

Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd
1st Floor
1 Tudor Street
London
EC4Y 0AH

Kate Mignano
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Date:
11/06/2019

Contact: Daniel Bates (Consents Manager)
E-mail: Daniel.bates@vattenfall.com

Phone: [REDACTED]

The Applicant's response to the Deadline 8 submissions

Dear Ms Mignano,

The Applicant has reviewed the Deadline 8 submissions from IPs and whilst it has no comment to make to the response from Natural England and the MMO, there are minor points of clarification on the responses from the MCA and Trinity House.

MCA Deadline 8 response

The Applicant has noted the MCA's Deadline 8 submission regarding misrepresentation of their statements during the examination.

Firstly, the Applicant is grateful to MCA for their continuous engagement during the development and examination of Thanet Extension. Throughout these periods the Applicant has sought to consult regularly with the MCA, as well as other maritime stakeholders.

Recognising the MCA as the statutory consultee for 'applications likely to affect the maritime or coastal environment, or the shipping industry' (APFP regulations 2009), the Applicant has placed understandable weight on matters agreed whether during meetings or in the Statement of Common Ground. Meeting minutes have always been sent to the MCA for comment and agreement to ensure they are an accurate reflection of what was discussed.

It is entirely accepted that the views of other IPs must be taken into account, however it is not uncommon for IPs to differ in their views and where the Applicant has agreed a matter with a statutory consultee it is not unreasonable to present that in submissions as statement of fact. Where this has been done the Applicant has sought to make this as transparent as possible in order to avoid misinterpretation or misrepresentation, and in the interests of openness to ensure that stakeholders are fully aware of where representations may differ between organisations with similar interests.

The Applicant has not responded on each point of the MCA's submission, however with respect to the comment on the ExQ3 3.12.19 response (submission of a layout plan as embedded mitigation), this condition in the dML is provided to allow the MCA to consider whether the final layout would present any issues for navigational safety prior to commencement. As with all pre-commencement conditions, this approval is a final check of

the appropriateness of the development once all detailed design information is available. It is therefore demonstrably a risk control measure as the project cannot commence until this final approval is secured.

Trinity House Deadline 8 response

The Applicant acknowledges and apologises for the error made in this Deadline 7 response, as noted by both Trinity House and the MCA.

Kind regards



Daniel Bates
Consents Manager – Thanet Extension Offshore Wind Farm
Vattenfall Wind Power Ltd