

**Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm**

# **Statement of Common Ground**

The Royal Society for the Protection of  
Birds

Applicant: Norfolk Boreas Limited  
Document Reference: ExA.SoCG-21.D0.V1.  
Deadline: 0

Date: November 2019  
Revision: Version 1  
Author: MacArthur Green

*Photo: Ormonde Offshore Wind farm*

Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
25/09/2019	01D	First draft for the RSPB Review	MT	EVD	JL/VR
21/10/2019	01D	RSPB review and comments	CM		
25/10/2019	02D	Second draft for the RSPB review	MT	EVD/CM	JL
30/10/2019	02D	RSPB review and comments	CM		
31/11/2019	03D	Third draft for RSPB review	MT	EVD/CM	
01/11/2019	03D	RSPB review and comments	CM		
04/11/2019	04D	Submission for Deadline 0	MT	EVD	JL

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Consultation with the RSPB.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Statement of Common Ground .....</b>	<b>7</b>

### Table of tables

Table 1 Summary of Consultation with the RSPB in relation to Offshore Ornithology	5
Table 2 Agreement Log -Offshore Ornithology	8

## Glossary of Acronyms

AEol	Adverse Effect on Integrity
BTO	British Trust for Ornithology
CI	Confidence Interval
CIA	Cumulative Impact Assessment
CRM	Collision Risk Model
DCO	Development Consent Order
DML	Deemed Marine Licence
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ExA	Examining Authority
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
IPMP	In Principle Monitoring Plan
LSE	Likely Significant Effect
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PVA	Population Viability Analysis
SNCB	Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies
SPA	Special Protection Area
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground

## Glossary of Terminology

Offshore cable corridor	The corridor of seabed from the Norfolk Boreas site to the landfall site within which the offshore export cables will be located.
Offshore export cables	The cables which transmit power from the offshore electrical platform to the landfall.
The Project	Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm

## 1 INTRODUCTION

---

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared with the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (the RSPB) and Norfolk Boreas Limited (hereafter the Applicant) to set out areas of agreement and areas for which discussions are ongoing in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm (hereafter 'the project'). A full description of the project can be found in Chapter 5 project description of the ES (document reference 6.1.5 of the Application, APP-218).
2. This SoCG comprises an agreement log which has been structured to reflect the topics of interest to the RSPB with regard to the Norfolk Boreas DCO application (hereafter 'the Application'). The agreement logs (Table 2) outline all topic specific matters agreed, not agreed and actions to resolve between the RSPB and the Applicant.
3. The Applicant has had regard to the Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2015) when compiling this SoCG. This SoCG represents the position of the parties as they currently stand. Matters that are not agreed will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve or refine the extent of disagreement between the parties and final positions of agreement and disagreement will be submitted as appropriate.

## 2 CONSULTATION WITH THE RSPB

4. This section briefly summarises the consultation that the Applicant has had with the RSPB. For further information on the consultation process please see the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).

### 2.1.1 Pre-Application

5. The Applicant has engaged with the RSPB on the project during the pre-Application process, both in terms of informal non-statutory engagement and formal consultation carried out pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.
6. During formal (Section 42) consultation, the RSPB provided comments on the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) by way of a letter dated 7<sup>th</sup> December 2018.
7. Further to the statutory Section 42 consultation, an additional meeting was held with the RSPB through the Evidence Plan Process.
8. Table 1 provides an overview of meetings and correspondence undertaken with the RSPB. Minutes of the meetings are provided in the Consultation Report Appendix 28.1 (APP-192).

### 2.1.2 Post-Application

9. As part of the pre-examination process, the RSPB submitted a Relevant Representation to the Planning Inspectorate on the 28<sup>th</sup> August 2019.
10. This SoCG represents the Applicant's and the RSPB's positions prior to the commencement of the Examination.

**Table 1 Summary of Consultation with the RSPB in relation to Offshore Ornithology**

Date	Contact Type	Topic
<b>Pre-Application</b>		
7 <sup>th</sup> December 2018	PEIR response from the RSPB	Comments on the PEIR chapter
26 <sup>th</sup> February 2019	Method statement and agreement log comments from RSPB	Comments on the Method Statement and Agreement Log
27 <sup>th</sup> February 2019	Offshore Ornithology ETG meeting	Discussion of PEIR responses
5 <sup>th</sup> April 2019	Draft HRA response from RSPB	Comments on the Draft HRA in relation to offshore ornithology
<b>Post-Application</b>		
28 <sup>th</sup> August 2019	Relevant Representation	RSPB's initial feedback on the DCO application.

Date	Contact Type	Topic
25th September 2019	1st draft of the offshore ornithology SoCG	The Applicant issued the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft in order to clarify areas of agreement and those in need of further work
21 <sup>st</sup> October 2019	RSPB comments on 1st draft of SoCG	RSPB comments on 1 <sup>st</sup> draft

### 3 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

---

11. The project has the potential to impact upon Offshore Ornithology. Chapter 13 of the Norfolk Boreas Environmental Statement (ES) (document reference 6.1 of the Application) provides an assessment of the significance of these impacts.
12. Table 2 provides areas of agreement (common ground) and on-going discussion regarding Offshore Ornithology between the RSPB and the Applicant.
13. Minutes of Evidence Plan meetings can be found in Appendix 9.17 and Appendix 25.8 of the Consultation Report (document reference 5.1 of the Application).



**Table 2 Agreement Log -Offshore Ornithology**

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited's position	RSPB's position	Final position
<b>Consultation</b>			
Consultation	The RSPB has been adequately consulted regarding offshore ornithology to date.	Agreed	Agreed
<b>Environmental Impact Assessment</b>			
Existing Environment	Survey data collected for Norfolk Boreas for the characterisation of offshore ornithology are suitable for the assessment.	Agreed	Agreed
	The methods and techniques used to analyse offshore ornithological data are appropriate for characterising bird distributions and estimating populations.	Agreed	Agreed
	The method used to determine flight heights is appropriate. Generic flight height data (Johnston et al. 2014, with corrigendum) were used due to data reliability concerns raised by the aerial surveyor.	Agreed	Agreed
	The method used to assign unidentified birds to species is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	Assessment has been based on migration free breeding seasons for those species which the Applicant considers to have negligible or no breeding seasons connectivity, but assessment has also been provided using the full breeding season for those species which Natural England and the RSPB considered to be appropriate (gannet, kittiwake and lesser black-backed gull).	Agreed	Agreed
<b>Assessment methodology</b>			
General	Appropriate legislation, planning policy and guidance relevant to offshore ornithology has been used.	Agreed	Agreed
	The list of potential impacts on offshore ornithology assessed is appropriate	Agreed	Agreed
	The definitions for determining impact significance on offshore ornithological receptors are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	The worst case scenarios used in the assessment for offshore ornithology are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	The characterisation of receptor sensitivity is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited's position	RSPB's position	Final position
Construction impact methods	The lists of potential construction impacts and ornithology receptors assessed are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	The methods used to estimate impacts during construction, including cable laying operations are appropriate.	Agreed, provided displacement and mortality rates used in the final conclusions are those agreed with Natural England.	Agreed, provided displacement and mortality rates used in the final conclusions are those agreed with Natural England.
Operation impact methods	The sources of operational impact assessed are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	The lists of ornithology receptors assessed for each impact are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	Methods for assessing operational displacement are appropriate.	Agreed, provided displacement and mortality rates used in the final conclusions are those agreed with Natural England.	Agreed, provided displacement and mortality rates used in the final conclusions are those agreed with Natural England.
	Methods for assessing population scale collision impacts are appropriate: presentation of Band collision risk model (CRM) options 1 and 2, with assessment based on option 2. Upper and lower estimates included to present variation due to nocturnal activity rates, proportions at collision height, avoidance rates and seabird densities. It should be noted that the breeding season gannet avoidance rate used was agreed with Natural England.	<p>Agreed with respect to use of Band model options 1 and 2.</p> <p>Agreed with respect to nocturnal activity rates provided they align with Natural England's advice.</p> <p>Not agreed with respect to the breeding season gannet avoidance rate (The RSPB recommends that</p>	<p>Agreed with respect to use of Band model options 1 and 2.</p> <p>Agreed with respect to nocturnal activity rates provided they align with</p>

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited's position	RSPB's position	Final position
		the gannet avoidance rate should be 98% in the breeding season).	Natural England's advice.  Not agreed with respect to the breeding season gannet avoidance rate.
	Methods for assessing barrier impacts are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	Methods for assessing indirect impacts are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
<b>EIA findings – project alone</b>			
Construction impacts	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from the construction phase are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Agreed (for EIA on basis of recommended displacement/mortality rates)	Agreed (subject to noted caveat)
Operation impacts	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from displacement during operation are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Agreed (for EIA on basis of recommended displacement/mortality rates)	Agreed (subject to noted caveat)
	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from collision during operation are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Agreed	Agreed
	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from barrier impacts during operation are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Agreed	Agreed
	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from indirect impacts during operation are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Agreed	Agreed
Decommissioning impacts	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from decommissioning are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Agreed	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited's position	RSPB's position	Final position
<b>Cumulative impact assessment</b>			
Cumulative construction assessment	The plans and projects considered within the CIA are appropriate.	Agreed. However, please note the RSPB's concerns with reference to the stated precautionary nature of using consented, as opposed to as-built, capacity.	Agreed. However, please note the RSPB's concerns with reference to the stated precautionary nature of using consented, as opposed to as-built, capacity.
	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from cumulative impacts during construction are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Agreed.	Agreed.
Cumulative operation assessment	The plans and projects considered within the CIA are appropriate.	Agreed, with relevance to sites and species of concern to the RSPB. However, please note the RSPB's concerns with reference to the stated precautionary nature of using consented, as opposed to as-built, capacity.	Agreed. However, please note the RSPB's concerns with reference to the stated precautionary nature of using consented, as opposed to as-built, capacity.
	The magnitude of impact and conclusions on significance resulting from cumulative displacement impacts during operation for all species assessed (guillemot, razorbill, puffin and red-throated diver) are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	Not agreed for guillemot, razorbill and red-throated diver.	Not agreed

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited's position	RSPB's position	Final position
	The magnitude of impacts and conclusions on significance resulting from cumulative collisions during operation are correctly identified and predicted. No impacts of greater than minor significance are predicted.	It is not agreed that significant cumulative collision risk can be ruled out, due to the level of cumulative impact currently predicted for kittiwake and great black-backed gull.	Not agreed
<b>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b>			
Screening of Likely Significant Effects (LSE)	The Approach to HRA Screening is appropriate.	Not agreed	Not agreed
	<p>The following sites and species have been screened in for further assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alde-Ore Estuary SPA (lesser black-backed gull for collisions);</li> <li>Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA (gannet and kittiwake for collisions and gannet, guillemot and razorbill for displacement);</li> <li>Greater Wash SPA (red-throated diver for displacement and little gull for collisions); and</li> <li>Outer Thames Estuary SPA (red-throated diver for displacement).</li> </ul>	Not agreed. The RSPB considers that the list of species for which the FFC SPA has been screened in for further assessment is incomplete as it does not include the assemblage feature.	Not agreed.
Assessment	The approach to the apportioning of species to SPAs is appropriate.	Not agreed	Not agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for the lesser black-backed gull population at Alde-Ore Estuary SPA on the basis of collisions for the project alone is appropriate.	Not agreed. Furthermore the RSPB requests that the draught height be raised as a mitigation measure to reduce collision impact.	Not agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for the lesser black-backed gull population at Alde-Ore Estuary on the basis of in-combination collisions, is appropriate.	Not agreed	Not agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for gannet population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA due to project alone collisions is appropriate.	Not agreed. Furthermore the RSPB requests that the draught height be raised as a mitigation measure to reduce collision impact.	Not agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for gannet population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA is appropriate on the basis of in-combination collisions.	Not agreed	Not agreed

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited's position	RSPB's position	Final position
	Conclusion of no AEoI for guillemot population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA due to project alone displacement is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for guillemot population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA due to in-combination displacement is appropriate.	Not agreed	Not agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for razorbill population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA due to project alone displacement is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for razorbill population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA due to in-combination displacement is appropriate.	Not agreed	Not agreed
	Conclusion of no AEoI for kittiwake population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA due to project alone collisions is appropriate.	Agreed. However the RSPB requests that the draught height be raised as a mitigation measure to reduce collision impact	Agreed. However the RSPB requests that the draught height be raised as a mitigation measure to reduce collision impact.
	Conclusion of no AEoI for kittiwake population at Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA is appropriate on the basis of in-combination collisions.	Not agreed	Not agreed
	Individual species which comprise the seabird assemblage feature of the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA have either been assessed separately (gannet, kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill) or lack connectivity with the project or have extremely low predicted impacts at the project (fulmar, puffin, herring gull, shag and cormorant). Therefore there is no requirement to assess these separately. Note that less than 0.1 puffin was apportioned to this SPA population.	Not agreed with regard to assessment of puffin.	Not agreed with regard to assessment of puffin.
	Conclusion of no AEoI for the red-throated diver population at the Greater Wash SPA is appropriate on the basis of project alone and in-combination construction and operation displacement (in relation to vessel movements).	Agreed	Agreed

Topic	Norfolk Boreas Limited's position	RSPB's position	Final position
	Conclusion of no AEoI for the little gull population at the Greater Wash SPA is appropriate on the basis of project alone and in-combination collisions.	Agreed	Agreed
<b>Monitoring</b>			
Monitoring	The proposed monitoring (to be developed through the Ornithological Monitoring Plan, in accordance with the In Principle Monitoring Plan (Application document 8.12)) is adequate. The Applicant considers that detailed monitoring should be agreed with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) who will consult with Natural England and other appropriate organisations at the appropriate time following consent award.	Agreed with respect to principle, but greater detail of proposed monitoring is still required.	Agreed
	The IPMP allows for both strategic and project level monitoring (although these need to be considered in relation to the relative magnitude of individual project scale impacts). Monitoring options will be agreed with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in consultation with relevant stakeholders in accordance with Condition 14(1)(l) of the generation Deemed Marine Licences (DMLs) (Schedule 9 and 10) which refer to the Ornithological Monitoring Plan.	Agreed that the IPMP allows for site specific monitoring if appropriate, but concerns remain that there appears to be a presumption against project level monitoring and that cumulative impact levels are under-rated in the description.	Agreed
	However, the Applicant also considers that in many instances studies for offshore wind farm effects on seabirds designed to reduce uncertainties and precaution in assessments need to be conducted at a strategic rather than project level. The Applicant is a key supporter of strategic monitoring initiatives and has a proven track record in this area (e.g. through the Scientific Research and Monitoring Programme for the European Offshore Wind Development Centre and involvement in the Offshore Renewables Joint Industry Programme).	Agreed and note the role of the RSPB in supporting and advising on the initiatives highlighted.	Agreed

The names inserted below are to confirm that these are the current positions of the two parties contributing to this SOCG

Printed Name	Rosie Sutherland
Position	Head of Environmental Law
On behalf of	The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Date	4 <sup>th</sup> November 2019

Printed Name	Jake Laws
Position	Norfolk Boreas Consents Manager
On behalf of	Norfolk Boreas Limited (the Applicant)
Date	4 <sup>th</sup> November 2019