To the extent that is has been assessed in the Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) (and NRA Addendum (NRAA)) and the Environment Statement (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 NRA (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. A final SoCG with the RYA, noting all matters agreed, was submitted in Deadline 3 by the Applicant.

2.8 G – Fishing and fisheries

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

- MMO; and
- Interested/Statutory Parties involved in fishing.

38 The Applicant is seeking a SoCG with the Thanet Fishermen's Association (TFA) and the Kent and Essex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (Kent and Essex IFCA) in addition to MMO.

2.9 H – Historic environment

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

- Historic England;
- English Heritage;
- Relevant local authorities;
- MMO; and
- Any other Interested/Statutory Party involved in the historic environment or archaeology.

40 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.

41 As confirmed at the Preliminary Meeting the Applicant has not consulted with English Heritage (EH) 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 the current draft covers any indirect effects on setting of all heritage assets including those managed by EH. An updated SoCG is provided in Appendix 35 of the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submission (see section 3).

42 The Applicant has also included reference to the historic environment within the SoCG with the MMO and relevant local authorities (KCC, TDC and DDC).

43 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

- 44 The ExA in their Rule 8 letter 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; and
 - 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 KCC. Other relevant local authorities (TDC and DDC) are final SoCGs submitted at Deadlines 3 and 4 respectively.
- 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 and 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 REP1-069 which supersedes APP-142/ Application Ref 8.7) 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, Nemo Link, Thanet OFTO and UKPN and will provide an update on these as part of the tracker requested by the ExA at each Deadline (excluding Deadlines 4B and 4C). 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; and
 - Consideration of actions (if any) necessary and agreed to safeguard military aviation.
- 58 The Applicant consulted with the MoD 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.
- 59 The Applicant have submitted a letter received from the MoD as Appendix 31 of the Applicant's Deadline 3 Submission (PINS Ref REP3-046) confirming that a SoCG with MoD regarding military shipping and war graves is not required.

3 Current status of SoCGs

The following table identifies the current status of all SoCGs. It should be noted that *the SoCG regarding matters of shipping and navigation are on hold. However, a workshop was held on 27th February 2019, as per the action arising from ISH 5, with the aim of reaching agreement on basic methodological approaches and assumptions to be applied. A secondary workshop was held on 29th March 2019, with a follow up teleconference on 2nd April, to seek to agree hazard scores to be used within the NRA Addendum. The Applicant will be seeking final SoCG regarding shipping and navigation matters for submission to Deadline 6.

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
Chamber of Shipping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation 	Draft received from CoS 150119. Revision A submitted in Deadline 1. Further matters being discussed.	A (on hold*)
Dover District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA Access/highways/transport Other consequential onshore effects Historic Environment SLVIA 	Revision A submitted in Deadline 1. Revised document sent to DDC on 150219. All matters agreed, signed version was submitted at Deadline 3.	B (Final)
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	Revision A submitted in Deadline 1. Revised document sent and discussed with the EA on 120219. Agreed version returned on 050319. A final document was submitted as Appendix 18 of the Applicant's Deadline 3 Submission (PINS Ref REP3-036).	B (Final)
Highways England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access/highways/transport 	Signed copy received and submitted at Deadline 1 (PINS Ref REP1-019).	A (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Environment • SLVIA 	<p>Following discussions with Historic England and the Applicant good progress has been made on both the onshore and offshore aspects of the SoCG. A revised draft of the SoCG has been submitted by the Applicant as Appendix 35 to the Deadline 5 Submission. The HE team has reviewed all relevant documents submitted to the examination process by the Applicant, including the onshore and offshore WSIs and the addendum to the historic environment ES chapter. A final version of this SoCG will be submitted in Deadline 6.</p>	C
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 	<p>A revised version of the SoCG was sent to KCC on 26 February and returned on 15 March. This was revised and returned to KCC on 12 April. The Applicant has held a teleconference (25 April) with KCC to discuss the outstanding matters with their technical experts. These are primarily access in the country park, waste and contaminated land and the onshore WSI. A revised draft of the SoCG has been submitted by the Applicant as Appendix 36 to the Deadline 5 Submission which demonstrates good progress made by both parties. It is</p>	C

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		<p>anticipated that agreement will be reached on the outstanding matters and a final version of this SoCG will be submitted in Deadline 6.</p>	
Kent IFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	<p>A revised draft of the SoCG has been submitted by the Applicant as Appendix 33 to the Deadline 5 Submission. There remain limited items under discussion in terms of designated sites. Full agreement has been reached on the fish and shellfish ecology assessment and commercial fisheries assessment.</p>	C
Kent Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	<p>Revised draft issued on 250219. Revised draft received on 010319 and was submitted in the Applicant's Deadline 3 Submission at Appendix 22. Two teleconferences with KWT were held (10 April and 26 April) and the SoCG document was progressed by both parties in preparation and during the calls. Areas of the SoCG are anticipated to be disagreed in the final version to be submitted in Deadline 6, these are primarily in relation to site selection and alternatives.</p>	B
MCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation Recreational boat use 	<p>Sent on 09/11/18. A final version of this SoCG will be submitted in Deadline 6.</p>	A (on hold*)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
MMO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation • Recreational boat use • Fishing and Fisheries • Historic Environment 	<p>Revision A submitted in Deadline 1. Revised draft submitted on 110219. Revised received 270319 and submitted as Appendix 23 to the Deadline 3 submission. Three teleconferences with MMO were held (5 April, 12 April and 26 April) and the SoCG document was progressed by both parties in preparation and during the calls. A revised draft of the SoCG has been submitted by the Applicant as Appendix 34 to the Deadline 5 Submission which presents the progress made by both parties. Aspects of the drafting of the DCO and the fish and shellfish assessment are the primary areas under discussion. A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.</p>	C
National Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA 	<p>Revision A submitted in Deadline 1. Revised draft sent on 180219. A revised draft was received on 26/02/19 and was included at Appendix 24 of the Applicant's Deadline 3 Submission. The Applicant has sought to arrange discussions with the National Trust to progress the document however this has not taken place due to availability. The</p>	B

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		Applicant has been in discussions with the National Trust regarding land issues which are being discussed outwith the SOCG process. A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.	
Natural England - Ornithology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	Revision A was submitted in Deadline 1. Revised draft was sent on 12019 and discussed and returned on 010319 A revised SoCG accompanies the Deadline 3 and 4 Submissions. The Applicant is seeking a meeting with Natural England in the week commencing 29 April 2019 to provide an updated SoCG to the panel, as a late Deadline 5 Submission, to provide the latest positions on HRA matters prior to the finalisation of the REIS as agreed in ISH8.	C
Natural England - SS&A		Original draft sent on 120219. A revised draft was received on 250219, discussed on the 040319 and a revised SoCG accompanies the Deadline 3 submission. The Applicant and Natural England held a discussion with the aim to progress this SoCG. A revised version was returned to Natural England on 8 April. The Applicant has held a subsequent teleconference	A

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		with Natural England to discuss HRA matters. A revised draft of the SoCG has been submitted by the Applicant as Appendix 37 to the Deadline 5 Submission.	
Natural England - Topics		Revision A was submitted in Deadline 1. Revised draft was sent on 12019 and returned on 250219, discussed on the 040319 and a revised SoCG accompanies the Deadline 3 submission. The Applicant and Natural England held a discussion with the aim to progress this SoCG. A revised version was returned to Natural England on 8 April. The Applicant is seeking a meeting with Natural England in the week commencing 29 April 2019 to provide an updated SoCG to the panel, as a late Deadline 5 Submission, to provide the latest positions on HRA matters to the ExA prior to the finalisation of the REIS as agreed in ISH8.	B
Port of London Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation 	Sent on 08/11/18. PLA submitted revised draft as part of their Deadline 2 Submission. A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.	A (on hold*)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
River Oak Strategic Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air navigation 	Response received on 14/01/19. Revised draft was sent on 14/01/19, no confirmation on final position received to date. The Applicant and River Oak Strategic Partners have been in discussion regarding both developments throughout the examination process. A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.	A
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 as per the letter sent to PINS 21 st January 2019 (PINS Ref REP1-150).	A
RYA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreational boat use 	Revised version received on 21/1/19 and a final agreed SoCG was included at Appendix 28 of the Applicant's Deadline 3 submission (PINS Ref REP3-044).	C (Final)
TFA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing and Fisheries 	Sent on 19/11/18. Advanced draft received 14/01/19. A revised copy was provided to TFA, following ISH8, on 25 April. The Fisheries Co-Existence Liaison Plan was revised and provided to TFA on 24 April. A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.	B
Thanet District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA Access/highways/transport 	Revision A was submitted in Deadline 1. Revised draft sent 15/02/19 and returned	B (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other consequential onshore effects • Historic Environment • SLVIA 	on 260219 and a final agreed SoCG was included at Appendix 30 of the Applicant's Deadline 3 submission (PINS Ref REP3-045).	
THLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation • Recreational boat use 	A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.	A (on hold*)
French Authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA • Fishing and Fisheries • SLVIA 	No further response has been received	N/A
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'. Response received on 150119. A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.	A (on hold*)
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'. Response received on 150119. A final version of the SoCG will be submitted by the Applicant as a submission to Deadline 6.	A (on hold*)
MoD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military affairs 	Contacted on 4/1/19, receipt acknowledged. Letter received on 150219 confirming no intention of	N/A

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		entering into a SoCG as submitted in Deadline 3 by the Applicant	

4 Statement of Commonality

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

4.1 Site Selection and Alternatives

61 An evident theme, in Deadline 1, was 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 was shared by:

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

62 Following the Applicant's removal of Option 2 from the project envelope the concerns regarding permanent loss have been withdrawn. Agreement on the site selection and alternatives has been reached with the majority of parties following the design change, with the exception of Kent Wildlife Trust and the National Trust.

4.2 Ornithology (displacement buffer) matters

63 An additional evident theme, in Deadline 1, was 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.

64 These matters have been the subject of additional clarification notes submitted by the Applicant to Natural England for consultation. Revised versions of these documents were submitted with the wider Deadlines 1, 2, and 3 submissions.

65 It has been agreed with Natural England that either parties' methods and effects of parameters used make no material difference to the overall conclusions. Therefore, this is no longer a theme of disagreement.

4.3 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. The audit is provided in Annex D of the DCO Explanatory Memorandum (Appendix 31 of the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submission) as final. Subject to further discussion with regards the project description parameters to be secured on the face of the DCO/dML(s) the adequacy of the Project Description is no longer considered to be a theme of disagreement.

4.4 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, NRA Addendum 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, with a workshop held on the 27th February to aid in better defining the available searoom. A hazard workshop was held with the IPs on 29th March at which initial hazards were discussed and risked scored in collaboration with the IPs. A follow up teleconference was held with the same parties on 2nd April. The Applicant will seek to engage with each of these stakeholders and submit final SoCG outlining final positions by Deadline 6.

4.5 In-combination effects from the disposal of material

70 The potential for in-combination effects resulting from the dredging and disposal of material, in proximity to designated sites (namely Thanet Coast SAC and MCZ and the Goodwin Sands pMCZ). This theme is shared by

- Natural England;
- KE IFCA; and
- Kent Wildlife Trust.

71 Following a request from the Natural England the Applicant has submitted a consolidation of all of the submissions made by the Applicant on this theme. This consolidation of material is submitted as Appendix 32 (and associated annexes) to the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submission. This submission is intended to resolve this outstanding issue with Natural England (and other IPs).

Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm

Annex A to Appendix 18 to Deadline 5
Submission: NATS Correspondence

Relevant Examination Deadline: 5

Submitted by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Date: April 2019

Revision A

Drafted By:	Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd
Approved By:	Daniel Bates
Date of Approval:	April 2019
Revision:	A

Revision A	Original document submitted to the Examining Authority

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

Bates Daniel (WO-MC)

From: WRIGHT, Darren T [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 May 2018 13:04
To: Bates Daniel (WO-MC)
Cc: Stewart Heald; NATSwindfarms
Subject: RE: Thanet Offshore Wind Farm Extension

Good Afternoon Daniel,

Thank you very much for providing this information, based on the information attached to your email I can confirm there is no predicted impact to NERL infrastructure. If you require any additional information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Darren



Darren Wright
AAU Business Support Specialist

[REDACTED]
4000 Parkway, Whiteley,
Fareham, Hants PO15 7FL
www.nats.co.uk

From: daniel.bates@[REDACTED]
Sent: 03 April 2018 16:06
To: WRIGHT, Darren T
Subject: RE: Thanet Offshore Wind Farm Extension

Dear Darren,

Apologies for the delay in our response to your message which has been passed on to myself. Please find below coordinates for Thanet Extension. The maximum tip height of the turbines above HAT will be 250m.

S/N	ETRS89 UTM31N		ETRS89	
	Easting(m)	Northing(m)	Latitude(Decimal Degrees)	Longitude (Decimal Degrees)
1	396836	5700269	51.44420	1.51553
2	400383	5703129	51.47055	1.56575
3	409461	5703143	51.47219	1.69641
4	411417	5700866	51.45204	1.72513
5	408963	5692782	51.37898	1.69191

6	402697	5693447	51.38391	1.60172
7	404541	5695508	51.40275	1.62765
8	408717	5695226	51.40091	1.68774
9	408771	5697839	51.42441	1.68784
10	405193	5701957	51.46084	1.63529
11	402821	5702004	51.46086	1.60115
12	400585	5700061	51.44301	1.56952

Please let me know if you require any further information or once you have confirmed the outcome of your assessment of the project's impact on NATS radar.

Kind regards
Dan

Daniel Bates
Consents Manager – Thanet Extension

Offshore Wind Consenting

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

www.vattenfall.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: WRIGHT, Darren T [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2018 2:59 PM
To: Daugherty Alison (WN-MU) [REDACTED]
Cc: NATSwindfarms [REDACTED]
Subject: Thanet Offshore Wind Farm Extension

Good Afternoon Alison,

I have been passed your details by Wendy Robson who works with me on the Windfarm Renewables Team, would it be possible please to get the co-ordinates and expected Turbine heights please so we can confirm your statement 582 from the "Report to Inform Scoping" that "It is anticipated that Thanet Extension would also avoid any impact on these {Radar} operations." as per the Link below please for our Safeguarding Team. If you require any additional information from me please do not hesitate to contact me.

<http://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/energy-minerals-and-infrastructure/notices/offshore-wind/>

Kind Regards

Darren



Darren Wright
AAU Business Support Specialist

[REDACTED]

If you are not the intended recipient, please notify our Help Desk at Email Information.Solutions@nats.co.uk immediately. You should not copy or use this email or attachment(s) for any purpose nor disclose their contents to any other person.

NATS computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system.

Please note that neither NATS nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses or any losses caused as a result of viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

NATS means NATS (En Route) plc (company number: 4129273), NATS (Services) Ltd (company number 4129270), NATSNAV Ltd (company number: 4164590) or NATS Ltd (company number 3155567) or NATS Holdings Ltd (company number 4138218). All companies are registered in England and their registered office is at 4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire, PO15 7FL.

We have recently changed the registered offices of a number of our companies. The following are now registered at 1 Tudor Street, London, EC4Y 0AH:
Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd, Border Wind Ltd, Border Wind Farms Ltd, BW Ops Ltd, Clashindarroch Wind Farm Ltd, Eclipse Energy UK Ltd,
Eclipse Energy Company Ltd, Kentish Flats Ltd, Ormonde Energy Ltd, Ormonde Energy Holdings Ltd, Ormonde Project Company Ltd, Thanet Offshore