



THE PLANNING ACT 2008

THE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES  
2010

**Thanet Extension Offshore Windfarm**

Planning Inspector Reference: EN010084

**Natural England's Answers to the Examining Authority's Third Round of Written Questions.**

28<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Question No.	Qs To:	Question	NE Response
3.0	<b>General and Cross-topic Questions</b>		
	No relevant questions for NE.		
3.1	<b>Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment (including HRA)</b>		
3.1.2.	Natural England	<p><b>Site Integrity Plan: Security</b></p> <p>In para. 13.1 of [REP5-064], Natural England states that the commitments to mitigation methods described in section 4 of the SIP “should be secured in the DCO/DML to ensure they are enforceable”. This is presented as a condition of Natural England’s agreement with the Applicant’s HRA conclusions in relation to the harbour porpoise feature of the Southern North Sea SAC.</p> <p>a) Could Natural England please confirm whether or not it considers the dDCO/DMLs, as drafted [REP5-019], provide adequate security for the mitigation commitments of the SIP?</p> <p>b) If not, please outline fully the changes sought to the dDCO/DMLs.</p>	<p>Natural England welcomes the commitment to the mitigation measures outlined in the SIP. These measures are presented as a range of options which will be considered when the SIP is revisited and implemented if deemed necessary at that time. Natural England is content with this approach however, we are not able to conclude no AEoI on the SNS SAC in-combination for Thanet Extension until there is a mechanism in place to manage a range of SIPs from different projects. We would however, be content to conclude no AEoI on the SNS SAC in-combination for Thanet Extension at this time if the seasonal restriction were secured in its own right on the face of the DCO. Natural England have suggested this approach to the Applicant, but we believe they do not wish to proceed with it. Therefore our advice remains</p>

			that we are unable to conclude no AEoI on the SNS SAC in-combination from Thanet Extension at this time.
3.1.4	The Applicant and Natural England	<p><b>Goodwin Sands Proposed Marine Conservation Zone (pMCZ)</b></p> <p>The SoCG with Natural England [REP5-076] identifies a number of areas that are not yet agreed in relation to the assessment of impacts on the Goodwin Sands pMCZ. In addition, section 4 of [REP5-064] sets out some specific requests for inclusion in the MCZ assessment. The notes within the SoCG indicate that actions agreed at a meeting on 2 May 19 may be capable of bringing the Applicant and Natural England to agreement, but full details of those actions have not been provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) At Deadline 6, could the parties please provide an updated position on agreement with regards to the pMCZ.</li> <li>b) If disagreement remains on any matters pertaining to the protection of the pMCZ at that stage, please provide a statement, agreed by both parties, setting out the remaining areas of disagreement and the extent to which resolution is being sought within the timescales of the examination.</li> <li>c) A concluding statement should be provided at Deadline 7.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) An updated position has been provided within the SoCG submitted at Deadline 6.</li> <li>b) As the SoCG highlights at Deadline 6, many of the disagreements have now been resolved. However, there a few positions that are currently still under discussion. Natural England and the Applicant have both provided commentary on these points within the SoCG, highlighting a proposed way forward.</li> <li>c) Natural England acknowledge this.</li> </ul>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Construction</b>		
	No relevant questions for NE.		
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and other Land or Rights Considerations</b>		
	No relevant questions for NE.		

<b>2.4</b>	<b>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>
	No relevant questions for NE.
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Debris, Waste and Contamination</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue.
<b>2.6</b>	<b>Electric and Magnetic Fields</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue at this time.
<b>2.7</b>	<b>Electricity Connections and Other Utility Infrastructure</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue.
<b>2.8</b>	<b>Environmental Statement General</b>
	No relevant questions for NE.
<b>2.9</b>	<b>Fishing and Fisheries</b>
	No relevant questions for NE.
<b>2.10</b>	<b>Historic Environment</b>
	No relevant questions for NE.

<b>2.11</b>	<b>Marine and Coastal Physical Processes</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue at this time.
<b>2.12</b>	<b>Navigation: Maritime and Air</b>
	No relevant questions for NE.
<b>2.13</b>	<b>Noise and other Public Health Effects</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue at this time.
<b>2.14</b>	<b>Other Strategic Projects and Proposals</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue .
<b>2.15</b>	<b>Socio-Economic Effects</b>
	No relevant questions for NE.
<b>2.16</b>	<b>Townscape, Landscape, Seascape and Visual</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue.
<b>2.17</b>	<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue at this time.

<b>2.18</b>	<b>Water Environment</b>
	The ExA has no questions to raise in relation to this issue at this time.