

Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm

Consultation Report

Appendix 13.15 Minutes of meeting with Cruising Association, RYA and Chamber of Shipping

Applicant: Norfolk Boreas Limited
Document Reference: 5.1.13.15
Pursuant to APFP Regulation: 5(2)(q)

Date: June 2019
Revision: Version 1
Author: Copper Consultancy

Photo: Ormonde Offshore Wind Farm

This page is intentionally blank.

Introduction

A meeting was held at Vattenfalls London offices on the 8th May 2017. The objective of the meeting was to discuss the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm project with the Cruising Association who represent a number of users (members) within the area surrounding the proposed project sites.

Attendees

| Attendee | Position | Company/Organisation |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| ██████████ (TO) | RATS Technical Committee Member | Cruising Association |
| Capt. Mike Vanstone (MV) | Marine Consultant | Vattenfall |
| Ali MacDonald (AMcD) | Principal Risk Analyst | Anatec Ltd |

Minutes

A summary of the meeting, including key notes, is given below:

1. AMcD presented an overview of the project developments, schedule and the approach to shipping and navigation. The results of the marine traffic surveys undertaken to date were also presented.
2. TO stated that the key concern was the cumulative impact of all the projects in the East Anglia Zone as opposed to just that from the Vanguard and Boreas sites.
3. TO commented that they would like to see two lines of orientation and any converters stations/accommodation platforms etc. in line with the turbines.
4. TO thinks that with the wind farms on both sides, vessels will treat this as a narrow channel (Rule 9).
5. With respect to the September surveys, TO did not consider this to be Summer, but acknowledged that there was only limited recreational traffic in the area. This was largely from vessels crossing the North Sea, with some vessels returning to the UK having spent the Summer in Europe. TO noted that there will also be vessels going to the Baltic in the spring, using different routes which would go through this area.
6. TO stated that he would expect the area to have quite a number of Dutch yachtsmen. MV stated that he would talk to the club at Ijmuiden in Holland as a way of further consultation (**Action 1**).
7. TO requested a copy of the Hazard Log for comment as well as a copy of the presentation (**Action 2**).
8. TO stated that this area has a high proportion of bad visibility (i.e. mist and fog), and suggested Anatec review the latest pilot book (North Sea West) (**Action 3**). MV suggested

further discussions with Zoe Roberts at Vattenfall to check numbers being used in assessments (**Action 4**).

Actions

1. MV will contact the recreational club at Ijmuiden to ensure Dutch yachtsmen are included in the consultation process.
2. Anatec will provide a copy of the Hazard Log and the presentation slides to the CA.
3. Anatec will check the Pilot Book (North Sea West) for any available visibility data for the area, and incorporate into the NRA process.
4. Anatec will check with Zoe Roberts at Vattenfall with regards to visibility data.

Introduction

A meeting was held at Vattenfalls London offices on the 8th May 2017. The objective of the meeting was to discuss the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm project with the Royal Yachting Association, who represent a number of users (members) within the area surrounding the proposed project sites.

Attendees

| Attendee | Position | Company/Organisation |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| ██████████ (SC) | Cruising Manager | Royal Yachting Association |
| Capt. Mike Vanstone (MV) | Marine Consultant | Vattenfall |
| Ali MacDonald (AMcD) | Principal Risk Analyst | Anatec Ltd |

Minutes

A summary of the meeting, including key notes, is given below:

1. AMcD presented an overview of the project developments, schedule and the approach to shipping and navigation. The results of the marine traffic surveys undertaken to date were also presented.
2. SC stated that one of the main issues for the RYA would be the cable landfall, and any resultant reduction in water depths in this area (**Action 1**).
3. SC stated that the other key issues from the RYA perspective were rotor clearance as well as not wanting operational safety zones, although they agreed with the requirement for construction safety zones as well as around accommodation platforms.
4. With respect to the September surveys, SC did not consider this to be Summer, but acknowledged that there was only limited recreational traffic in the area from vessels crossing the North Sea.

Actions

1. Anatec will consider reduction in under keel clearance within the NRA.

Introduction

A meeting was held at Vattenfalls London offices on the 8th May 2017. The objective of the meeting was to discuss the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm project with the Chamber of Shipping who represent a number of users (members) within the area surrounding the proposed project sites.

Attendees

| Attendee | Position | Company/Organisation |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| ██████████ (RM) | Policy Advisor | Chamber of Shipping |
| Capt. Mike Vanstone (MV) | Marine Consultant | Vattenfall |
| Ali MacDonald (AMcD) | Principal Risk Analyst | Anatec Ltd |

Minutes

A summary of the meeting, including key notes, is given below:

1. AMcD presented an overview of the project developments, schedule and the approach to shipping and navigation. The results of the marine traffic surveys undertaken to date were also presented.
2. RM asked if the MCA and Trinity House have agreed to a 1nm buffer from the edge of the DWR for all the wind farms. AMcD stated that this had been discussed at recent consultations and no amendments had been proposed to the buffer distance already agreed for EA1.
3. The CoS are very interested in the cumulative impact of both Vattenfall and ScottishPower projects, so would like to see all projects considered together to understand how overall routing will be impacted in the area. RM stated that the CoS want to see the impact on the affected (deviated) routes entirety and not just within 10nm i.e., a holistic review of the overall route from port to port to assess deviations (**Action 1**).
4. RM noted that BP have stated that their vessels will require to slow down, which will result in an increase in fuel consumption and hence greater emissions resulting from shipping.
5. RM stated that access points will be needed for wind farm service vessels in the area, and it will need to be known where they are likely to be crossing the DWR. It should be ensured that the impact of wind farm construction and operational traffic is considered in the NRA (**Action 2**).
6. RM stated that transboundary issues should be considered and the Dutch authorities/stakeholders consulted. AMcD stated that Dutch user and authorities are to be consulted (**Action 3**).

7. RM asked what efforts had been made to engage with users in the area, and if a list of users Anatec had tried to engage with could be provided.
8. In relation to cumulative assessment, AMcD mentioned the previous Southern North Sea Offshore Wind Farm Work which was jointly carried out by developers. This update would be preferred so that they can understand the overall impact based on the planned developments.
9. AMcD acknowledged that this was now outdated given the time elapsed since the previous study. This will be discussed with Vattenfall (**Action 4**).
10. RM asked why Anatec were using 10% in term of future growth in numbers of vessels, RM suggested considering using a higher number (e.g. 20%) as a sensitivity, especially over 25 years. AMcD noted that gas platforms are being decommissioned over the next few years which will also remove some of the traffic from the area.
11. RM asked if safety zones associated with oil and gas platforms will disappear once the infrastructure has been removed. AMcD stated that this would likely happen after all post surveys have been carried out.
12. RM stated that as only 28 days had been used that in the area he would like to see the use of longer term AIS data by way of validation. He asked if the Met Mast data could be used for this purpose (**Action 5**). RM felt that the earlier survey data he had received through scoping looked busier than the more recent surveys.
13. RM would like to see that the impacts of both construction and operational traffic are considered in the NRA, i.e., an assessment of increased vessel presence associated with construction and operation of the project, and how it will interact with the existing traffic.
14. RM stated that there should be a look at the overall risk management of shipping in the area from a cumulative perspective. This should include a review of the existing routeing measures (e.g., changing the DWR to a TSS).

Actions

1. Anatec will take the CoS comments in regards to the cumulative assessment of vessel routeing into account within the NRA.
2. Anatec will provide discussion of likely access points and DWR crossing positions of vessels associated with Norfolk Vanguard within the NRA.
3. Anatec will continue to include Dutch authorities/stakeholders in the Norfolk Vanguard consultation process.
4. Anatec will discuss an approach to cumulative assessment with Vattenfall, given that the Southern North Sea Offshore Wind Farm Work jointly carried out by the relevant developers is now outdated.
5. Anatec will use the long term Met Mast data and previous survey analysis work to validate the estimated vessel numbers using the DWRs in the vicinity of Norfolk Vanguard.