

Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm

Appendix 7 to Deadline 7 Submission: Requests
for Statements of Common Ground and Statement
of Commonality

Relevant Examination Deadline: 7

Submitted by Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

Date: June 2019

Revision E

Drafted By:	GoBe Consultants Ltd
Approved By:	Daniel Bates
Date of Approval:	June 2019
Revision:	E

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
Revision D	Revised document submitted to the Examining Authority
Revision E	Revised document submitted to the Examining Authority

Copyright © 2019 Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd

All pre-existing rights retained

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Statements of Common Ground.....	5
2.1	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
2.2	B – Access, highways and transportation effects	8
2.3	C – Other consequential onshore effects	8
2.4	G – Fishing and fisheries.....	8
2.5	H – Historic environment	9
2.6	I – Recreational use of the foreshore.....	10
2.7	J – Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment.....	10
2.8	K – Energy undertakers	11
2.9	L – Military affairs.....	12
3	Current status of SoCGs	13
4	Statement of Commonality.....	21
4.1	Site Selection and Alternatives	21
4.2	Ornithology (displacement buffer) matters.....	21
4.3	Adequacy of (Offshore) Project Description transcription	22
4.4	Marine Conservation Zone Assessments	22
4.5	Potential effects for fish species	23

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 7 Submission. This note supersedes and provides an updated status from the revision previously submitted in Deadlines 1, 3, 5 and 6.
- 3 This note specifically provides and update on the SoCG entered into with Interested Parties (IPs) with Non-Shipping and Navigational interests and provides an updated summary of matters under discussion or disagreement. This note should be read in conjunction with Appendix 21 of the Applicant's Deadline 7 Submission which provides a statement of commonality on Shipping and Navigational matters.
- 4 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.
- 5 Section 3 provides a summary of the status of the SoCGs presented within the body of this document. Section 4 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

- 6 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.
- 7 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.

2.1 A – Natural environment and HRA

- 8 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).
- 9 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

- 10 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

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

Marine Management Organisation

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

National Trust

- 13 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

- 14 The Applicant has drafted an SoCG with Kent Wildlife Trust (KWT) on all requested topics with the exception of:
- HRA; and
 - Water Quality.
- 15 It was requested by KWT requested for the Water Quality section to be removed from their SoCG as they have chosen to defer to the Environment Agency on this matter.
- 16 In addition, KWT also requested that the HRA section to be removed from their SoCG as they have deferred to Natural England on this matter.

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

- 17 The Applicant 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.
- 18 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.
- 19 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

- 20 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)

21 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.

2.2 B – Access, highways and transportation effects

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

- Relevant local authorities.

23 On the following matters:

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

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

25 The Applicant has agreed a SoCG with Highways England in addition to seeking a SoCG with the relevant local highway authority (KCC).

2.3 C – Other consequential onshore effects

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

- Relevant local authorities.

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

- Economic effects of the Project.

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

2.4 G – Fishing and fisheries

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

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

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

2.5 H – Historic environment

31 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.

32 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.

33 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 has agreed a 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. The final SoCG was provided in Appendix 6 of the Applicant's Deadline 6 Submission (see section 3).

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

35 There are no other Interested/Statutory Parties of relevance to consider with regards potential effects on the historic environment or archaeology.

2.6 I – Recreational use of the foreshore

- 36 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.
- 37 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.
- 38 The Applicant has included reference to the recreational use of the foreshore in the final SoCGs with National Trust, KWT, KCC, TDC and DDC.
- 39 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.

2.7 J – Seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment

- 40 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.
- 41 On the following matters:
- Agreed approaches to seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment (SLVIA); and
 - The adequacy of mitigation.

- 42 The Applicant has included reference to SLVIA within the SoCGs with Historic England and the relevant local authorities (KCC, DDC and TDC).
- 43 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.
- 44 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.

2.8 K – Energy undertakers

- 45 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.
- 46 On the following matters:
- Effects of the proposed development on transmission and distribution infrastructure.
- 47 The Applicant has been in discussions on crossing and proximity agreements with NGET, Nemo Link, Southern Water and UKPN and has reached agreement with those parties. Nemo Link have confirmed in writing that they withdraw their representation, the remaining parties are expected to withdraw any relevant representations prior to the close of examination. The Applicant can confirm that negotiations with Southern Water were completed on 6 June 2019, and Southern Water have withdrawn their objection to the Order. The Applicant is in positive ongoing discussions with Thanet OFTO with a view to concluding a similar agreement and will provide an update on these as part of the tracker requested by the ExA at each Deadline (excluding Deadlines 4B, 4C and 8). The Applicant expects to reach agreement with all of the Thanet OFTO. As such it is not currently intended to enter into a SoCG with them. NGG do not have any apparatus in proximity to the project and have not been approached.

48 A SoCG has been entered into with Ramac Holdings Ltd and was submitted as a working draft as Appendix 47 to the Applicant's Deadline 6 Submission.

49 There are no other Interested or Statutory Parties of relevance.

2.9 L – Military affairs

50 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.

51 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.

52 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.

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
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 	A signed copy received and was submitted at Deadline 1 (PINS Ref REP1-019) with all matters agreed.	A (Final)
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Environment SLVIA 	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 of this SoCG was submitted as Appendix 6 to	C (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission. Agreement was reached on all matters.	
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 at the time. Following Deadline 5 additional clarifications have been provided by the Applicant. The Applicant has sought to update the onshore WSI in line with the requested changes from KCC’s advisory. A revised draft of the SoCG was submitted by the Applicant as Appendix 8 to the Deadline 6 Submission. Agreement has been reached on all matters.</p>	D (Final)
Kent IFCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA 	<p>Full agreement has been reached on the fish and shellfish ecology assessment, designated sites and commercial fisheries assessment. The final SoCG was submitted as Appendix 7 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission.</p>	D (Final)
Kent Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA 	<p>Previous drafts of the SoCG have been submitted in Deadlines 1 and 3 which have provided progress updates on the</p>	C (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		<p>level of agreement between the parties. The Applicant and KWT held a teleconference on 10th April, 17th April and 7th May to agree on final positions across the matters under discussion. As anticipated, and stated previously, the SoCG includes areas of disagreement including but not limited to site selection and ecological monitoring requirements. The final SoCG was submitted as Appendix 9 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission.</p>	
MMO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA • Port, shipping, commercial sea navigation (addressed in Appendix 2 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission) • Recreational boat use • Fishing and Fisheries • Historic Environment 	<p>Previous drafts of the SoCG have been submitted in Deadlines 1, 3 and 5 which have provided progress updates on the level of agreement between the parties. Following the submission of the SoCG in Deadline 5, a teleconference with MMO was held (15th May) and the SoCG document was progressed by both parties in preparation and during the call. In addition, numerous emails have been exchanged to discuss and seek to progress the disagreement over the fish and shellfish assessment. Aspects of the drafting of the DCO and the fish and shellfish assessment are the primary areas under discussion. The final SoCG</p>	D (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		<p>was submitted as Appendix 11 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission. Annex A to Appendix 11 (of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission) presents a tracker of the full dialogue held between the parties throughout the examination phase.</p> <p>Following the submission of the final SoCG the parties have been in discussion (via email correspondence) to seek to reach agreement on the fish ecology matters outstanding – see section 4</p>	
National Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural environment and HRA 	<p>Revision A submitted in Deadline 1. Revised draft sent on 18/02/19. 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 Applicant has been in discussions with the National Trust regarding land issues which are being discussed generally outwith the SOCG process. The final SoCG was submitted as Appendix 13 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission.</p>	C (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		The parties have not reached agreement on all matters.	
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 and Natural England held a meeting 2 nd May to discuss the latest position on the HRA and MCZ assessments. The SoCG was submitted as a late Deadline 5 Submission. Following discussions with Natural England on 22 nd May the SoCG was updated with the final positions of both parties. The final SoCG was submitted as Appendix 14 of the Applicant's Deadline 6 Submission.	E (Final)
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 with Natural England to discuss HRA	C (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		<p>matters. A revised draft of the SoCG has been submitted by the Applicant as Appendix 37 to the Deadline 5 Submission. An updated copy of the SoCG was submitted as a late Deadline 5 Submission. Following discussions with Natural England on 22nd May the SoCG was updated with the final positions of both parties. The final SoCG was submitted as Appendix 14 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission. Agreement has been reached on all matters.</p>	
Natural England – Topics		<p>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 and Natural England held a meeting 2nd May to discuss the latest position on the HRA and MCZ assessments. The SoCG was submitted as a late Deadline 5 Submission. Following discussions with Natural England on 22nd May the SoCG</p>	D (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		<p>was updated with the final positions of both parties. The final SoCG was submitted as Appendix 15 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission.</p> <p>Following the submission of the final SoCG the parties have been in discussion (via email correspondence and teleconference(s)) to seek to reach agreement on the outstanding concerns regarding Goodwin Sands MCZ – see section 4.</p>	
Ramac	Not Applicable	<p>The final SoCG is submitted as Appendix 47 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission.</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing to discuss agreements with Ramac Holding Ltd, more information is provided in Appendix 11 of the Applicant’s Deadline 7 Submission.</p>	A (Final)
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 (Final)
TFA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing and Fisheries 	Sent on 19/11/18. Advanced draft received 140119. A revised copy was provided to TFA, following ISH8, on 25	C (Final)

Stakeholder	Relevant Topics	Status	Current Revision
		<p>April. The Fisheries Co-Existence Liaison Plan was revised and provided to TFA on 24 April. A working draft of the SoCG was submitted as Appendix 20 of the Applicant’s Deadline 6 Submission. A final revision is submitted as Appendix 20 of the Applicant’s Deadline 7 Submission. There remain items of disagreement between the parties including but not limited to the methodology, categorisation of significance, safety considerations and cumulative effects.</p>	
<p>Thanet District Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA • Access/highways/transport • Other consequential onshore effects • Historic Environment • SLVIA 	<p>Revision A was submitted in Deadline 1. Revised draft sent 150219 and returned on 260219 and a final agreed SoCG was included at Appendix 30 of the Applicant’s Deadline 3 submission (PINS Ref REP3-045). Agreement was reached on all matters.</p>	<p>B (Final)</p>
<p>French Authorities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment and HRA • Fishing and Fisheries • SLVIA 	<p>No further response has been received.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>MoD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military affairs 	<p>Contacted on 04/01/19, receipt acknowledged. Letter received on 15/02/19 confirming no intention of entering into a SoCG as submitted in Deadline 3 by the Applicant.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

4 Statement of Commonality

53 The following section describes the common themes or areas of commonality that have arisen through review of the relevant representations and further submissions into the examination process.

4.1 Site Selection and Alternatives

54 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).

55 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

56 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.

57 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.

58 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

59 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.

60 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 Marine Conservation Zone Assessments

61 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 was shared by:

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

62 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 were submitted as Appendix 32 (and associated annexes) to the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submission. Full agreement has been reached with Natural England and KE IFCA on the in-combination effects on Thanet Coast SAC and MCZ.

- 63 The effects on Goodwin Sands MCZ remained under discussion with Natural England, at Deadline 6, and were subject to the Applicant's providing a final summary and signposting note. The Applicant provided the requested sign-posting note and consolidation of submissions relating to the MCZ assessments to Natural England on 3rd June and held a teleconference on 6th June to confirm that they met Natural England's requests and requirements. The Applicant has submitted a draft signposting document to Natural England addressing the residual points raised, and have received commentary back. The Applicant will submit the final signposting document at Deadline 8, with no anticipated disagreements with Natural England. NE have requested this in order to clearly and concisely demonstrate that all significant pressures and attributes have been considered. This will allow NE to confidently agree with conclusions ie that conservation objectives are not hindered.
- 64 KWT still retain their disagreement on this matter for Thanet Coast MCZ generally and for Goodwin Sands pMCZ in combination with the Dover Harbour Board project in particular.

4.5 Potential effects for fish species

- 65 A common theme between the Applicant and IPs is the potential effects on fish and in particular any associated mitigation which may be required. This theme was raised by the MMO and Natural England in their Relevant Representations. The Applicant reached full agreement on fish ecology matters with Natural England, as evidenced in the final SoCG.
- 66 However, the requirement for a seasonal restriction and/ or the use of at source noise mitigation (e.g. bubble curtains) remains a matter of disagreement between the Applicant and the MMO (and their scientific advisors). It is the Applicant's position that this is disproportionate and not demonstrated to be required based on the findings of the ES chapter (and accompanying noise modelling). Following the receipt of the MMO's Deadline 6A Submission, in response to the ExA requests for further information under EPR Rule 17, the Applicant is anticipating the MMO to provide a position paper on this topic as a Deadline 7 Submission. The Applicant will provide a final response as part of their Deadline 8 Submission.