Hornsea Project Four: Consultation Report

PINS Document Reference: B1.1.3
APFP Regulation s37(3)&(7) PA 2008

Volume B1, Annex 1.3 – Applicant Regard to Section 47 Consultation Responses

Prepared Counter Context, September 2021
Checked Humphrey Laidlaw, Ørsted, September 2021
Accepted Hannah Towner-Roethe, Ørsted, September 2021
Approved Julian Carolan, Ørsted, September 2021

B1.1.3
Version A

Table of Contents

Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DCO	Development Consent Order
ERYC	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
FAQs	Frequently Asked Questions
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
LIEs	Local Information Events
MMO	MMO
NE	Natural England
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OnSS	Onshore Substation
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PEIR NTS	Preliminary Environmental Information Report Non-Technical Summary
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
SoCC	Statement of Community Consultation
SoS	Secretary of State
TCE	The Crown Estate

Table 1.1: Applicant regard to phase one section 47 consultation responses by EIA topic area – feedback received via feedback form, email, freepost, information line, and online.

EIA topic area: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)[1]	Project commitment?[2]	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_012	Respondents highlighted Leconfield as a key village to avoid. It was suggested that the scoping boundary should be moved further west of the village. It was also requested that noise, vibration and traffic should be minimised through the village, including strict working hours.	Y	N/A	The site selection and route refinement process is detailed in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. This also details changes to the scoping boundary through to PEIR, which fell to the west (over 300 metres) of Leconfield, excluding the village from any potential direct impacts. The Applicant has committed to the following in relation to core construction working hours (Co36): • Monday to Friday: 07:00 - 18:00 hours; • Saturday: 07:00 - 13:00 hours; • Up to one hour before and after core working hours for mobilisation ("mobilisation period"), i.e. 06:00 to 19:00 weekdays and 06:00 to 14:00 Saturdays; and • Maintenance period 13:00 to 17:00 Saturdays.

[1] N/A = Comment is not requesting a project change to be made; Y = Amendments made to the project design as a result of feedback from consultation; N = The applicant has had regard to the comment but determined that a change is not appropriate / justified in the circumstances; I = The applicant has had regard to the comment and incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment

[2] 1o = primary Commitment relevant to this response; Change = any change to the existing Commitment as a consequence of the feedback; New = any new commitment resulting from the comment

				Activities carried out during mobilisation and maintenance will not generate significant noise levels (such as piling, or other such noisy activities). In circumstances outside of normal working practices, specific works may have to be undertaken outside the normal working hours. In these instances, the project will inform ERYC in writing.
Phase one_feedback form_024, Phase one_feedback form_030, Phase one_feedback form_005, Phase one_feedback form_047	Respondents registered concern about the scoping boundary and potential cable route through Foston on the Wolds. A number of respondents also requested that the final cable route should be located a distance away from residential properties and agricultural land.	N/A	N/A	As detailed in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**, the onshore export cable corridor (ECC) is directed around Foston on the Wolds to the north and west with no direct effect on the village from the works themselves. The closest approach to the village will be over 200m away, with Old Howe Lane being crossed by the cable to the north of the village. Furthermore HGVs will avoid travel through Foston on the Wolds (Co171). Hornsea Four has made a commitment (Co49) to route the onshore ECC a minimum of 50m away from residential properties. Co 123 provides for the use of mufflers and acoustic barrier where noise has the potential to cause disturbance for HDD activities. Due to the amount of agricultural land within the area, agricultural land cannot be avoided. The impact on agricultural land is assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**.
Phase one_feedback form_036	The onshore cable passes through the rural area where I live, work and 'play'. My home is within 1 mile of the proposed cable route. I am content with the underground cable with no booster stations. You MUST NOT deviate from this proposal to gain the support	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

	of me and my family. Thank you.			
Phase one_feedback form_055	Like 'Forewind' we appreciate that a cable(s) will travel through Ulrome. We want to minimise the disruption to the village of Ulrome and preserve the wildlife that exists in and around the village.	N/A	N/A	The cable will pass Ulrome over 2.5 km away at its nearest point with the landing point located near Fraisthorpe (see **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**). The Applicant undertook a suite of environmental and ecological surveys, with appropriate mitigation measures agreed to protect sensitive species and habitats as required (see **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation**).
Phase one_feedback form_040	The project shows that the works for the trench passes Foston on the Wolds and turns to the bottom of Gembling village with the "grey" marking covering the bottom paddocks and gardens of the village including ours. This area should be ring marked with "no works" due to the mature trees and hedgerows, including mature English Oaks, which we are now seeking to have preservation orders issued for. The trench can easily be moved to the south of Gembling which would mean all works would be completed in open fields.	N/A	N/A	The cable corridor passes over 500 m south of Gembling village at its closest point. As per Co 2, where possible, unprotected areas of woodland, mature and protected trees (those with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs)) will be avoided.

Phase one_feedback form_016	I am in agreement with the proposals so far with the substation being sited as close as possible to the existing Creyke Beck	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase one_feedback form_018, Phase one_feedback form_019, Phase one_feedback form_024	Respondents queried the location of the OnSS and whether farming practices could continue, including the impact on small family businesses. There were further concerns from respondents that the project would impact land and property values.	N/A	N/A	The site selection process for the OnSS is detailed in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives.** The Applicant has been in consultation with landowners and tenants, both individually and through the Landowner Interest Group (LIG), as detailed In **Chapter 1: Consultation Report.** The Applicant (and through appointed land agents) has held discussions regarding land or property values on an individual landowner basis and has worked on minimising impacts.
Phase one_email_062	One respondent did not appreciate that the existing wind turbines at Hornsea 1, 2 and 3 were not yet operational. You did not actually say why the new Hornsea 4 line had to be on a completely different route and to a completely different destination. Even if it must eventually terminate at Creyke Beck surely it would be easier to run the line under the sea as far as possible rather than go	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has undertaken a comprehensive route planning and site selection exercise, which has included the refinement of the onshore and offshore export cable corridor based on a range of environmental and technical constraints. This refinement process has been set out in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. This process also included the refinement of the landfall proposals and the avoidance of key environmental receptors, such as woodland and designated wildlife areas.

	overland and wind around Beverley? It could cross Holderness using existing pipeline corridors and then around the north of Hull on the existing high voltage pylon alignment where presumably wayleaves already exist. It would be helpful to know before I am asked these inevitable questions at our Parish Council meeting on 6 November. (I have no issues with the line you propose to adopt)			
Phase one_email_066	We viewed the proposed plans for the Hornsea Project Four Offshore Wind Farm and noted that the land fall search area just skimmed our farmland to the north of us. It would be very much appreciated if the proposed cables did not come across our land, as it would involve going across two ditches, two strips of woodland and our wildlife area.			

EIA topic area: Project Description

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_023	The future of UK energy generation is probably marine generated (wind or tidal based). So just get on with it and make it work as efficiently as possible, asap.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase one_feedback form_036	There should be a viable plan and commitment to remove all offshore seabed infrastructure at end of life of this project	N	N/A	At the end of the operational lifetime of Hornsea Four (anticipated to be 35 years), it is expected that any infrastructure above the seabed will need to be completely removed. A decommissioning plan will be developed and agreed prior to decommissioning of the infrastructure, to take account of new techniques and technology.
Phase one_feedback form_046	HDD - I would love to see the HDD in operation - hopefully at Hornsea 2 at Horseshore Point or inland.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase one_feedback form_036	The in-service maintenance and upkeep of offshore wind turbines is very very expensive - I know this. At the engineering design stage please consider this aspect and aim to keep 'our' energy bills reasonable.	N/A	N/A	

Phase one_email_058	Thank you for your Community Consultation Leaflet received today. Please could you let me know how many acres (approx.) of land your proposed Onshore Substation near Cottingham will take up.	N/A	N/A	As set out in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**, the maximum parameters for the permanent area of the site for all OnSS and EBI infrastructure (inclusive of landscaping) is 164,000 m^2, with an additional 130,000 m^2 required as a temporary works area.
Phase one_email_059	We received a booklet through our door, as our village sits in the proposed onshore cable route area. What does "high-level" cables mean? Pylons? Or will the cable be underground?	N/A	N/A	The Applicant clarified that the term 'high-level' was referenced in the phase one community consultation leaflet (see **Annex 1.14: Phase One Section 47 Community Consultation Leaflet (October 2018)**). This term was used in regard to the early stage 'high-level' proposals, when exact details of the cable route/location were to be finalised as part of ongoing consultation. As set out in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**, all onshore cables will be buried underground for the full length of the onshore ECC, starting at the landfall point near Fraisthorpe, heading south to the OnSS connection point at Creyke Beck, Cottingham.
Phase one_email_060	I visited your exhibition at Foston on 22 October and now realise that I did not ask some obvious questions. How is the power from the existing Hornsea turbines being fed into the National Grid? Why cannot that route be used instead of going to all this trouble and expense?	N/A	N/A	The Applicant clarified that National Grid has allocated Creyke Beck as the proposed connection point for Hornsea Four (see **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**). The Applicant also noted that for other consented Ørsted projects, including Hornsea Project One, which is now commercially operational, the cable route runs from a landfall point at Horseshoe Point to a grid connection at North Killingholme. A new adjacent cable route and same landfall point, and grid connection is also required for Hornsea Project Two, which is under construction and is to be commercially operational in 2022.

	I do not recall a similar consultation exercise for that route - was there one?			Due to different grid connection points and project infrastructure, the Applicant confirmed that one common route cannot be utilised for these projects.

EIA topic area: Consultation

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_004	Respondents highlighted the need to engage fully with county/parish councils.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has undertaken consultation with a range of prescribed and non-prescribed consultees, as set out in **Chapter 1: Consultation Report**. These consultees included parish and county councils, as detailed in **Annex 1.6: Consultees Consulted Under Section 42 of the 2008 Planning Act**, with a full listed of elected members provided in **Annex 1.31: Elected Members Distribution List**.
Phase one_feedback form_023	This question was not done by a consumer Market Researcher. I am not sure what you are looking for. However, how about committing to actually making the project work, and 'doing' it? What happened to the Cardiff Bay tidal generation project or the CO2 capture project? Plan it well and do it quickly. Don't faff about for years while funds evaporate, and some	N/A	N/A	Ørsted has over 25 years' experience developing, constructing and operating offshore wind farms, with a strong track record of delivering projects on time and to a high standard. Ørsted's global pipeline includes 25 operational offshore wind farms (totalling 5.6 gigawatts (GW)), with a further 4 projects (totalling 4.3GW) under construction, and more in development. In the UK, we own or operates 12 offshore wind farms with the world's largest offshore wind farm, Hornsea One, becoming commercially operational in 2020, and Hornsea Two, which will become operational in 2022.

	alternative becomes flavour of the month			
Phase one_feedback form_004, Phase one_feedback form_021, Phase one_feedback form_018, Phase one_feedback form_025 Phase one_feedback form_033, Phase one_feedback form_036, Phase one_feedback form_037, Phase one_feedback form_038, Phase one_feedback form_042	A number of respondents provided comments about the consultation process, which included: - Views need to be taken into account. - Maps supplied were not detailed enough to show exact locations of proposals. - All consultees need to be updated at all times throughout the consultation period. - All questions at events were answered clearly by staff. The public should have an active say in what happens to the environment, and a 'public voice' is heard.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase one_feedback form_025	The consultation has been poorly locally advertised	N/A	N/A	
Phase one_feedback form_011	Appreciate the time Julian explained the proposals etc as I had little idea of how wind farms worked etc. Very			

	impressed and think it's a great idea for the future production/generation of electricity			
Phase one_feedback form_021	Happy to be consulted. For your reference on drainage, consult: River Hull Valley Drainage Heritage Group "Becks, Banks, Drains and Brains" ISBN 9780955291210			
Phase one_email_060	Thank you for your recent consultation leaflet. Good luck to your project. I will look forward to attending my closest information event. I anticipate opposition from various groups but will support your efforts to substitute renewable energy generation in place of fracking and other fossil fuel extraction processes. Please keep me informed of progress. Bears Wishes.			
Phase one_feedback form_010, Phase one_feedback form_023	Some respondents registered their support for the project and requested the project to go ahead.			

Phase one_feedback form_007	The concept of wind energy I am in front of; just need to ensure that impacts during construction are minimised. The next information events should have far more specific details.	N/A	N/A	Impacts during construction have been fully assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, with more detail presented during the phase two section 47 consultation. **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** has also been produced as part of the DCO application, which details outline details regarding construction measures.
Phase one_feedback form_010, Phase one_feedback form_033	Why is it taking so long to put into place? UK needs to make best use of its natural resource as much as possible (i.e. Wind power)	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four has a generating capacity exceeding 100 MW and is therefore classified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. The consultation process, as detailed in **Chapter 1: Consultation Report** is therefore highly prescriptive.
Phase one_feedback form_042	The proposals will go ahead regardless of local concerns/input. Proposals are vague on actual effects/impact on our village.	N/A	N/A	As part of the examination process, the Applicant must satisfy PINS that pre-application consultation has been undertaken. This includes consultation with the local community under Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008 (the 'Planning Act) and material consideration of consultation feedback received throughout the pre-application process. This is detailed in **Chapter 1: Consultation Report**, along with demonstration of compliance in **Annex 1.2: Consultation Compliance Checklist**. Examples of how local residents' feedback has helped shape the Hornsea Four proposals were provided throughout the consultation period, including the phase one section 47 consultation summary report (**Annex 1.18: Phase One Section 47 Summary Consultation Report**) and phase two section 47 consultation summary report (**Annex 1.25: Phase Two Section 47 Summary Consultation Report**). The Applicant has also included a 'Commitments Register' as part of the DCO application (see **Volume A4, Annex 5.2: Commitments Register**) which includes commitments directly informed by consultation comments.

Phase one_feedback form_046	A liaison officer is very useful to have as they can give details of much of the project's progress. But what is the carbon footprint for all the work done to produce a windfarm when transport to and from the sites are considered? Also the materials used have to be quarried, dredged etc - that adds to the carbon footprint. Helicopter transport, manufacture of wind turbines and their transport. Windcat vessels used for repair or maintenance. I have seen that after consultations, public views have been considered and the project has been refined and refined again. Good that the public are listened to. The locals know their area - this includes those who work at sea.	Y	N/A	The Applicant appointed a Community Liaison Officer (CLO), Andrew Acum, in March 2019, whose role was to act as an independent link between Hornsea Four and the local community in land surrounding the ECC, OnSS and landfall areas. The CLO's role and responsibilities are detailed in **Chapter 1: Consultation Report**. In 2017, Siemens performed a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of an average European offshore wind farm with 80 8.0 MW turbines installed. It shows that during its entire lifecycle, the wind farm produces 41 times more energy than it consumes and the energy payback time for the wind farm is less than 7.4 months. The energy payback is the length of time the wind farm has to operate in order to produce as much energy it will consume during its entire lifecycle. The full report is available online here: https://www.siemensgamesa.com/-/media/siemensgamesa/downloads/en/sustainability/environment/siemens-gamesa-environmental-product-declaration-epd-sg-8-0-167.pdf
Phase one_feedback form_040	One respondent felt that the consultation was poorly advertised locally.	N/A	N/A	The advertising campaign for the phase one section 47 consultation is reported in **Chapter 1: Consultation Report** with evidence provided in **Annex 1.15: Publicity of Phase One Section 47 local information events**.

				This feedback was acknowledged. The Applicant ensured that all community consultation events were advertised to the statutory requirements, including the addition of a geographically targeted social media campaign and posters which were produced for display in Parish Council village halls along the cable route. When undertaking community consultation events, the Applicant always aimed to provide a range of locations and dates to maximise attendance across the community.
Phase one_email_065	One respondent mentioned (at the local information event) that I might write something along the lines of what you are doing right and wrong from what I have seen - I hesitate to do that but what has crossed my mind is:- to have a film, video or slide show putting tog. The various processes and techniques used from the start to completion of an OWF – you have plenty of examples now even though there will be variations in the methods and equipment used because of the variety of terrains etc. you have to go through – this could be used in school and colleges and for the public. Perhaps it would be too large a task or	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment. The range of consultation materials displayed during the pre-application consultation, including at the phase two section 47 local information events, are detailed in **Chapter 1: Consultation Report.**

	you may already have something like this already. Just a thought.			

EIA topic area: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_025	Putting turbines in sea must have an impact on cliff erosion	N/A	N/A	**Volume A2, Chapter 1: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes** provides details of historical cliff erosion rates at the landfall site with assessment of the potential impacts of Hornsea Four on the cliff erosion. In summary, it has been concluded that there will be no significant impacts on the cliffs as a result of the presence of Hornsea Four.
Phase one_feedback form_021	Landfall will need to take account of cliff erosion. 2 cm per year on average. Fraisthorpe – Bridlington beach is a recreation hotspot.	N	N/A	Cliff erosion has been a key factor in determining the appropriate site for landfall and its associated components. We have taken average cliff erosion rates based on the information from ERYC Cliff Erosion Monitoring Rates and ensured the rate of erosion covers the proposed construction and operational lifetime of the windfarm, including a buffer, to allow sufficient protection against erosion and the effects of climate change. We have also considered the social aspects of the area in our landfall site selection. We discounted landfall sites A1 and A2 due to their proximity to the popular cafe and busy car park, which has the highest density of people and we have also avoided tourist hot spots such as caravan parks. Further information can be found online in our Site Selection Annex (**Volume A4, Annex 3.1: Selection and Refinement of the Cable Landfall**).

EIA topic area: Fish and Shellfish Ecology

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_025, Phase one_feedback form_037, Phase one_feedback form_046	Respondents registered a general concern for the well-being of offshore ecology, include porpoise, whales, dolphins, all species of fish. Razor fish beds and big warm beds. All species of birds were also mentioned as key species by respondents.	N/A	N/A	Detailed assessments on the impact of offshore ecology has been published as part of the final DCO application, including: • **Volume A2, Chapter 2: Benthic and Intertidal Ecology**. • **Volume A2, Chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology**. • **Volume A2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals**. • **Volume A2, Chapter 5: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology**.

EIA topic area: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_011, Phase one_ feedback form _042, Phase	Respondents highlighted the danger to migratory birds, including a major sea bird colony at Flamborough Head. This was considered as	N/A	N/A	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Four on offshore and intertidal ornithology is presented in **Volume A2, Chapter 5: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology**. Furthermore, the impact on the seabird colonies of the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) have been considered within the Draft Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) and it has been concluded that there will be no significant impacts on

one_feedback form_043	feeding water for many seabird colonies.			migratory birds offshore. Notwithstanding the conclusions in the RIAA, the Applicant undertook a Targeted Consultation on the compensation measures resulting from the Hornsea Four Without Prejudice Derogation Case in August 2021. An overview of the Compensation Measures can be found in **Volume B2, Chapter 6: Compensation measures for FFC SPA: Overview**

EIA topic area: Commercial Fisheries

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_046	One respondent hoped that fisherman were involved with the consultation/s as their area is well fished and it is their livelihood	N/A	N/A	In relation to commercial fisheries, consultation with UK inshore and offshore fisheries and European offshore fisheries has been important in providing an accurate baseline of the fishing activity in the vicinity of Hornsea Four. This consultation with commercial fisheries has been an ongoing process throughout the project development process, with details provided in **Volume A2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries**.

EIA topic area: Shipping and Navigation

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_009	Operating a fleet of workboats that can assist in all phases of windfarm construction/production	N/A	N/A	The number of offshore workboats for the construction and operation of Hornsea Four is detailed within **Volume A2, Chapter 8: Shipping and Navigation**. The ES chapter concluded that there will be no significant impacts on shipping and navigation receptors and demonstrated that vessels can still operate safely in the vicinity of Hornsea Four.

Phase one_feedback form_010	Sea anchorages of oil tankers offshore	N/A	N/A	The impact on shipping and navigation within the vicinity of Hornsea Four has been fully considered within **Volume A2, Chapter 8: Shipping and Navigation**. Vessel traffic surveys have been conducted by the Applicant in order to supplement the detailed desktop review of existing studies and datasets to provide an accurate baseline of the vessel activity in the area. The ES chapter concluded that there will be no significant impacts on shipping and navigation receptors and demonstrated that vessels can still operate safely in the vicinity of Hornsea Four.
Phase one_feedback form_046	Important - Some important shipping may be found but some creatures may have colonised them!	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

EIA topic area: Onshore Ecology and Nature Conservation

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_038, Phase one_feedback form_041	Respondents requested a commitment to consider local wildlife and habitats along with sensitive sites, such as woodland. The impact on the village of Barmston and on marine life was also highlighted.	N	Co2	During the design development process, Hornsea Four has sought to minimise impacts on local ecology and wildlife (Co2), for example through the avoidance of ecologically designated sites. Further detail on this can be found in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. A suite of ecological surveys have been undertaken in consultation with East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Natural England, the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, to determine the presence or absence of species within the footprint (or within respective study areas) of the Hornsea Four Order Limit. Potential impacts on local wildlife and specific species are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation**. Where appropriate, these surveys and impact assessments
Phase one_feedback form_040	Our premises is home for the following protected wildlife; Bats (2 colonies) Great Crested Newts (confirmed by	N	Co2	

	and independent by a third party) Badgers Egrets Barn Owls among other wildlife. The hedgerow and mature trees surrounding the properties under your "grey" area need protection and confirmation that your intention will be to move the trench into open land as removal/disturbance will have an unnecessary irreversible impact. The consultation is floored due to no site visits being made.			have determined the requirement for mitigation and management both within, and above industry standard mitigation, as necessary. Where possible, Hornsea Four will avoid trees within the Hornsea Four onshore Order Limits. Where hedgerows and/or trees require removal, Hornsea Four has committed to replacing them with like for like hedgerow species (see Co26). Where agreed with landowners, removed hedgerows and trees will be replaced with hedgerows of a more diverse and locally native species composition than that which was removed (see Co194). Further details on trees and hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation**.
Phase one_feedback form_003, Phase one _feedback form_024, Phase one _feedback form_046	Great crested newts, owls, trees. Will trees and hedges be replaced? Respondents also highlighted the presence of hedgehogs, foxes and buzzards and the importance of preserving all habitats.	N/A	Co26, Co194	
Phase one_feedback form_025	Marine life, whales/dolphins/porpoise, water voles in ditches and drains, eels in drains, frogs/toads/newts	N/A	N/A	

Phase one_feedback form_011, Phase one_feedback form_030	Member of RSPB and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust so impact on birds and wildlife important to me. Understand impact studies have been/are being done so happy with that. Respondents also highlighted important species such as Lapwings, Water Voles, Deer, Barn Owls, Hares, and Hedgehogs.	N/A	N/A	
Phase one_ feedback form _036	I would wish to see the project designed and managed to have minimum impact on onshore ecology, with an aim of zero long term effects	Y	Co2, Co33, Co35, Co120	There are a number of commitments which Hornsea Four have implemented to ensure impacts to ecology are minimised which include the avoidance of sensitive habitats and protected sites (Co 2), any vegetation removal will be undertaken outside the breeding bird season or following a nesting bird check undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist (Co 33). In addition, where required, provision will be made to ensure the normal movements of species such as badger are possible throughout construction (Co 35). Construction site lighting will only be used where necessary and will be directional so as not to disturb species such as bats (Co 69). Habitat manipulation will be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist within areas suitable for reptiles (Co 120). All works are underpinned by an Outline Ecological Management Plan (Volume F2, Chapter 3: **Outline Ecological Management Plan**).
Phase one_feedback form_053	Enhance and improve local habitats with professional and scientific consultation.	N	Co10, Co26	As per Co 10, all working areas will be reinstated to pre-existing conditions as far as reasonably practical, in line with standard industry guidance. In addition, in line with Co 26, trees and hedgerows that require removal, will be replanted with locally appropriate native species. Where agreed with landowners, removed hedgerows and trees will be replaced with hedgerows of a more

				diverse and locally native species composition than that which was removed (see Co194).
Phase one_feedback form_055	Rickaby Wood was noted as a key ecological site, contains many mammals, birds, amphibians including Great Crested Newts	N/A	Co2	Following further refinement of the scoping boundary to the PEIR boundary, Rickaby Wood is no longer within the Project footprint and therefore not subject to any potential effects. This was clarified during the phase two section 47 consultation. Sensitive areas including ancient woodland will be avoided by the permanent project footprint. Furthermore, where possible, unprotected areas of woodland and mature trees will be avoided (Co 2).

EIA topic area: Hydrology and Flood Risk

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_004, Phase one_feedback form_021	Respondents highlighted the importance of high-level and low-level drainage systems, which must not be compromised or land reverts to swamp. Consider offering assistance to internal drainage board e.g. assistance with flood protection (N.B. prevent breach on Old Howe).	N/A	Co14, Co19	Appropriate mitigation measures have been identified-for Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Further details are provided in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**. Hornsea Four will develop a construction drainage scheme using a land drainage consultant and in consultation with landowners and the relevant authorities (Co14). Operational drainage will also be developed in accordance with the Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy (**Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**) (Co19).

Phase one_feedback form_022, Phase one_feedback form_024, Phase one_feedback form_032, Phase one_feedback form_056, Phase one_feedback form_057	Respondents highlighted potential damage to existing drainage system once construction has been completed. This includes any requirements to divert watercourses along the onshore ECC. The River Hull/West Beck was noted as an important	N/A	Co1, Co19	The Applicant has committed to crossing all main rivers, Internal Drainage Board (IDB) maintained drains, main roads and railways will by HDD or other trenchless technology as set out in the Onshore Crossing Schedule (Co 1). As per **Volume A1, Annex 4.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule**, River Hull Headwaters (SSSI) will be crossed by HDD (Crossing Identification Number ECC_WA_097). There is no identified requirement to divert watercourses along the onshore cable route. Consideration of flood risk of the project (including risks to and as a result of the project) have been considered in the Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment (**Volume A6, Annex 2.2: Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment**).
Phase one_feedback form_028	Respondents highlighted the prevalence of flooding in the area and the exceptionally high-water table, with potential impacts to farming activities and IDB drains.	N/A	Co14, Co23,	As per Co 14, drainage systems in each field will be identified by a Land Drainage Consultant prior to construction. This will enable an assessment to be made of any impacts on drainage during construction, and for reinstatement (such as additional or replacement field drains) to be targeted appropriately. Cut-off drainage will be installed prior to start of construction to ensure that existing drainage systems which lie outside the working width function properly during construction and also to prevent excess water flowing into the working width. Also, as set out in Co19, a surface water drainage scheme will be designed so that the existing run-off rates to the surrounding water environment are maintained at pre-development rates.
Phase one_feedback form_042	Please avoid works around Barmston drain to avoid village flooding	Y	Co143	As set out in Co143, a landfall site that avoids the Barmston Main Drain has been selected. This site selection and refinement of landfall is detailed in **Volume A4, Annex 3.1: Selection and Refinement of the Cable Landfall**.

				Due to other constraints, the drain will be crossed further inshore to the southeast of Gembling using Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) technology to cause minimal disruption to the drainage system.
Phase one_feedback form_046	The changing climate needs to be taken into consideration if the Yorkshire cliffs are receding at such tremendous rates.	N/A	N/A	Cliff erosion has been a key consideration in determining the appropriate site for landfall and its associated components, as described in **Volume A4, Annex 3.1: Selection and Refinement of the Cable Landfall**.
Phase one_feedback form_053	Build in flood alleviation to enhance the local landscape	N/A	Co19	Appropriate mitigation measures have been identified for Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in **Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk** as well as the outline CoCP (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**) and Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy (**Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**). As set out in Co19, a surface water drainage scheme will be designed so that the existing run-off rates to the surrounding water environment are maintained at pre-development rates.
Phase one_feedback form_057	Your engineers need to seriously consider risks of serious/relatively long-term flooding in the River Hull Valley in areas where the river is higher than surrounding land and proposed installations.	N/A	Co14, Co19	Flood risk implications of the proposed development (including risks to and from the proposed development) have been considered in the Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment (**Volume A6, Annex 2.2: Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment**). The proposed development incorporates measures during the construction phase (Construction Drainage Scheme, Co14) and operation phase (Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy, Co19) to manage flood risk and ensure that there are no increases in flood risk as a result of the proposals.

	Attached plans show approximate proposed cable route, areas of concerns with flooding/inundation risk, West Beck/River Hull (2.3m higher than adjacent land). Any breach or overtopping of West Beck/River Hull for 10 miles south of Corpslanding results in overwhelming of lowland drainage system capacity and consequent flooding of all land in system. Attached photos showing the view from east of Corpslanding looking west over 'Brigham Ings' in June 2007 - Circles some water which is on the proposed cable route and is approximately 1m deep. Rape crop in the foreground is also completely inundated but was 2m high and still appears green. After heavy rainfall in June 2007, field through which proposed cable route passes was completely inundated. Also sends picture of field 200m east of Corpslanding 2007			

	lowland drain (Nafferton Drain), River Hull 300m east of proposed cable route with water overtopping the east bank and picture of lowland drain - Nafferton drain in winter of 2017/18. Also sends picture of riverbanks adjacent to Corpslanding, showing breach of riverbanks, 'repairs' by Environment Agency and level of West Beck/River Hull.			
Phase one_feedback form_057	Effects on low land drainage system and field drainage systems. Limitations imposed b 6x220 K volt cables on proposed and future drainage schemes through arable land and maintenance of existing systems. Proposal would have large cost implications for any future work. Safety aspects of 220,000 volts buried only 1.2 metres deep. With regard to above issues and operation of agricultural equipment. Long term resolution of weed	N/A	Co14, Co19	Appropriate mitigation measures have been identified for Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Further details are provided in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**. Hornsea Four will develop a construction drainage scheme using a land drainage consultant and in consultation with landowners and the relevant authorities (see Co14). Operational drainage will also be developed in accordance with the Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy (**Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**) (Co19). The normal expected cable burial depth of 1.2m to the top of the cable or duct containing the cable, allows for a protective tape of tile to be laid above the cable at a depth of approximately 1.0m. However, in certain conditions, in consultation with the landowners the cables can be laid at a depth of up to 1.5m if required.

	infestation arising due to 2 years of uncontrolled weed growth and seed return. based on recent experience, this will take approx.10 years post-return of land to resolve and at a large cost (yield/production loss). We are taking legal advice on the latter point and on the depth of cable installation.			In relation to safety, the location of all newly installed cables are recorded and visible marker plates are installed at appropriate locations along the cable route to identify the location of the cables. The cables have a protective tile / tape installed above them to indicate the presence of the cable and provide a degree of mechanical protection. Guidance on working in close proximity to high voltage cables are provided in the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Guidance Document HSG47. In relation to soil management and weed growth, the Applicant require our Contractors to adhere to the guidance from DEFRA and other guidance in relation to the handling of soils and ensure that any disturbed soils are protected and maintained and the soil returned in a good a condition as possible. Further details are provided in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**
Phase one_feedback form_028, Phase one_feedback form_44, Phase one_feedback form_54	Long term impact and disruption of productive land for the next few years and long-term drainage of fields was cited as a key issue for respondents. Respondents requested a long-term commitment to repair drains properly and monitor drainage to ensure there is no crop loss. This includes the impact the pipeline would have on GPS.	N/A	Co14	Drainage systems in each field will be identified by a Land Drainage Consultant prior to construction. This will enable an assessment to be made of any impacts on drainage during construction, and for reinstatement (such as additional or replacement field drains) to be targeted appropriately (Co14). In relation to export cable impacts on GPS, the emfs.info website states that impacts may occur only if the Applicant installed overhead lines which would then act as a physical barrier, just as there can be some degradation close to buildings and trees. Accordingly, buried cables should have no impact on satellite navigation systems.

EIA topic area: Landscape and Visual

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_010 ,Phase one_feedback form_023, Phase one_feedback form_025, Phase one_feedback form_037, Phase one_feedback form_041, Phase one_feedback form_042, Phase one_feedback form_043, Phase one_feedback form_046	Respondents questioned how far the offshore wind turbines will be located offshore and their visibility from the beach. In addition, some respondents questioned why additional offshore turbines were needed when turbines were visible onshore. This includes a number of projects in operation off the East Coast. Respondents did highlight that visual impact would be significantly less offshore than in would be onshore.	N/A	N/A	The Hornsea Four wind turbines will be located approximately 65 km from Flamborough Head - the closest coastal location to the wind farm array area. At this distance, 'excellent' visibility conditions would be required to see a very limited number of wind turbines (in the order of 1-30 turbines). Using Met Office visibility information for the area, it has been calculated that the wind turbines would only be visible on approximately one day per year from Flamborough Head, and approximately 5 hours per year from the coast around Bridlington. In addition to the wind turbines, there will be up to three High Voltage Alternating Current (HVAC) booster stations located over 25 km from Flamborough Head. Again, 'Very good' visibility would be required for these booster stations to be visible from the coast, meaning that the booster stations would only be visible on approximately 122 days from Flamborough Head and approximately 43 days from the coast around Bridlington. As such, the Applicant considers that the visual impact from the offshore elements of the projects will be negligible and not significant.
Phase one_email_061	Will this wind farm be visible from the heritage coast, including coastal sections within the North York Moors National Park?	N/A	N/A	

	(Flamborough Head to Ravenscar) According to maps this is 55 miles + from the development zone. Surely it can't be visible from here? How close is the nearest WTG to the coast?			
Phase one_feedback form_011, Phase one_feedback form_017, Phase one_feedback form_018	Respondents highlighted the importance of minimising visual impact of the project, notably the onshore substation. This may have an impact on individual properties, landowners and farmers.	N/A	N/A	Any permanent infrastructure at the landfall and along the onshore cable route will be located below ground and not visible. Therefore, the only above ground visible infrastructure will be the onshore substation See **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual** for an assessment of all elements of Hornsea Four, including outline mitigation proposals. Potential design mitigation measures for the OnSS are presented in **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan** and **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**.
Phase one_feedback form_021, Phase one_feedback form_033, Phase one_feedback form_049	Respondents pointed out that consultation materials stated that potential high-level cable options (i.e. overhead pylons) would be assessed, which would be undesirable. However, they were told this is not being considered and we misunderstood.	N/A	Co25	The Applicant clarified that no overhead pylons are proposed as part of the Project, which has been made a Commitment (Co 25). Any permanent infrastructure at the landfall and along the onshore cable route will be located below ground and not visible. Therefore the only above ground visible infrastructure will be the onshore substation. Landscape and visual impacts of all onshore elements of Hornsea Four are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 4, Landscape and Visual**, including outline mitigation proposals.

	Burial of transmission line and minimising visual impact of stations are vital, along with reinstating the area to its previous condition.			
Phase one_feedback form_026. Phase one_feedback form_037, Phase one_feedback form_043, Phase one_feedback form_025	Respondents were concerned about the visual impact of the onshore substation and the impact during the construction phase. Once constructed, it was also requested that the OnSS should be screened by trees to limit the visual impact. It was also pointed out that land along the coast was flat, so any manmade structure takes away the natural beauty of the area, including for tourists.	N/A	N/A	Plans for the Hornsea Four OnSS are described in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**. Landscape and visual impacts of all onshore elements, including the OnSS, are set out in **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**. The Applicant has also provided an outline Design Plan (**Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**) and outline Landscape Management Plan (**Volume F2, Chapter 8**), which identifies how this infrastructure will be incorporated into the environment best by selective use of appropriate design. Design measures associated with the OnSS have been developed iteratively during the pre-application consultation period, including the involvement of key stakeholders as part of the Onshore Substation Consultation Group (OSCG). Information was available during the phase two section 47 consultation where the Applicant invited feedback on the proposals (see **Chapter 1: Consultation Report**).
Phase one_email_064	Now I realise that there are plans to bring the electricity on to the grid at Creyke Beck substation. I have lived in Cottingham for nearly 60 years and witnessed the ugly building that mars the local landscape. We walk ours dogs every day in sight	N/A	N/A	

	of it and use the public footpath that passes by the fence line Recently it was enlarged which was distressing enough. Please advise me of what plans are being made to further increase this eyesore as I can see no real mention of them in the booklet.			
Phase one_feedback form_025	Already enough wind turbines in our area	N/A	N/A	No onshore wind turbines are proposed as part of the Hornsea Four. In addition to this, the offshore wind turbines will be located approximately 65km offshore from the Yorkshire coast.
Phase one_feedback form_036	After re-instatement and naturalisation, I would hope to see NO visual impact onshore in the rural areas	I	Co10	Hornsea Four has made a commitment to reinstate the working area post-construction to pre-existing condition as far as reasonably practical in line with DEFRA 2009 Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298 (Co10). For information regarding impact assessment, see **Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions**. Landscape and visual impacts of all onshore elements during the operational phase of Hornsea Four are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**, including outline mitigation proposals.
Phase one_feedback form_025	We have been assured by your team there will be no visual impact in the landfall area after initial works complete.	I	Co10	Landscape features at the landfall and along the cable corridor will be restored as far as reasonably practical, following completion of the cable installation. Any permanent infrastructure at the landfall and along the onshore cable route will be located below ground and not visible. Therefore,

				the only above ground visible infrastructure will be the OnSS (see **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**).
Phase one_feedback form_048	I asked about reparations along the route of the cables and was assured that it would be possible to overfill and plant on top. All good.	I	Co10	Hornsea Four has made a commitment to reinstate the working area post-construction to pre-existing condition as far as reasonably practical in line with DEFRA 2009 Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298 (Co10). For information regarding impact assessment, see **Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions**.
Phase one_feedback form_053	Important to enhance landscape to protect the local environment to absorb emissions and alleviate flooding	I	Co14, Co19	Landscape features will be restored as far as reasonably practical to the existing condition, following completion of the onshore cable installation. The proposed development incorporates measures during the construction phase (i.e. Construction Drainage Scheme, Co 14) and operation phase (i.e. Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy, Co 19) to manage flood risk and ensure that there is no increase in flood risk as a result of the proposals.
Phase one_feedback form_021	Minimise visual intrusion. Minimise disruption e.g. to rights of way. Full restoration of landscape. Non-interference with all drainage systems.	I	Co79, Co25	Hornsea Four has committed to bury the onshore cable reducing visual and landscape effects to those associated with the OnSS (Co25). **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan** and **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan** identifies how this infrastructure will be incorporated into the environment via the selection use of appropriate design. Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the OnSS site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co.79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the

				temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Phase one_feedback form_007	Lighting: If working at night - levels of lighting to be considered to ensure no impact on residents	N/A	Co69	As per Co69, construction site lighting will only operate when required and will be positioned and directed to avoid unnecessary illumination to residential properties, sensitive ecological receptors, footpath users, and minimise glare to users of adjoining public highways.
Phase one_feedback form_046	I hope that a lot of thought will go in to where the cables are positioned for landfall as the cliffs are eroding at such a rate in the area. If cables have to cross because of those already in the area - how will this be achieved? (offshore). Is there any EMFs from these cables - will the fish/fishing industry be affected? 6 cables seem a lot to bring in - the cable corridor will have to be very wide? Any possibility to have fewer as technology advances? The farms in Norfolk concerned as the how long it will take their land to recover after cables are buried on their land. Some turbine blades have suffered from the onslaught of ice in winder gales which	N/A	N/A	The cliff recession rates described in **Volume A5, Annex 1.1: Marine Processes Technical Report** are based on NCREM data, projected over 35 years. In summary, it has been concluded that there will be no significant impacts on the cliffs as a result of the presence of Hornsea Four. If the cables must cross third party infrastructure, such as existing cables, both the third-party asset and the installed cable must be protected. This is typically achieved through some form of armouring like rock placement or concrete mattress to maintain the integrity of the cable. The spatial extent of EMFs will be limited to the immediate vicinity of the cable and the magnitude is considered to be minor. Recent research reported that the effects of EMF result in no unusual behaviour being observed in Atlantic salmon (both adult and smolt stages) and European eel. Based on the available evidence on EMFs, the impact of EMFs on fish and shellfish species has been agreed with the Planning Inspectorate and relevant statutory consultees to be scoped out of further assessment for Hornsea Four. Up to 6 offshore export cables will be installed within am offshore cable corridor of 1.5km. At the end of the operational lifetime of Hornsea Four (anticipated to be 35 years), it is expected that any infrastructure above the seabed will need to be completely removed. A decommissioning plan will be developed and agreed

	has led to them having to be replaced because of being damaged and just farming - the technology moved on to improve the design and fabric? Decommissioning - Fast forward 25/30 years - cables are going to be left. What will the effect of salt water be on them - is that known? Will their position still be monitored? Where will the power be coming from then? Will a new wind farm be built in the area or what? Are you hoping for another source of power to have been created/designed etc?			prior to decommissioning of the infrastructure, to take account of new techniques and technology. Although it is expected that most array and export cables will be left in situ, for the purposes of this consent application it has been assumed that all cables will be removed during decommissioning, though any cable protection installed will be left in situ. Exposed cables are more likely to be removed to ensure they don't become hazards to other users of the seabed. At this point in time, it cannot be accurately determined whether and which cables will be exposed at the time of decommissioning. Once onshore, it is likely that the cables would be deconstructed to recover and recycle the copper and/or aluminium and steel within them. Route selection forms an integral part of the design process and is detailed in **Volume A4, Annex 3.3: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure**. An EMF compliance statement was submitted as part of the PEIR submission and can be found along with the rest of the documents as part of the consultation package for Hornsea Four (https://hornsea4feedback.commonplace.is/).

EIA topic area: Historic Environment

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_001, Phase one_feedback form_011, Phase	Respondents highlighted a number of key archaeology sites along the onshore ECC, include an iron age fortification near Gembling	i	Co2, Co162	As set out in Co 2, the following sensitive sites will be avoided by the permanent project footprint: Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens (Thwaite Hall and Risby Hall), Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, non-designated built heritage assets and Ancient Woodland. Please refer to **Volume A6, Annex 5.1: Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment** for

one_feedback form_033, Phase one_feedback form_046, Phase one_feedback form_053	and British roman settlements around Beck Hill. Respondents highlighted the importance of historic sites for future generations and the opportunities available to learn more about archaeology in the area and how local heritage can be improved.			detailed lists of designated heritage assets that are avoided by Hornsea Four. With the exception of River Hull Headwaters SSSI and one Scheduled Monument (see **Volume A6, Annex 5.1: Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment** for details), sensitive sites have been avoided. Any remaining impacts on heritage assets are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment**. Where possible, unprotected areas of woodland, mature, and protected trees (e.g. veteran trees) shall also be avoided. Furthermore, Co169 states that an Onshore Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) will be developed in line with an Outline Onshore Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (**Volume F2, Chapter 10: Outline Onshore Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation**). The onshore WSI will detail the survey and archaeological mitigation requirements in advance of and during construction. Where possible, as demonstrated in **Volume F2, Chapter 14: Outline Enhancement Strategy**, some heritage assets may be enhanced, through agreement with local stakeholders.
Phase one_feedback form_025, Phase one_feedback form_030	Respondents highlighted the importance of a number of SSSI's, including Skipsea, which is not allowed to be dug on (without GAD)	N/A	Co2	In line with Co 2, sensitive sites such as SSSIs have been avoided during project design, which includes Skipsea Bail Mere SSSI. Where unavoidable (such as the River Hull SSSI and Bryan Mills Field LWS) crossing methodologies will be discussed (and agreed) with relevant stakeholders. Please refer to **Volume A6, Annex 3.1: Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report** for details.
Phase one_feedback form_037	Local chalk rivers (See E. Yorkshire Rivers Trust Website r.e. these rivers being under threat from urban development)	i	Co4, Co34	We recognise the sensitivity of chalk rivers such as the River Hull / West Beck, and the project includes a range of measures to prevent adverse impacts. As set out in Co 1, all main rivers and IDB maintained drains will be crossed by HDD or other trenchless technology where technically feasible, and as set out in the onshore crossing schedule.

				In addition, and through Co 4, a pollution prevention plan will be developed and implemented during works associated with the Project. The pollution prevention plan will be based on the outline pollution prevention plan, which forms an appendix to **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. It will set out a range of best practice pollution prevention and control measures that will prevent contaminated during construction and operation (e.g. with fine sediment, soils, construction materials, foul water, oils and lubricants).

EIA topic area: Land Use and Agriculture

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_021, Phase one_feedback form_030, Phase one_feedback form_035, Phase one_feedback form_055.	Respondents emphasised that interruption of PROWs must be avoided or at least minimised. Vital infrastructure on minor roads means these cannot be disruption at all. - Yorkshire Water at Tophill Low - Environment Agency. Respondents listed other notable PRoWs, such as Minister Way, and the PRoW from Ulrome to Skipsea.	I	Co79, Co144	Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the OnSS site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Co79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. This plan will contain details of measures (e.g. the use of set routes) to manage construction traffic routeing in agreement with East Riding of Yorkshire Council taking in to account all sensitive locations. The crossing of Carr Lane (leading

				to Tophill Low) by the onshore cable will be made underground and will not therefore affect access to this site. The Applicant can also confirm that the Rickaby Wood PRoW will not be affected. the cable corridor passes over 2.4km from Ulrome at its nearest point.
Phase one_feedback form_022	Damage to soil inevitable	N/A	Co10	Consideration of impacts relating to geology and ground conditions can be found within **Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions**. As secured through Co 10, on completion of the project, all temporary working areas will be reinstated to pre-existing condition as far as reasonably practical in line with DEFRA 2009 Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298. Further information regarding soil management measures is provided in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Phase one_feedback form_026, Phase one_feedback form_042, Phase one_feedback form_043, Phase one_feedback form_048 Phase one_feedback form_055	Respondents commented on the popular coastal area for local and tourists (beach and cliff top walks). Respondents also requested that there will be no loss to English coastal path on local footpaths/access roads. There could be an opportunity to improve existing cycle path at proposed site of substation.	N/A	N/A	Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the Onshore Substation site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co.79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. The PRoW at the OnSS site will be permanently diverted and where possible, enhanced as per **Volume A4, Annex 4.6: Outline Design Vision Statement**.
Phase one_feedback form_027, Phase	Respondents highlighted potential short- and long-	N/A	N/A	Impacts on agriculture have been assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Disruption will be minimised as far as practicable and appropriate compensation agreed.

one_feedback form_022, Phase one_feedback form_032	term disruption to farming activities.			
Phase one_feedback form_046	Land is being used in many areas for building projects and loss of hedgerows and tress etc are being lost.	I	Co26	In line with Co26 removed hedgerows and trees will be replaced with locally appropriate native species.
Phase one_feedback form_053	As part of the Woodmansey Neighbourhood Planning Proposal is to enhance community use of land and PROW, creating walking and cycling routes	I	Co79	The Applicant confirmed that the proposals do not encroach within 2.4km of Woodmansey.
Phase one_ feedback form _022	Potential disruption higher tier stewardship agreement	N/A	N/A	All landowners that will be directly affected by new infrastructure on their land have been contacted regarding compensation agreements through their land agents. Where Countryside Stewardship schemes are in place these should be identified by the landowner and we will consider these on a case-by-case basis as part of any such discussions. Impacts on stewardship schemes and agricultural land is contained in **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**.

EIA topic area: Traffic and Transport

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

Phase one_feedback form_029	Creyke Beck Substation connection and connector station; No construction traffic via Cottingham village and Dunswell village. All traffic via dedicated access from A1079. On completion this access to be used for emergence only. No buildings to obstruct view from St Mary's Church Cottingham and Beverley Minister	Y	Co150, Co1517	The Applicant has removed all construction and operational access from the south of the OnSS. As such, all vehicles will route from the north, via the A1079. This will remove any traffic from Cottingham and Dunswell. In recognition of the importance of such views, Hornsea Four has committed to no infrastructure obstructing the view from St Mary's Church Cottingham to Beverley Minister (Co151).
Phase one_feedback form_007, Phase one_feedback form_024, Phase one_feedback form_054	Respondents highlighted concerns about increasing traffic movements through rural villages whilst works are being undertaken, such as through Barmston. Respondents also noted that lorries driving through villages would cause damage.	N/A	Co144	The Applicant has committed to the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (Co 144). The CTMP will contain details of measures to manage construction traffic routeing to ensure that no Hornsea Four traffic passes through Barmston village (see **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**) which includes an outline CTMP. The CTMP will set standards and procedures for managing the safe passage of HGV traffic via the local highway network. In addition, prior to commencement of construction works, the Applicant and local highway authority would agree how any damage to the highway attributable to Hornsea Four would be monitored and mitigated.
Phase one_feedback form_023	There will inevitably be some level of traffic disruption during land work and while it is undesirable, it is understood, and accepted.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase one_feedback	Respondents highlighted that rural villages cannot	N/A	N/A	**Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport** includes an assessment of the impacts of increases in Hornsea Four construction traffic upon all roads within

form_024, Phase one_feedback form_025, Phase one_feedback form_035, Phase one_feedback form_038, Phase one_feedback form_042, Phase one_feedback form_044, Phase one_feedback form_049	cope with the high volume of traffic on rural roads, especially for the use of Heavy Goods Vehicles. Disruption should be kept to a minimum, and it was noted that this would only be short term. Of notable examples. Brigham was highlighted as a village where construction traffic may travel through, which of concern for local residents. Only access is through this village and over a narrow bridge.			the traffic and transport study area. A range of potential mitigation measures has been identified by Hornsea Four to ensure that residual impacts are not significant. A key mitigation measure (Co144) will be the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The CTMP (see **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** for an outline version of the CTMP) will set standards and procedures for: * Managing the numbers and routeing of HGVs during the construction phase; * Managing the movement of employee traffic during the construction phase; * Details of localised road improvements necessary to facilitate safe use of the existing road network; and * Detail of measures to manage the safe passage of HGV traffic via the local highway network. In addition, prior to commencement of construction works, the Applicant and local highway authority would agree how any damage to the highway attributable to Hornsea Four would be monitored and mitigated, in line with the measures set out in the outline CTMP (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). Following completion of the construction of Hornsea Four, there would be low levels of operational traffic demand as onshore operation and maintenance will be largely preventative and corrective, with remote monitoring of the onshore cables and onshore substation.
Phase one_feedback form_030	Access to Lockington village retained from A164 at all times.	N/A	Co1	The Applicant does not envisage the requirement to restrict access to Lockington Village and has committed (Co1) to the use of HDD or other trenchless technology to ensure that all main roads (including Station Road serving Lockington) would not need to be closed to install the cables for Hornsea Four.

Phase one_feedback form_033	Once the work is complete there will be no extra traffic	N/A	N/A	**Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport** details that the impacts from traffic generation during operation of Hornsea Four have been scoped out of assessment. The rationale for this agreement being the low levels of operational traffic demand as onshore operation and maintenance will be largely preventative and corrective, with remote monitoring of the onshore cables and onshore substation.
Phase one_feedback form_037	A major issue. Local single-track roads used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders. Danger and disturbance from construction traffic	N/A	N/A	**Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport** includes an assessment of the impacts of Hornsea Four construction traffic upon 'local single-track road' (referred to as Driver delay - Local roads) and Pedestrian Amenity, which considers the vulnerability of all non-motorised users. The assessment identifies the requirement for a range of mitigation measures to ensure that residual effects are not significant. A key mitigation measure (Co144) will be the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The detailed CTMP will include further details of measures to manage the safe passage of HGV traffic via the local highway network and will also include commitment driver inductions/ training to increase awareness of sensitive routes. See **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** for an outline version of the CTMP.
Phase one_feedback form_053	Enhancing local public transport and bus shelters.	N/A	N/A	A review of the existing public transport provision has identified that due to the remote location of the construction sites relative to existing public transport routes there would be limited opportunities for construction employees to use public transport to access Hornsea Four. No enhancements are therefore proposed to local public transport and bus shelters.

EIA topic area: Noise and Vibration

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

Phase one_feedback form_007, Phase one_feedback form_018, Phase one_feedback form_023, Phase one_feedback form_046	Respondents highlighted inevitable noise and vibration from construction works, including during HDD operations and construction at night, along with proximity to residential properties. It was suggested that agreements should be made on levels of noise, vibration and lighting with local authorities along with the construction working hours. A question was also asked on the location of the onshore substation.	N/A	Co123	Hornsea Four has committed (Co49) to routing the onshore export cable corridor a minimum of 50m away from residential properties. Hornsea Four has committed to the following in relation to core construction working hours: • Monday to Friday: 07:00 - 18:00 hours; • Saturday: 07:00 - 13:00 hours; • Up to one hour before and after core working hours for mobilisation ("mobilisation period"), i.e. 06:00 to 19:00 weekdays and 06:00 to 14:00 Saturdays; and • Maintenance period 13:00 to 17:00 Saturdays. Activities carried out during mobilisation and maintenance will not generate significant noise levels (such as piling, or other such noisy activities). In circumstances outside of normal working practices, specific works may have to be undertaken outside the normal working hours. In these instances, the project will inform ERYC in writing. Based on noise modelling results, and for locations where noise has the potential to cause disturbance, the use of mufflers, acoustic barriers and directional lighting for areas where HDD is undertaken will be implemented (Co123). ERYC has been, and will continue to be, consulted and included on all planning matters as the project progresses including those associated with lighting, noise and vibration impacts and mitigation.
Phase one_feedback form_025	Vibration is known to have impact on wildlife	N/A	N/A	A suite of onshore ecological surveys have been undertaken, with findings detailed in **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation**. Where identified, appropriate mitigation have been proposed to minimise any potential impacts.
Phase one_feedback form_037, Phase	Respondents were concerned about noise and vibration during the	N/A	N/A	**Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration** contains assessment of construction activity. This assessment includes impacts from construction traffic associated with Hornsea Four.

one_feedback form_042	construction and excavation phase. The noise from traffic movement and the construction of access roads was also an issue.			Hornsea Four has committed (Co144) to the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The CTMP will set standards and procedures for managing the safe passage of HGV traffic via the local highway network and will identify the routes for which HGVs and/or other construction related vehicles will most likely take for the project. See **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** for an outline version of the CTMP.
Phase one_feedback form_043, Phase one_feedback form_053	Respondents highlighted their concerns for noise from onshore infrastructure in a rural setting, which should be limited.	N/A	Co159	Hornsea Four has committed (Co159) to limiting noise from the onshore infrastructure. Commitment Co159 states: "Operational noise from the onshore substation will be at a noise level no greater than 5dB above the representative background (LA90, T) during the daytime and night at the NSRs. Furthermore, information regarding noise mitigation is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**, with the respective noise levels being secured by Requirement 7 of the DCO.

EIA topic area: Air Quality and Health

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase one_feedback form_047	We are very interest in the efficacy of the cable shielding, particularly in respect of reducing the distance the EMF travels underground	N/A	N/A	An EMF compliance statement is submitted as part DCO application (**Volume A4, Annex 4.3: EMF Compliance Statement**).

EIA topic area: Socio-economics

Comment ID	Comment	Project change?	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

(consultation_feedback type_comment ID)		(Y/N/I or N/A)		
Phase one_feedback form_008	Displacement and subsequent loss of income for fishing industry.	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four has assessed the potential impacts of construction and operation on affected UK fishing vessels. Where significant effects are identified, mitigation will be proposed to reduce the impact to environmentally acceptable levels.
Phase one_feedback form_035, Phase one_feedback form_038, Phase one_feedback form_053	Respondents highlighted the importance of employing locally where possible and utilising local suppliers. It was also highlighted importance of highlighting and enhancing the local economy and employment.	N/A	N/A	A number of stakeholders, including ERYC, Parish Councils and members of the community highlighted the importance of maximising the potential benefits associated with Hornsea Four, including jobs and opportunities particularly in the construction phase for local businesses. A socio-economics assessment has been undertaken for Hornsea Four, which assesses the impact of the construction and operation of the project on the local and UK economies. See **Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economic**. Further information on the positive impacts of Hornsea Four on the local economy and community is also available in **Volume F2, Chapter 18: Outline Supply Chain and Employment Plan**.
Phase one_feedback form_042	No benefits locally	N/A	N/A	In addition to the above, the Applicant will review the interactions of the project as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. This includes a voluntary Community Benefit Fund (CBF), many of which have been establishment for a number of projects which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Four could be made post-financial investment decision (FID).
Phase one_feedback form_048	Personally, I fully supply a scheme that increase the percentage of electricity	N/A	N/A	Orsted is engaged in a number of Partnerships and Initiatives with local schools and charities in both the Humber and the East Riding of Yorkshire.

	generation coming from renewables. Orsted presence in the area is good news for the economy. Would like to see opportunities for school children to understand the work that is being done.			Through our East Coast Community Fund we give grants to organisations delivering science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) related activities. For example: • The Grimsby Institute will receive a grant to build on existing investment and expertise and create an annual programme of events designed to excite, inform and spark curiosity to over 2000 students in junior, secondary, higher education across the coastal zones of North East Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire, East Riding of Yorkshire and East Lincolnshire. • The Teacher Scientist Network is receiving a grant to provide 12 schools in the area free access to all the necessary components to run a four week, after-school, STEM club focused on the assembly of a working wind turbine. • A grant has gone to STEM Learning to fund an ENTHUSE Partnership in the East Riding of Yorkshire. The Partnership will bring together 8 schools and colleges, from the eligible funding area, to develop a two-year intensive improvement programme to raise achievement and aspiration in STEM subjects. • Franklin College were awarded a grant to support students in their STEM academy to undertake paid internships, enabling them to gain vital work experience.

Table 1.2: Applicant regard to phase two section 47 consultation responses by EIA topic area – feedback received via feedback form, email, freepost, information line, and online.

Key

Bold = Contextual information to stakeholder feedback provided by the Applicant for purpose of Table 1.2.

EIA topic area: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)[3]	Project commitment?[4]	Applicant Response
Phase Two_email_004	**Power supply** AC power distribution is tried and tested and integrates with the rest of the national grid with less infrastructure. DC would require more infrastructure at Creyke Beck to convert DC to AC in order to feed into the national supply. The photomontages of AC and DC installations at Creyke Beck show the difference in visual impact.	N/A	N/A	Due to uncertainty (see **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**) a decision on which transmission system (HVDC or HVAC) to adopt will not be made until post-consent after extensive engagement with potential system suppliers has taken place. As a result of this, we have conduced our assessments based on a realistic worst-case scenario, which could either be HVAC or HVDC technology depending on the receptor.
Phase Two_feedback form_009	No objections to the locations of the logistics compounds	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

[3] N/A = Comment is not requesting a project change to be made; Y = Amendments made to the project design as a result of feedback from consultation; N = The applicant has had regard to the comment but determined that a change is not appropriate / justified in the circumstances; I = The applicant has had regard to the comment and incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment

[4] 1o = primary Commitment relevant to this response; Change = any change to the existing Commitment as a consequence of the feedback; New = any new commitment resulting from the comment

Phase Two_feedback form_009	Southern (landfall) site would be preference as furthest from Wilsthorpe	Y	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment. See **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** for selection of the landfall site taken forward to DCO.
Phase Two_feedback form_023	I opt for (landfall option) A4 as there is considerable public use of the beach, car parking, café etc at Fraisthorpe all year round. It is very popular with holiday makers, residents, day trippers, dog walkers etc.	Y	N/A	Comment noted. See **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** for selection of the landfall site taken forward to DCO. Impacts relating to recreational users and tourism are considered in **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture** and **Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics**.
Phase Two_feedback form_009	No objections to offshore array area and offshore export cable - so long as not interfering with shipping lanes	N/A	N/A	Comments noted. The project has assessed vessel movements and displacement associated with offshore construction activities within **Volume A2, Chapter 8: Shipping and Navigation**.
Phase Two_feedback form_012	Our preference would be the more southerly landfall access point as we frequently use Fraisthorpe beach and its amenities, for a peaceful walk on the beach	Y	N/A	Comment noted. See **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** for selection of the landfall site taken forward to DCO.
Phase Two_feedback form_013	Other providers who require a cable corridor should be consulted, and a common corridor used. At present two corridors are to be provided which will double the amount of food growing land disturbed, and double the amount of works required.	N/A	N/A	The potential for onshore impacts arising as a result of Hornsea Four to combine with other planned developments (including Dogger Bank Creyke Beck) is assessed in each respective topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (**Volume A3: Onshore Environmental Assessment**), under the heading 'Cumulative Effect Assessment'. Due to differing stages of applications and potential construction periods, it is not possible to share the same onshore export cable corridor route as Forewind's Dogger Bank offshore wind farm.

Phase Two_feedback form_014	The project should take a shorter and less disruptive route	I	N/A	Following on from the design refinement process, which took into consideration consultation responses, the onshore cable corridor has been refined to avoid and minimise impacts on sensitive receptors. **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** sets out the route refinement process which considered, amongst other factors, technical and environmental factors.
Phase Two_feedback form_014	I support the principles of renewable/green energy, but think less disruptive methods of delivery could be found.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment. Hornsea Four has been designed through the route planning and site selection process to minimise potential effects through both construction and operational phases.
Phase Two_feedback form_013, Phase Two_feedback form_014, Phase Two_feedback form_015, Phase Two_feedback form_017, Phase Two_feedback form_021, Phase Two_feedback form_023, Phase Two_feedback form_025, Phase Two_online_038, Phase Two_online_040, Phase Two_online_043, Phase Two_online_048	The 'temporary' access road from the A1079 was frequently mentioned by respondents. Access to this site at present is limited - single-track for some distance. Respondents suggested that this temporary road should remain permanent for access for all contractors, plant and materials. The Cottingham road network, especially Park Lane, was noted as being only suitable for limited traffic, with potential disruption caused by this haul road, such as business disruption. In terms of access, respondents noted that Park Lane is a route for three agricultural businesses, with this also being the only access to the caravan	Y	New	The Applicant has removed all construction and operational access from the south of the onshore substation. As such, all vehicles will route from the north, via the A1079. This will remove any traffic from Park Lane. Regarding the haul road within the onshore export cable corridor, the Environmental Statement has concluded that no significant effects will occur at the sensitive receptor, subject to the incorporation of primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures. Hornsea Four has committed to the following in relation to core construction working hours: • Monday to Friday: 07:00 - 18:00 hours; • Saturday: 07:00 - 13:00 hours; • Up to one hour before and after core working hours for mobilisation ("mobilisation period"), i.e. 06:00 to 19:00 weekdays and 06:00 to 14:00 Saturdays; and

	storage park (Wanlass Farm). Excessive daily traffic movements along Park Lane was opposed with the road currently seeing speeding drivers and debris appearing on the road at times. It was noted that the access road should be of use only for construction traffic (i.e. contractors or plant) and that it should be policed with restricted working hours. The serious fire at the National Grid substation was also noted where emergency services were required.			• Maintenance period 13:00 to 17:00 Saturdays. Activities carried out during mobilisation and maintenance will not generate significant noise levels (such as piling, or other such noisy activities). In circumstances outside of normal working practices, specific works may have to be undertaken outside the normal working hours. In these instances, the project will inform ERYC in writing. The comments regarding fire safety at the nearby Creyke Beck National Grid Substation are noted. The Applicant has undertaken an outline HAZiD report which is available as part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 12: Outline Energy Balancing Infrastructure HAZiD Report**)
Phase Two_feedback form_016, Phase Two_online_044	Less than 1/4 mile from Creyke Beck - all the previous page so aspects of the project ticked before will affect us (Landscape and visual impact, Land use, agriculture, socioeconomics and recreation, Traffic and transport, Noise and vibration)	N/A	N/A	Comment noted.
Phase Two_feedback form_017, Phase Two_feedback form_021	Some respondents noted concerns about the location of the onshore cables, including routeing to the south of onshore substation.. Concern was also expressed about the location of the onshore substation in close proximity to this property, raising	Y	New	The onshore export cable corridor has been sited based on a range of environmental, landowner / tenant and technical constraints and considerations as outlined in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. Having considered all of this information, a route from the northwest of the onshore substation site is considered to be too highly constrained for reasons such as the proximity to Birkhill Wood ancient woodland,

	concerns such as an animal welfare issue to livestock, noise and dust pollution There was a suggested commitment to reduce the land required for the onshore substation and temporary working area the movement of the temporary work area further from Burn Park Farm. The proposed access and haul roads were also cited as key issues for residents at the closest residential receptor neighbours, and residents of Park Lane and Cottingham. The number of daily vehicle movements (1097) was also queried.			Jillywood Local Wildlife Site and the other infrastructure in the area. The site selection process for the onshore substation, in addition to comments received from local stakeholders, informed the selection of the identified site (as identified in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**). The Applicant has engaged with the residents of the closest residential receptor to make amendments to the project footprint where feasible. This has resulted in the temporary works area being moved to the west to provide a greater distance to the identified livestock, and all access being moved to the north from the A1079. In respect of the potential for likely significant effects at surrounding residential receptors, the Environmental Statement has concluded that no significant effects will occur at the sensitive receptor, subject to the incorporation of primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures.
Phase Two_feedback form_021	We as joint tenants of the Burn Park Farmhouse; Buildings and 7 acres of land strongly oppose Hornsea Four because we will become an island in the midst all the development. There is hardly a field surrounding us left untouched, some taken permanently. The peace and quiet for ourselves, the pony heard and domestic pets which we intended to enjoy for our retirement will be destroyed. Three generations, since 1933 have farmed here. The impact on all the above mentioned will be horrendous. A veterinary report, is being prepared re: ponies and pets, and this is now enclosed.	I	N/A	

Phase Two_feedback form_018	My property will be adjacent to the compound near to Creyke Beck. I hope this compound will be safeguarded from my property.	N/A	N/A	The onshore substation temporary works area will be secured by appropriate security fencing. Mitigation measures to avoid significant effects as a result of construction activities are secured in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Phase Two_feedback form_018	I am the owner of *redacted* and strongly oppose this development, in particular the route of the cable connecting the wind farm to the substation at Creyke Beck and crossing my farm. It was also requested that the cables should go under the farm's access road to maintain 24-hour access.	N/A	N/A	A route planning and site selection process has been undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Four. This process is described in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** and has been informed by specific constraints including designated sites, major asset crossings (e.g. road, rail lines and rivers) and proximity to residential properties. Impact to access to *redacted* will be mitigated where possible and the Applicant will continue to engage with the affected receptors throughout the construction period.
Phase Two_feedback form_018, Phase Two_feedback form_055	If this materialises, I expect the route of the cable will be kept close to the boundaries of the fields as much as possible. One respondent also requested that the corridor should remain close to field boundaries to enable recreation purposes to continue, such as equestrian activities.	I	N/A	The Applicant has endeavoured to stick to field boundaries wherever possible in the route planning process. There are a number of constraints which would prevent us from sticking to field boundaries which are described in **Volume A4, Annex 3.1: Selection and Refinement of the Onshore Infrastructure**.
Phase Two_feedback form_018	Plattwood Farm has been in our family for 102 years and is a small family farm which is sadly under threat with thousands of small farms disappearing in	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

	the last few years across the country and we very strongly feel that small farms need to be protected from development and loss.			
Phase Two_feedback form_018	Various factors were suggested to be taken into account in the site selection process for the onshore cables, such as ancient woodland.	N/A	N/A	A route planning and site selection process has been undertaken during the pre-application phase of Hornsea Four. This process is described in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** and has been informed by specific constraints including designated sites (including ancient woodland), which has been avoided entirely by the onshore footprint of Hornsea Four), major asset crossings (e.g. road, rail lines and rivers) and proximity to residential properties.
Phase Two_online_026	I live at [redacted] and had no information on this project until out running at seeing a planning application. Please can you tell me what you are proposing to put the field [redacted] in Walkington?	N/A	N/A	Through the design development process, the onshore cable corridor has been refined to avoid or minimise impacts on sensitive receptors. **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** sets out the route refinement process which considered, amongst other factors, technical and environmental factors. The proposed cable corridor runs to the east of Walkington crossing underneath the B1230 via Horizontal Directional Drilling.
Phase Two_online_026	Because I have had no information on the project and if it opposite my house with large turbines obviously I would not support that.			All wind turbine generators (WTGs) will be located offshore in the Hornsea Four AfL area, with the nearest WTGs situated approximately 65 km offshore from the Flamborough Head.
Phase Two_online_027	River Hull, does the cable go under or over?	N/A	lo Col	The Applicant has committed to crossing all main rivers, Internal Drainage Board (IDB) maintained drains, main roads and railways will by crossed by HDD or other trenchless technology as set out in the Onshore Crossing Schedule (Co1). As per the Onshore Crossing Schedule,

				which forms part of this DCO application, River Hull Headwaters (SSSI) will be crossed by HDD (Ørsted Crossing Identification Number ECC_WA_097). See **Volume A4, Annex 4.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule**.
Phase Two_online_028	The landfall area is potentially suitable, with mitigation. The location is in an area where husbands' ashes are scattered which was near to the two pillboxes on the cliff under the row of trees. Would prefer direct construction works to be routed around or avoid these features.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two_online_029	All elements of the project are suitable as it is not affecting a large population and is environmentally friendly			
Phase Two_online_029, Phase Two_online_030, Phase Two_online_040	Some respondents supported the location of the onshore substation, providing suitable mitigation is in place.	N/A	N/A	Comment noted. Hornsea Four has proposed a range of mitigation measures and landscaping to minimise the visual impact of the onshore substation. See **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual** and **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan** which sets out specific planting and species. **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan** sets out design principles of the onshore substation which are selected to minimise its visual impact, including colour and material finishes.
Phase Two_online_050	Walkington Parish Council notes the proposed siting of the sub-station and the fact that the cable route will run north to south down the eastern side of Walkington between the village itself and Broadgates and wishes to express its concerns about the route that	I	N/A	The routing of Hornsea Four construction traffic has been planned to avoid settlements where possible. HGV traffic will avoid Walkington, with management measures in place to ensure appointed contractors comply, secured in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (an outline of which is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**).

	construction traffic (both for the cable-related work and the sub-station) is likely to take.			
Phase Two_online_031	The location of this element of Hornsea Four is suitable because it is good to have wind power	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two_online_032	The location of this element of Hornsea Four is suitable. Your company have done the work to make sure the project is in the right area.			
Phase Two_online_034	The location of this element of Hornsea Four (YO25 9BA) is potentially suitable, with mitigation. This is the main release and rearing pens for Scorborough Syndicate Shoot which is owned and run by Dalton Estate. There are several main drives which based around this wood. The main concern is that the shoot will be unable to run for at least one shoot season and would be severely disrupted for the shooting season after and potentially before. This will reduce the estates income which is a key part of the Estates business. Might have to find alternative shoot for syndicate shoot as it means the Estate will lose income if this area cannot be shot.	I	N/A	Hornsea Four has consulted with landowners and the local community. Where required, Hornsea Four has taken on board any feedback received and has moved onshore export cables, where it has been possible. Further details of which can be found in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**.

EIA topic area: Project Description

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two _letter_001	My concerns were highlighted last week when your existing wind farm failed, almost simultaneously with a gas fuelled generator in the Midlands. I am also certain that whatever technical issue caused nearly a million people to be stranded with no power for many hours can and will be resolved for the future.			
Phase Two _letter_001	The problem is that there is currently very little spare capacity in the generating family of companies.			
Phase Two _letter_001	We are also stepping up our demand for more electricity and every year household demand rises, despite the use of ever more efficient domestic equipment, and in the not too distant future the growth in electric powered road vehicles will accelerate and who knows where the generation capacity will come from to meet that demand.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two _letter_001	Wind farms are never going to be consistent generators. I understand that you have studied the wind power and that your models will show sufficient production to justify the investment. You			

	wouldn't do this unless you were certain of making money. It's the service you provide that's the issue. Wind comes and goes and the North Sea is certainly the most prolific location around our shores. Again, you would not be here unless it were.			
Phase Two _letter_001	My point is that we need our electricity generators to be a 24/7 providers and only reduce output when servicing demands arise, and this is the same with all your competitors, and can be phased.			
Phase Two _letter_001	The real issue is that wind power is a variable source of energy, and varies from excessive levels to nothing. Nothing doesn't happen very often but when it does no wind will eventually result in no electricity, as we saw last week, and people will be stranded home and away.			
Phase Two _letter_001	There are two other means of renewable energy both tidal power and hydrogen. The tide has four phases every day and is the only constant on our planet, and we are an island where water will always be available, even if we have to use desalination.			
Phase Two _letter_001	So why this rush to build something that's ultimately going to fail in its service demands. When your small the loss will hardly be noticed, but as we saw last week you are now big enough to cause			

	major inconvenience when you fail to generate, and with wind power there will always be times in every month when the wind power is not enough, and there is nothing that can be done about that.			
Phase Two _email_004	This project is a major investment in clean energy. It is a great step in the right direction to help reduce carbon emissions.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two _email_005	We understand the logistics depot is temporary. How long will this be there?	N/A	N/A	Logistics compounds will be in place for a period of up to 36 months.
Phase Two _email_005	Are detailed plans available for the logistics depot?	N/A	N/A	Detailed plans are not available for logistics compounds as the exact use of each compound will be determined per-construction. An indicative description is provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**.
Phase Two _email_006	I recently visited your event in Cottingham, and was pleased to see mention on one of the display stands that you had recognised the view of Beverley from the top of Cottingham's St Mary's Church tower, and how that might be affected by the proposed onshore substation near Creyke Beck. I was assured at the event that any substation wouldn't affect the view. Unfortunately, one of National Grid's pylons already obstructs the 600-year-old view of Beverley Minster towers (see attached photo); I have had discussions with National Grid about this but	N/A	New Co151	A commitment was made during the site selection process for the onshore substation (Co151) to avoid Hornsea Four above ground infrastructure obstructing views from St Mary's Church to Beverley Minster.

	understand that nothing can be done in the short term.			
Phase Two_feedback form_008	UK - the need to be self-sufficient with energy	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two_feedback form_011	Why is the cable corridor 80m in width?	N/A	N/A	Of the 80m cable corridor width, 60m is required for the permanent works area and 10m is required either side for temporary works. A maximum of 60m would be required (with the exception of specific crossings, see **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description** for details) to house a maximum of six cable circuits, in six trenches, to be buried at a target depth of 1.2 m underground. The full project parameters, including the number of cable circuits is set out in Section 4 of **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**.
Phase Two_feedback form_011	What depth will the cable be?	N/A	N/A	Where open cut techniques will be used to install the onshore export cables, they will be buried at a target depth of 1.2 m. Where Hornsea Four may use Horizontal Directional Drilling (or other trenchless techniques) (for example, for roads, railways, high pressure gas pipelines and main rivers) the onshore export cables may be buried at greater depths, to be agreed with the appropriate stakeholders. Full parameters for the onshore export cables are provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**.
Phase Two_feedback form_011	What is the life expectancy of the cables?	N/A	N/A	Parameters of the cable trench are provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**. Cables will be fully operational for the entire life span of the project (expected to be 35 years).
Phase Two_feedback form_025	Perhaps with growing technology this could be lessened (the width) - so much	N/A	N/A	Comment noted.

	of the countryside being taken up and disturbed.			
Phase Two_feedback form_025	Make sure you honour these commitments (dimensions of the onshore substation)	N/A	N/A	Parameters of the onshore substation are provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**. These parameters are a maximum design scenario and are secured via the DCO.
Phase Two_feedback form_025	You have some much still to sort out - The PEIR report gives so many scenarios, it is heard to see way to go at the moment - the cable corridor will be wide if you intend to bring in 6 cables - with growing technology could this number be decreased? When bringing in the cables and working on the tjb's I hope that your timings which you mention take into account any setbacks and the high spring tide which could hamper and restrict any work on the foreshore area.	N/A	N/A	The Hornsea Four Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is based on a maximum design scenario. The full project parameters, including the number of cable circuits is set out in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**. The actual type, number and dimension of any infrastructure installed may be reduced at construction from that described within this document, depending on the final design.
Phase Two_feedback form_025	Does Orsted use SF6 gas?	N/A	N/A	SF6 gas is used by the electrical industry as an insulator to prevent electrical accidents and fires in for instance wind turbines and electrical substations. SF6 is a potent greenhouse gas, but because it is used in very small volumes, SF6 leakage only represents around 0.0001% of the emissions avoided thanks to wind energy every year. The wind industry carefully manages its use of SF6 and takes measures to reduce its use, and where this is not practicable, to mitigate any potential adverse consequences. For further information please see this statement from Wind Europe -

				https://windeurope.org/newsroom/news/wind-energy-and-sf6-in-perspective/
Phase Two_feedback form_025	I see that the Eastern part of The Wash is being mentioned again - PLEASE NO MORE CABLES IN THE WASH! They were the source of so much concern for the marine environment and the landfall area!	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four has no plans to install cables within The Wash. The project design is described within **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**.
Phase Two_feedback form_025	Dogger Bank too gets a mentioned - more cables coming into Creyke Beck Power Station? The people of Suffolk are suffering from overload of energy proposals for that area. This seems to be totally unfair on the population there with little forethought as to what is going on to that specific area . I hope the area North East Yorkshire does not find itself in the same scenario.	N/A	N/A	Comment noted.
Phase Two_online_053	Balancing the need for clean energy while minimising the impacts on the environment			

EIA topic area: Consultation

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_013	Hopefully all the authorities with responsibilities will scrutinise all aspects and conclude with decisions are to the Public Good.	N/A	N/A	Comment noted. The Applicant has been in continued engagement with statutory and non-statutory consultees throughout the pre-application process, and

				will continue to do so following submission of the DCO Application.
Phase Two_feedback form_013	Inform us by email you have received the Hornsea Four feedback form we have completed.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant confirmed receipt of the feedback.
Phase Two_feedback form_016	Nothing regarding the previous pages is in black and white yet so nobody knows how residents will be affected.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two_feedback form_023	I'm impressed with thoroughness of surveys and in general I support the scheme	N/A	N/A	
Phase Two_feedback form_025	Comment about Orsted's eBook for 5-8-year olds. Wonderful! Vanguard produced their work in a book form - "Sam the seagull's big adventure". Would be lovely to have your e-book in a hardback or paperback for schools/libraries, etc.	N/A	N/A	
Phase Two_online_049	One respondent provided comments regarding the difficulty adding comments online and its relation to the paper feedback form.	N/A	N/A	
Phase Two_feedback form_025	Do not know the area well enough to comment BUT listen to the locals and the knowledge they impart - they are the ones who know the area - this includes those using the marine environment - the fisherfolk will know about the seas, tides and seabed. I presume the RNLI are involved as they will know the coastline etc as well.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has engaged with statutory and non-statutory stakeholders, including those who are affected by or living in the vicinity of the project, throughout the duration of the pre-application period. Engagement with commercial fisheries is covered in **Volume A2, Chapter 6: Commercial Fisheries**.

Phase Two_feedback form_025	Do inform the locals of what you are doing - keep them up to date and show transparency with your work. The more they are included the better the relationship will be. Take advice from the local groups you have formed as these people will be able to give you a lot of information - such a good idea.			All feedback and consultation with local stakeholders has been carefully considered by the Applicant and will be incorporated where possible into the final design. A summary of all the comments received and how we have had regard to these is provided within the Consultation Report which forms part of the DCO application. This report also sets out how engagement continued with a range of consultees and stakeholder groups has continued (see **Chapter 1: Consultation Report**).

EIA topic area: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_008, Phase Two_feedback form_025	Some respondents highlighted the fragility of the cliffs and the need to be aware of coastal erosion	I	N/A	During the design development process, Hornsea Four has sought to minimise impacts on the natural environment, including proposing mitigation measures to minimise impact on hydrological features (e.g. coastal processes). Impacts on marine processes includes those associated with coastal erosion are assessed in **Volume A2, Chapter 1: Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes**. **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** sets out the process of identifying the location of the landfall site, which has avoided sensitive areas along the coastline.
Phase Two_feedback form_025	BUT I hope that full consideration has been taken re the cliffs which are fragile and prone to erosion. With rising tides, more tidal surges happening lately the erosion can only get worse/continue.	I	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment

	Nothing seems predictable these days as have been shown in the past few years (2013)! Environment agency predictions are not reliable and they have recently stated that there will be the need for preparation to move from some coastlines further inland (Emma Howard Boyd - Chair of E.A). Fairbourne in Wales is in this stage now.			
Phase Two_feedback form_025	Offshore - I hope that the sediments are such that the cables can be buried to sufficient depths to avoid rock or mattress covers etc which tidal forces these could move and become a hazard to shipping/fishing etc (anchors) if cable become exposed. Do a good job initially so that repairs later on do not have to be undertaken. I understand that crossing other cables etc have been taken into consideration.	N/A	N/A	Comment noted. Hornsea Four is committed to the burying of all export cable infrastructure where ground conditions permit. The use of cable protection by means of rock armouring will be minimised wherever possible.
Phase Two_feedback form_025	The engineers I presume will estimate a suitable distance away from the clifftops for the first HDD entrance shot and make sure that it is a substantial distance back to take into account the continuous erosion so that in the future cables will not become exposed.	I	N/A	Site specific surveys will be undertaken prior to construction to inform construction methodologies, including at landfall where the cables come ashore (see **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**).

EIA topic area: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology

Comment ID	Comment	Project change?	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

(consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)		(Y/N/I or N/A)		
Phase Two_feedback form_023	The impacted on migrating birds was noted as an important issue for some respondents.	I	N/A	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Four on offshore and intertidal ornithology is presented in **Volume A2, Chapter 5: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology**.
Phase Two_feedback form_025	I hope that you will do your own surveys and not just rely on desk-based reviews and Hornsea 1,2 and 3 reports as those cables take different routes across the North Sea and had to take into different accounts of varying sea birds etc and areas to avoid.	N/A	1o Co87	The potential impact of Hornsea Four on different bird species is assessed in **Volume A2, Chapter 5: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology**. This chapter includes all relevant surveys undertaken by the Applicant during the pre-application process. This chapter also highlights any necessary monitoring and/or mitigation measures which could prevent, minimise, reduce or offset the possible environmental effects identified in the EIA process. The proposed developable area has been selected from the larger Hornsea Four Agreement for Lease (AfL) area to avoid areas with the highest concentrations of birds (kittiwake, gannet and guillemot) that are more likely to be displaced by the construction activities, and birds that are more likely to fly at heights that brings them within the rotor swept zone and hence at risk of collision (Co87). The Hornsea Four AfL area has also been reduced from 868 km2 (presented at Scoping) to 600 km2 (presented at PEIR).

EIA topic area: Marine Mammals

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

Phase Two_feedback form_019	A thorough marine life survey over several seasons to be carried out before and after so data can be collated and used on future projects.	I	N/A	A full assessment of the effects of Hornsea Four on marine life is presented in the following Environmental Statement chapters: - **Volume A2, Chapter 2: Benthic and Intertidal Ecology**; - **Volume A2, Chapter 3: Fish and Shellfish Ecology**; - **Volume A2, Chapter 4: Marine Mammals**; and - **Volume A2, Chapter 5: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology**.

EIA topic area: Geology and Ground Conditions

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_011, Phase Two_feedback form_019, Phase Two_feedback form_024, Phase Two_online_047	Respondents requested that land should be reinstated back to its previous purpose. It was highlighted that after 3 years of industrial use, farming land would be in a poor state. A five-year monitoring of the area was also requested. Concerns were raised about monitoring post-construction and that PRoW will suffer subsidence in the years following construction if not monitoring. A commitment was also suggestion to ensure foundation/sub-foundations of	N/A	1o, Co10	Hornsea Four has made a commitment to reinstate the working area post-construction to pre-existing condition as far as reasonably practical in line with DEFRA 2009 Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites PB13298 (Co10). For further information and impact assessment, see **Volume A3, Chapter 1: Geology and Ground Conditions** and **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. The Applicant will pay compensation for any reasonable losses as a result of its works on a proven loss basis, should these losses continue once construction has completed, then claims should continue to be submitted on the basis of the incurred loss with sufficient supporting evidence.

	PRoW are appropriate and not just filling in trenches with topsoil. One respondent also requested that farmers/landowners are guaranteed financial or physical help to correct any problems caused by the works.			Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Interaction with other road or recreational users (e.g. pedestrians) is assessed in **Volume 3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**, with mitigation measures set out in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan**. All roads intersected by Hornsea Four are set out in **Volume A4, Annex 4.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule**.

EIA topic area: Hydrology and Flood Risk

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_015	Some respondents registered a general concern regarding flooding.	N/A	N/A	Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in **Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk** as well as **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**.
Phase Two_feedback form_010	Proximity to house will disrupt the outflow from our septic tank system. Any alteration to the level of flow will cause it to back up.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two_feedback form_010, Phase Two_online_037	Some respondents commented on the current proposed route with regards to flood risk in and around Lockington. This included the avoidance of springs, which run straight through an artisan well/lake	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four has consulted with landowners and the local community. Where required, Hornsea Four has taken on board any feedback received and has moved onshore export cables, where it has been possible. Further details of which can be found in **Volume A1,**

	which flood consistently every year as the water table is at ground level.			**Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. A flood risk assessment for Hornsea Four has been undertaken (see **Volume A6, Annex 3.2 Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment**). Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in **Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk**, **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**.
Phase Two_feedback form_011	How will we be able to do any extra/replacement drainage in the future? Where are the inspection chambers?	N/A	N/A	The exact location of any link boxes which may be used for corrective (not preventative) operational maintenance of the onshore export cables is not yet known. The final design of the location of the link boxes will be established by the Principal Contractor, and where relevant, in consultation with landowners. The Applicant understands the importance of maintaining land drainage systems before, during and after construction and will appoint a local Drainage Consultant who will carry out an assessment of the existing drainage system of the land affected by the works and will prepare a design for the required drainage works on the land affected by the construction works and subsequent restoration. After consultation with the landowner, a drainage scheme will be implemented by a suitably qualified and experienced drainage contractor.

				The Applicant's intention is to ensure that, where reasonably possible, the agricultural land drainage and natural drainage systems are in no worse a condition than before the date of entry for the construction works.
Phase Two_feedback form_011, Phase Two_feedback form_012, Phase Two_feedback form_019, Phase Two_feedback form_021	Concern about drainage on farmland was raised by a number of respondents, including the high-water table through Foston which has a previous history of flooding. A question was also asked about who the Applicant will link up with existing flood alleviation systems. The detailed surface water drainage across the substation site was also questioned.	N/A	Co14, Co19	A flood risk assessment for Hornsea Four has been undertaken (see **Volume A6, Annex 3.2: Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment**). Where sufficient information has been made available and where Hornsea Four has been made aware of relevant flood alleviation schemes, through consultation with the Environment Agency, East Riding of Yorkshire Council and the Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board these have been considered. Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Further details are provided in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**, and **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**. Hornsea Four will develop a construction drainage scheme using a land drainage consultant and in consultation with landowners and the relevant authorities (see Commitment 14). Operational drainage will also be developed in accordance with **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**.
Phase Two_feedback form_017	Detailed surface water drainage plans required. Existing drainage from Burn Park Farm across the substation must be resolved.	I	Co14, Co19	Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding. Details are provided in **Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk** as well as **Volume F2, Chapter**

				2: Outline Code of Construction Practice and **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**. Hornsea Four has committed to developing a detailed construction drainage scheme in consultation with landowners and relevant stakeholders (see Co14) including the Environment Agency, the Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board and East Riding of Yorkshire Council, where relevant. The Applicant has also committed to restricting drainage to greenfield run-off rates at the onshore substation (see Commitment 19) including an allowance for climate change. The detailed drainage design at the onshore substation will accommodate surface water drainage and will be in accordance with **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**.
Phase Two_online_048	I have various concerns about Cottingham and Skidby. Flood risk, more details are needed to show attenuation and water courses to be used,	I	N/A	Hornsea Four has outlined a specific area within the onshore substation site for an attenuation feature (See **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**) and any further mitigation required to inform the detailed design of both the onshore cable corridor and onshore substation have been developed in consultation with the Environment Agency, East Riding of Yorkshire Council and the Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board, as necessary.
Phase Two_feedback form_024	Concerns regarding flood risk associated with PRoW were noted by respondents.	I	N/A	A flood risk assessment for Hornsea Four has been undertaken (see **Volume A6, Annex 3.2: Onshore Infrastructure Flood Risk Assessment**). Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Four to minimise impacts on drainage and flooding.

				Further details are provided in **Volume A3, Chapter 2: Hydrology and Flood Risk**, **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**, and **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**. Hornsea Four will develop a construction drainage scheme using a land drainage consultant and in consultation with landowners and the relevant authorities (see Commitment 14). An operational drainage will also be developed in accordance with **Volume F2, Chapter 6: Outline Onshore Infrastructure Drainage Strategy**.
Phase Two_feedback form_024	There are unknown underground rivers near all waterways vide Kingswood Tunnel 1994 so extra care when HDD underneath as well as when trenching.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment

EIA topic area: Ecology and Nature Conservation

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_008, Phase Two_feedback form_019, Phase Two_feedback form_021, Phase Two_feedback form_025	Respondents noted that all biodiversity should be of concern to the Applicant, with as much care as possible. A number of important species noted by respondents included: Owls, Bats, Hares, Deer, Water Voles (who use local water	I	N/A	During the design development process, Hornsea Four has sought to minimise impacts on local ecology and wildlife, for example through the avoidance of ecologically designated sites. Further detail can be found in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. A suite of ecological surveys have been undertaken in consultation with East Riding of Yorkshire Council, Natural England, the

	ways and dykes etc), including in the locations of Cottingham and Skidby.			Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, to determine the presence or absence of species within the footprint of the Hornsea Four order limits and relevant study areas. Potential impacts on local wildlife and specific species are assessed in Environmental Statement **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation**. Where appropriate, these surveys have determined the requirement for mitigation and management both within, and outside of industry standard mitigation, as necessary (see **Volume F2, Chapter 3: outline Ecological Management Plan**). Where a Barn Owl nest has been identified adjacent to the access to the landfall, Hornsea Four has incorporated sufficient flexibility within the Hornsea Four order limits, should this be required during construction.
Phase Two_feedback form_010	Replace trees: "Where hedgerows and/or trees require removal, this will be undertaken prior to topsoil removal. Where practical, the length of hedgerow and number of trees to be removed will be limited. Removed hedgerows and trees will be replaced with locally appropriate native species, and replacement hedgerows will be species-rich in nature."	N/A	N/A	Where possible, Hornsea Four will avoid or microsite around trees within the Hornsea Four onshore order limits. Where it is not possible to retain hedgerows and trees, they will be replaced with like for like species or subject to landowner agreement, species-rich and locally appropriate hedgerow species (Co26, Co194). Further details on trees and hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation** and **Volume A4, Annex 4.1: Onshore Crossing Schedule**, and details of any new landscaping can be found in **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**.
Phase Two_feedback form_012	150m from our house there are often wild deer, owls and bird life. They are	N/A	1o	During the design development process, Hornsea Four has sought to minimise impacts on the natural

	there because it is their natural wild habitat. This is exactly where the trench is sited.			environment, including to local ecology and wildlife. A suite of ecological surveys has been undertaken to determine the presence or absence of species (including for birds, owls and any other species of note) within the footprint of the Hornsea Four onshore boundaries. Potential impacts on local wildlife and specific species are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation**. Hornsea Four will also conduct an additional suite of pre-construction ecology surveys and checks prior to construction, and where necessary the appropriate mitigation and management will be used, as outlined in **Volume F2, Chapter 3: Outline Ecological Management Plan**.
Phase Two_feedback form_017	Livestock on farms has been disregarded	I	N/A	The Applicant takes account of any livestock issues or concerns and will put in place measures to ensure safety. Please contact our land agent with your specific concern regarding your livestock.
Phase Two_feedback form_055	Also the old sewerage works is a wildlife haven and therefore I request the corridor is placed as far away as possible from this area. The old sewerage works is now home to many wild animals. Putting the corridor too close will likely be very disruptive and disturbing to them. The current proposed route is very close to the field where horses are kept and the field is used for training horses (also close to a wildlife haven).	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

EIA topic area: Landscape and Visual

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two _email_002	I own a second home in Cherry Burton and my query is: why are you undergrounding the project when pylons would be much cheaper?	I	1o Co25	The need to minimise potential landscape and visual impacts arising from Hornsea Four was identified early in the design process and led to a commitment by Hornsea Four to completely bury the onshore export cable corridor for its entire length as opposed to using overhead lines (Commitment Co25). See **Volume 1, Chapter 4: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. This was also requested during the first phase of community consultation. See **Volume B1, Annex 1.3: Applicant Regard to Section 47 Consultation Responses**.
Phase Two _email_004	**Visual aspect at Cottingham Creyke Beck - Ørsted Viewpoint 2, OS map reference TA 041 343**[5] The Sensitivity of the Receptor statements for Viewpoint 2 (Hornsea Project Four: Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) Volume 3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Assessment, sections 4.11.2.50 to 51,) do not mention the view of Beverley	Y	New Co151	The importance of views of Beverley Minster from the surrounding landscape is recognised, and is considered in the assessment of effects, in context with other available views of Beverley Minster (see **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment**. The value attached to views of the Minster from viewpoint 2 will be noted, and the desirability of retaining these views will inform the landscape mitigation proposals at the substation, where possible. It is noted however that the onshore substation layout within the permanent

[5] Contextual information supplied by the Applicant for feedback clarity.

	minster. It is clearly visible from there. It adds significantly to the value of the view. It should be included in the assessment, as it increases the value of Viewpoint 2, probably by a large amount.			footprint is led by technical requirements and buildings are not able to be avoided in specific areas. The following new commitment has been added: Co. 151 - No above ground infrastructure associated with Hornsea Four will obstruct the view from St Mary's Church Cottingham to Beverley Minister through considered design of the OnSS and site selection. Regarding viewpoint 2, Landscape and visual impacts of all onshore elements of Hornsea Four are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**. This includes proposed mitigation solutions and visual screening proposed for the onshore substation to minimise impacts (see **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**). Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**). The Hornsea Four design vision is summarised in **Volume A4, Annex 4.6: Outline Design Vision Statement**.
	The sight of the minster from this location is inspiring. Heading north along Park Lane, the rural hedged road suddenly opens out at the S-bend (Viewpoint 2) to reveal an open countryside, with the minster in the distance. This view must have encouraged pilgrims heading north to worship at the shrine of St John. It still inspires those using the lane on foot or on bicycle (national route 1), both locals and visitors.			
	It is stated that the view of the minster from the top of Cottingham St Mary's church tower is important. However, the number of people that go up St Mary's church tower is a fraction of the number of people that pass Viewpoint 2. And it includes those that are unable to climb the church tower. Surely then, Viewpoint 2 has significance to many more people ? Inevitably the power distribution structures will interrupt the view north from Viewpoint 2. However, priority			

	should be given to preserving the view of the minster from there.			
Phase Two _email_004, Phase Two_online_53	Respondents highlighted the importance of minimising the visual impact of the onshore substation, including a uniform light grey colour and the absence of large writing at height. One respondent also highlighted that mitigation is sufficient, with colour option 2 (presented online) deemed the most appropriate option.	I	N/A	The need to minimise potential landscape and visual impacts arising from the onshore substation was identified early in the design process. Landscape and visual impacts of all onshore elements of Hornsea Four are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**. This includes proposed mitigation solutions and visual screening proposed for the onshore substation to minimise impacts (see **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**). Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**). The Hornsea Four design vision is summarised in **Volume A4, Annex 4.6: Outline Design Vision Statement**.
Phase Two_feedback form_017, Phase Two_online_041	Some respondents felt that the mitigation for the substation is not sufficient. One respondent also suggested mitigation through rearrangement of buildings at Creyke Beck.			
Phase Two _email_005	Appearance - Do you have any images of what the depot may look like? As you are aware Lockington is a conservation area, so I'm sure you can understand our concerns.	N/A	N/A	Logistics compounds have been identified throughout the Hornsea Four Order Limits. Dependant on the specific requirements of each individual location, logistics compounds would potentially include, but not limited to, Office accommodation, including all desks, seating, office storage, welfare etc. to accommodate all staff (60+); Meeting Rooms; All relevant utility services, power, water, heating, lighting telecommunications, internet and Wi-Fi connections; Printing, scanning and copying facilities; Car parking for all project staff; Canteen facilities; Drying, storage and changing facilities for Personal Protective Equipment; Material storage; Waste

				storage; Cable drums; Security fencing; and Security. Further details are provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**.
Phase Two _email_011	How long will the scrape be left open?	N/A	N/A	The length of time over which the cable trenches will remain open is dependent on many variables. including the length of the section being installed, the installation technique, and the location of the transition jointing bays for example. Where possible, Hornsea Four will limit the duration over which any trenches are left open in order to limit disruption to the landowners and the local community.
Phase Two _email_011	How do we access the far end of the field when being dug/laid?	N/A	N/A	Where land may be severed or where Hornsea Four is proposing to cross any existing accesses, Hornsea Four will work with landowners in order to manage and maintain access to these areas as much as possible.
Phase Two _email_012	There is nothing but open field behind our house for miles. We will be directly affected by the works in our view and there are no natural sounds barriers to prevent this.	N/A	Co123, Co124	Appropriate mitigation measures have been designed-in to Hornsea Four to minimise impacts during construction periods of the project. The Applicant has made a commitment to develop a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) in accordance with the outline CoCP, which includes measures to reduce temporary disturbance to residential properties (Commitment number Co124). See **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Furthermore, where noise has the potential to cause significant adverse effects, mufflers and acoustic barriers will be used where HDD is being undertaken (Co123).
Phase Two _email_012	The proposed route is directly in our eyeline at the back of our property. Due to nothing but fields behind us, we can	N/A	Co144	The route planning for Hornsea Four has ensured that the onshore export cable corridor is located a minimum of 50 m from residential properties (Co49). For assessments in

	even hear an owl hooting 3 miles away. We moved to Foston on the Wolds for peace and quiet. 3 years of disruption is an awful lot to stomach, especially with a proposal of 7am starts every day. Traffic will probably be arriving at 6:30am to commence at 7am.			regard to the visual impact of Hornsea Four, see **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**. Regarding traffic movements, the Applicant has committed (Commitment number Co144) to the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), an outline of which will form part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). The CTMP will set standards and procedures for construction traffic routeing and timings. Regarding core working hours, numerous nationally significant infrastructure projects have accepted working hours commencing from 07:00 and are considered to be established and acceptable. Consistency of start time across the project holds a number of advantages including consistent construction programming along the route, including the deployment of work fronts and deliveries and ability to utilise daylight hours. A construction start time of 07:00 also provides a mechanism for some of the workforce and vehicle movements to travel outside the standard peak AM traffic movements, helping to minimise impacts on the wider road network.
Phase Two_feedback form_015, Phase Two_feedback form_017	Some respondents requested that the onshore substation should be given maximum screening to prevent it being a (further) eyesore. There was also feedback that mitigation proposals presented were rather meagre,	N	N/A	The need to minimise potential landscape and visual impacts arising from the onshore substation was identified early in the design process. Landscape and visual impacts of all onshore elements of Hornsea Four are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**. This includes proposed mitigation solutions and visual screening proposed for the onshore substation to

	with a more detailed landscape and visual impact assessment required.			minimise impacts. Indicative proposals are shown within **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**. Colour finish options for the onshore substation are also presented in **Volume F2, 13: Outline Design Plan**.
Phase Two_feedback form_015	Onshore substation: Request to keep hedgerows as they are, as far as possible. Hedge removal is anathema.	N/A	1o	Where possible, Hornsea Four will avoid or microsite around trees within the Hornsea Four onshore. Where it is not possible to retain hedgerows and trees, they will be replaced with species-rich and locally appropriate hedgerow species (see Commitment 26). Further details on trees and hedgerow removal, retention and replacement can be found in **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation** and **Volume A4, Annex 4.1: Onshore Crossing Schedule**. Details of any new landscaping can be found in **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**. At the onshore substation, Hornsea Four has committed to preserving areas of existing landscaping at the north of the substation site (see **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description**) as well as committing to maintaining 'dark corridors' of an appropriate distance within specific areas of the onshore substation boundary in order to limit any impacts to specific species, such as bats. For further details see **Volume A3, Chapter 3: Ecology and Nature Conservation**, and **Volume F2, Chapter 3: Outline Ecological Management Plan**.
Phase Two_feedback form_019	Building height and colour and landscaping should be done with local planning.	N/A	N/A Co191	Parameters of the onshore substation are provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description** with a maximum height of buildings of 25m. The Applicant has presented colour application methodology in **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**. This outline document

				secures the decision-making process within the remit of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
Phase Two_feedback form_021, Phase Two_feedback form_023, Phase Two_online_049	A number of comments were made about visualisations/photomontages presented for the onshore substation and infrastructure along with the landscape mitigation plan presented online. One respondent noted that this was "totally unacceptable", in the close proximity of the Georgian farmhouse, possibly one of the oldest remaining in the area, known as Burn Park Farmhouse. Additional hedge and tree planting was also requested around the onshore substation site to ensure sympathetic integration into the local landscape.	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four has proposed a range of mitigation measures and landscaping to minimise the visual impact of the onshore substation. See **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual** and the **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan** which sets out specific planting and species. **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan** sets out design principles of the onshore substation which are selected to minimise its visual impact, including colour and material finishes. Parameters of the onshore substation are provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description** with a maximum height of buildings of 25m. The Applicant has presented colour application methodology in **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**. This outline document secures the decision-making process within the remit of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

EIA topic area: Historic Environment

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two _feedback form_024	Respondents noted that it is important to carry out archaeological assessments prior to work taking place. These	I	N/A	The impacts from Hornsea Four on known and potential archaeology within the onshore and offshore area is

	opportunities should be maximised, especially at the coast where roman remains can be found.			assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment** and **Volume A2, Chapter 9: Marine Archaeology**.

EIA topic area: Land Use and Agriculture

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two _email_005, Phase Two _feedback form_017, Phase Two _feedback form_019, Phase Two _feedback form_021, Phase Two _feedback form_024, Phase Two_online_040, Phase Two_online_042, Phase Two_online_049, Phase Two_online_051	A number of PRoW were mentioned throughout the consultation, including the transmission line crosses Wilfholme Lane and Barfhill Causeway, along with a general concern for PRoW between Cottingham and Beverley. Concern was note for the potential traffic increase on Station Road and the poor standard of the footpath along this road, along with the resulting HGV traffic from the Logistics Compound. A PRoW crossing the centre of the proposed substation was also noted, with respondents also requesting that PRoW, bridleways and cycle paths should remain open, with safety being prioritised. This included Route 66 diversions away from any livestock and all working areas.	N/A	N/A	Any impact to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the OnSS site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co.79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. The Applicant recognises the importance of PRoW reinstatement upon completion of construction works. A meeting has been held with ERYC (on 29 October 2019)

	It was requested that PRoW should be diverted rather than closed and PRoW should be maintained as best as possible with a clear PRoW management plan.			in which the matter of monitoring was discussed. It was noted that on past projects the Applicant has not undertaken specific monitoring and it is not proposed for Hornsea Four; however, as part of agreements with relevant landowners, the Applicant is obligated to maintain and resolve any issues that occur as a result of Hornsea Four. Furthermore, specific methodologies have been outlined within the Public Right of Way Management Plan, within **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. The impact of HGV traffic on the local road network is addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced (which forms an appendix to **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). All roads on the public highway network impacted by the onshore export cable corridor will be crossed using trenchless technologies (such as HDD) (Co1) and would not require closure during the construction of Hornsea Four.
Phase Two_online_033	This (YO25 9BE) is a well-used public bridleway which the route cuts through. It is part of a well-used loop. There are quite a lot of liveries and private horse owners in this area. An alternative would need to be provided which would effect Dalton Estates tenants who farm these fields.	I	N/A	
Phase Two_online_045	I am a Principal Transport Policy Officer with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Although you are dealing with colleagues on highway issues, my specific brief is to look at the potential impact on the National Cycle Network. It is important that the impact on the NCN is minimised. having discussed the proposals with Tom Watts, your proposal to keep the NCN route around Creyke Beck open during the works was reassuring. It would be useful to explore ways in which the project could enhance local facilities for walkers and cyclists and I understand that you plan a feedback session following the consultation.	I	N/A	
Phase Two_email_005	Disruption of Public Rights of Way and the way the transmission line crosses	N/A	N/A	

	Wilfholme Lane and Barfhill Causeway and whether these will be shut for periods of time. If so, this will increase the traffic on Station Road. We are very concerned about the Health & Safety of pedestrians on Station Road due to the poor standard of the footpath and the resulting HGV traffic from the Logistics Depot.			
Phase Two_email_007	*Redacted* recognises that Ørsted Hornsea Four has acknowledged the disruption and inconvenience that will affect users of Public Rights of Way that lie across the proposed route of the cable corridor and at the site of the substation. *Redacted* has noted that there is a promise to minimise inconvenience by ensuring, with two identified exceptions, that closure of PROWs will be temporary and that signed diversions will be provided. *Redacted* will have purview of applications for such closure and will offer to the County Council advice about the suitability of diversions for users.	I	N/A	
Phase Two_email_007	*Redacted* draws Ørsted Hornsea Four's attention to the fact that several C-class roads crossed by the cable corridor are used to connect PROWs or to access PROWs that intersect the highway. Ørsted Hornsea Four needs to be aware	I	N/A	

	that, although these roads are open to motorised traffic, users include pedestrians and horse riders.			
Phase Two_email_007	*Redacted* has concerns regarding the PROW identified as requiring diversion and/or extinguishment i.e. Skidby Footpath No. 16. The Consultation Document (Volume 3, Chapter 6) appears dismissive of the value of this PRoW, stating "There is a relatively dense PROW network in this area and other routes moving (sic) east-west and north-south are available in the local vicinity" and that "SKID16 is considered to be a PRoW of local importance as it is not designated as a national or regional…route". *Redacted* points out that designation of PROWs as part of a national or regional route does not make them more important and that local usage is often more intense for daily exercise, health (both physical and mental) and enjoyment of the countryside. Given its remit, *redacted* will scrutinise the application for proposed diversion and/or extinguishment and advise the County Council of its appropriateness.	I	N/A	
Phase Two_email_007	*Redacted* notes with concern what appears to be an omission of consideration of the impact on	I	N/A	

	Woodmansey Bridleway No. 30 of the access road to the Onshore Substation (Temporary Works) from the A1079 - the access road appears to run along the Bridleway for circa 200 m. *Redacted* asks for clarification of proposals regarding diversion of this bridleway which connects with Rowley Bridleway No.13, the western end of which also appears to be affected by an access road to the cable corridor.			
Phase Two_email_007	*Redacted* notes that Ørsted Hornsea Four is proposing prolonged closure of Barmston Footpath No. 4 and, if designated, diversion of The English Coast Path. *Redacted* suggests that a permissive path be established eastwards off Barmston Footpath No 3 south of the Logistics Compound that would allow connection with the beach and foreshore.	I	N/A	
Phase Two_email_007	*Redacted* is very concerned that the Consultation Documents state: "Given the lack of potential significant effects no monitoring in relation to land and agriculture is proposed as part of Hornsea Four". *Redacted* is of the opinion that restoration of the cable corridor where it crosses PROWs will leave soils in a dilated state (meaning that soils will have lower bulk density and lower shear	I	N/A	

	strength and, hence, lower load carrying capability).			
Phase Two_email_007	It also believes that consolidation of soil (sub- and topsoil) over time will lead to linear micro-topographical depressions along the PROWs that will retain ponded water and severely reduce the utility of the PROW, especially in winter. Users will be either discouraged from traversing or will be encouraged to trespass off the PROWs and, hence, effect crop damage.			
Phase Two_email_007	These problems of access will extend, in each case, at least 60 m (the width of the cable corridor) and this could be longer where the intersection of cable corridor and PROW is oblique.			
Phase Two_email_007	*Redacted* wishes to see stated a commitment to monitoring all PROWs where these have been affected by Open-Cut -i.e. trenched - cable corridor crossings and a further commitment to suitable restoration measures where PROWs are affected by soil consolidation and surface subsidence. These commitments should be guaranteed for at least seven years after soil restoration.			
Phase Two_email_007	The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 98) states that 'Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide			

	better facilities for users. Given the inevitable disruption to the PROW network during project delivery, *redacted* is disappointed that the scope for potential enhancements to the network – in accordance with paragraph 98 - is not strongly evident within the PEIR (Volume 3, Chapter 6).			
Phase Two_email_007	It is however acknowledged that enhancements could potentially be delivered through the allocation of Section 106 (or other similar) funding specifically relating to rights of way and public access, and *redacted* therefore requests the provision of such funding for this project to mitigate the negative impacts and ensure that PROW enhancements are delivered.			
Phase Two_feedback form_008	You need to liaise carefully with local farmers who has in depth knowledge of subsoil, etc.	I	N/A	Disruption to agricultural activities has been considered in the impact assessment in **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Any disruption will be temporary along the onshore export cable corridor and longer-term impacts from changes to drainage (for example) will be assessed and mitigated. This includes thorough engagement with landowners and farmers.
Phase Two_feedback form_008, Phase Two_feedback form_023	Coastal and beach paths between Barmston and Bridlington were noted as important. Public use and access to Fraisthorpe was also noted.	I	Change Co187	The English Coast Path has been fully considered within the impact assessment. Impacts related to recreational users and PRoWs, including near the landfall site, are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**.

				The Applicant has committed to the installation of the offshore export cables at landfall by Horizontal Directional Drilling or other trenchless methods (Co187).
Phase Two_feedback form_009	The onshore cable corridor needs to be buried underground and farming can be continued as normal	I	1o Co25	The need to minimise potential landscape and visual impacts arising from Hornsea Four was identified early in the design process and led to a commitment by Hornsea Four to bury all onshore export cables (as opposed to using overhead lines (as per project Commitment Co25). See **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**. *Amended Co25: The onshore export cable corridor will be completely buried underground for its entire length. No overhead pylons will be installed as part of the consented works for Hornsea Four.*
Phase Two_feedback form_011	Will the cables current prevent GPs equipment on agricultural machinery from working?	N/A	N/A	Generally, it is understood that GPS systems operate at very high frequencies and are not influenced by EMF from electrical systems which have very low frequencies. An EMF Compliance Statement (**Volume A4, Annex 4.3: EMF Compliance Statement**) and Health Impact Assessment (**Volume A4, Annex 5.8: Health Impact Assessment**) have been completed to support the DCO.
Phase Two_feedback form_011	What heat is given off from the cables - will this affect crops growing at different stages?	N/A	N/A	The circuits are designed to mitigate effects of heat dissipation from cables. Therefore the circuits must be spaced out to minimise the mutual heating effect. This spacing enables the cables to effectively carry the large power volumes required without overheating.15. We do not envisage any heat impacts having a detrimental impact on agricultural practices; however, a claim will be considered if received with sufficient supporting evidence.

Phase Two_feedback form_011	How will you prevent contamination from neighbours' fields i.e. Blackgrass?	N/A	N/A	The Applicant is aware there is the risk of biological contamination between agricultural land holding and individual fields. In order to prevent this happening, an Onshore Biosecurity Protocol will be implemented to minimise the risk of biological contamination and the spreading of invasive species. See **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** for further details.
Phase Two_feedback form_011	Will impact on value and viability of my farmland, if any of my questions occur - for example heat, disease, magnetic field to re-mention a few.	N/A	N/A	A photographic record of condition will be undertaken prior to access for construction works commencing. Should there be any resulting impact to yielding or crop growth as a result of soil composition then this should be submitted in a claim with sufficient supporting evidence. Hornsea Four as a developer and under the terms of proposed Option Agreement will be liable to reinstate the land to a condition comparable to that prior to work commencing or pay appropriate compensation where this is not possible.
Phase Two_feedback form_013	13 hectares approx. 28 acres of land is a large compound. The land will take 30 years to recover its potential yield for food production. 'Just in Time' supply policy could be used which should reduce the compound size.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two_feedback form_013	The public rights of way, bridle paths, cycle routes to remain open. Our family business relies on the Bridle Path being open. Compensation payments will be rigorously pursued if our business is affected in any way whatsoever, from the activities of this project.	N/A	N/A	Any impact to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the Onshore Substation site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to

Phase Two_feedback form_014	It will ruin the quality of life at redacted. It will disrupt public rights of way including safe routes for horses and bicycles	N/A	N/A	enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co.79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. The impact of HGV traffic on the local road network is addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). All roads on the public highway network impacted by the onshore export cable corridor will be crossed using trenchless technologies (such as HDD) (Co1) and would not require closure during the construction of Hornsea Four.
Phase Two_feedback form_014	The bridle paths are used by our equestrian customers and will devalue our business if not available. Cycle routes 1 and 66 are used regularly by our health club customers and personally. They are part of our NATIONAL cycle route!	N/A	N/A	
Phase Two_feedback form_019	Pedestrian/equine/cycling around the Cottingham development, safety first! These walkways/bridle paths and cycle routes must remain open to public access at all times. If any of these routes have to be redirected. A public consultation must be carried out first!	I	1o	
Phase Two_feedback form_022, Phase Two_feedback form_024, Phase Two_online_038, Phase Two_online_052	One respondent suggested diverting existing PRoW through Burn Park Farm. Access to this PRoW was noted as being important for some respondents, with all footpaths and bridleways requested to be kept open or diverted during construction. It was also noted that it was important that post-completion, PRoW are not closed but diverted, such as SKIDF18, 17 and 07 (amongst others). PRoW between Burn Park and Poplar was also noted as important.	I	N/A	

Phase Two_feedback form_015	PRoW-cyclist Route 66 are invaluable, and very rare, assets in this area. To be safeguarded	N/A	N/A	Cycle Route No.66 and No.1 will not be impacted by Hornsea Four.
Phase Two_feedback form_018	We are a small farm and the pipeline will cause great upheaval to us in its current proposed route, with the possible loss of two fields and several harvests.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant will pay compensation for any reasonable losses as a result of its works on a proven loss basis, should these losses continue once construction has completed, then claims should continue to be submitted on the basis of the incurred loss with sufficient supporting evidence.
Phase Two_feedback form_024	The proposed lack of monitoring is a particular concern as the lack of PRoW management plan.	I	N/A	The Applicant recognises the importance of PRoW reinstatement upon completion of construction works. A meeting has been held with ERYC (on 29 October 2019) in which the matter of monitoring was discussed. It was noted that on past projects the Applicant has not undertaken specific monitoring and it is not proposed for Hornsea Four; however, as part of agreements with relevant landowners, the Applicant is obligated to maintain and resolve any issues that occur as a result of Hornsea Four. Furthermore, specific methodologies have been outlined within the Public Right of Way Management Plan, within **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.

EIA topic area: Traffic and Transport

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

Phase Two _email_003, Phase Two _online_036	A number of respondents requested that HGVs do not travel through Cherry Burton for the duration of the onshore construction works (including Highgate and Main Street) as a means of access. Streets through this village were noted as being narrow, , and at times winding, road through the village which is bordered by residential properties, a primary school and a children's playground. Roads were noted as being narrow at many points and effectively a single-track route, including outside the village shop which attracts parking on both sides of the road. It was noted that East Riding Council has undertaken to designate this road "Not suitable for HGVs" to prevent its use as a shortcut for heavy vehicles and signs will be erected.	I	N/A	Impacts related to access are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). This includes the potential impact of additional traffic on the local road network caused by Hornsea Four HGV traffic associated with the construction of Hornsea Four will not be routed through Cherry Burton.
Phase Two _email_005	My concerns are: 1) Logistics Depot on Station Road Lockington/A 164 and 2) HGV Traffic in and around Station Road (As well as increased traffic, noise and vibration concerns).	N/A	N/A	Impacts related to access, including the onshore temporary logistics compound at Lockington, are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. Peak traffic flow numbers for individual road

Phase Two _email_005	What are the likely number and types of vehicles using the logistics depot? What is going to the level of noise pollution?	N/A	N/A	links, including Station Road, are detailed in **Volume A6, Annex 7.1: Traffic and Transport Technical Report**.
Phase Two _email_005	Is there any waste materials to be stored at the depot, if so what?	N/A	N/A	It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). This includes the potential impact of additional traffic on the local road network caused by Hornsea Four
Phase Two_feedback form_008	Need to be aware of tourists in summer season and the increase in volume of traffic at these times	N/A	N/A	Impacts relating to recreational users and tourism are covered in **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture** and **Volume A3, Chapter 10: Socio-economics**. It is noted that traffic and recreation has been considered in the selection of the southern landfall option (documented in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**).
Phase Two_feedback form_009	Might be an issue for residents of Barmston. Gravel pit road - track to the south of landfall	N/A	N/A	The routing of Hornsea Four construction traffic has been planned to avoid settlements where possible. It is anticipated that HGV traffic will avoid Barmston, with management measures in place to ensure appointed contractors comply, secured in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (an outline of which is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). In addition, the temporary access track to the south of the landfall has been reduced in length and is located further to the north.

Phase Two_feedback form_012, Phase Two_feedback form_054	We are very concerned about the vehicle movements through our village (Foston on the Wolds) even though they may only be contractors' vans and small trucks. This village is extremely quiet village - not a thoroughfare. There is also concern about the proposed logistics centre near Foston. One respondent noted that their original concern of construction traffic through Foston had been addressed during the second phase of consultation, but did note a potential 'bottle-neck' with the use of Foston Lane from Beeford to Gembling.	Y	New Co171	Impacts related to access are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). This includes the potential impact of additional traffic on the local road network caused by Hornsea Four A commitment has been made to avoid HGVs associated with construction routeing through Foston on the Wolds (Co171). The Applicant is not able to make the same commitment for LCV and traffic associated with employee movements.
Phase Two_feedback form_014	A traffic plan must be devised that prevents the unauthorised use of the private that runs through Cottingham Parks and Spring Park Farm. It has been used as a rat run when the new power station was behind built with no regard for golfers, horse riders etc.			
Phase Two_feedback form_012	It is important for us to know in advance when the works will be undertaken and when there will be periods of disruption and noise throughout our village. We understand this will be intermittent over a 3-year period, and would appreciate	N/A	N/A Co144	The Applicant has committed (Commitment number Co144) to the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (an outline of which is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. The CTMP will set standards and procedures for managing the passage of HGV traffic via the local highway network.

	prior warning before each construction phase.			The noise and vibration assessment (**Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration**) outlines necessary noise management measures, which will be secured via **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Phase Two_feedback form_020	Carr Lane, Watton, is a single-track road with limited passing places. We want to see you work with ERYC to provide more passing places. A 30-mph limit as there are already a lot of HGVs on this road.	Y	1o Co144	The Applicant has committed (Commitment number Co144) to the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (an outline of which is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). Studies have been undertaken into the Hornsea Four traffic and transport study area, which assesses the local road links utilised by traffic for the onshore construction of Hornsea Four. See **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**.
Phase Two_feedback form_023	Applaud using A164 and minimising traffic through Cottingham	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Phase Two_feedback form_025, Phase Two_feedback form_054	Suggestion that you have wheel washing facilities for the lorries exiting the sites so that local roads are kept clean and also on the traffic management plan keep the movement of the lorries to a minimum. Ensure contractors adhere to the plans especially keeping the speed limits set! One respondent also requested that any damage to existing roads/access networks should be reinstated back to their previous use, such as Foston and Gembling lanes.	N/A	1o	**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** (which includes an Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan) sets out the requirements for mitigation measures including detail on the need for wheel washing facilities. The CTMP will set standards and procedures for managing the HGV traffic. Damage to the existing highway network will be avoided, with control measures set out in the final CTMP.

Phase Two_online_048	24-hour Contact details for the developer and contractors must be issued to local parishes to resolve any problems. Building height / colour and landscaping should go through local planning .	N/A	N/A	A contact phone number will be available during construction of Hornsea Four, as secured via **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Parameters of the onshore substation are provided in **Volume A1, Chapter 4: Project Description** with a maximum height of buildings of 25m. The Applicant has presented colour application methodology in **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**. This outline document secures the decision-making process within the remit of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
Phase Two_online_035	The location of this logistics compound (Lockington) and access is suitable. I have Concern for construction traffic on Carr Lane (Watton) which is a single-track lane and in poor condition. The track is used by an equestrian centre and cyclists and walkers often. This road is already used extensively by HGVs for the water treatment plant and the water bottling plant, agricultural plant and free-range egg farm. In liaison with the highway authority additional passing places and road strengthening may be required. Most beneficial if passing places could be retained following construction. Would be helpful for Watton Parish Council to be consulted on in relation to construction traffic management plan.	N/A	N/A	Impacts related to access, including the onshore temporary logistics compound at Lockington, are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase. See **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**, which contains the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan. This includes the potential impact of additional traffic on the local road network caused by Hornsea Four. Stakeholders (inclusive of parish councils) have the opportunity to comment on the outline CTMP at both PEIR and submission of the DCO.
Phase Two_online_050	Walkington Parish Council notes the proposed siting of the sub-station and	I	N/A	The routing of Hornsea Four construction traffic has been planned to avoid settlements where possible. HGV traffic

	the fact that the cable route will run north to south down the eastern side of Walkington between the village itself and Broadgates and wishes to express its concerns about the route that construction traffic (both for the cable-related work and the sub-station) is likely to take. In particular, the Parish Council would like to highlight the fact that, if construction traffic relating to this project were to travel through the main street in Walkington village on the B1230, this would be extremely problematic. This road is already extremely congested and there is a 7.5-ton weight limit operating in this area. The Parish Council has already raised this matter with Mr Andy Acum (Managing Director of Mercury Group Ltd.) and understands that a commitment has been made that there will be no HGVs passing through the village on the B1230, which it very much welcomed. However, Mr Acum has also confirmed that there could be other traffic in the form of cars / vans relating to this project which would go through the village.			will avoid Walkington, with management measures in place to ensure appointed contractors comply, secured in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (an outline CTMP is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Impacts related to access are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. The assessment of employee traffic movements has been based on a worst-case assumption that all employee traffic would occur during peak hours. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced based on this assumption to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase (see the outline CTMP for further details). Regarding peak hours, there is potential that the construction start time of 07:00 could result in some of the workforce and vehicle movements travelling outside the standard peak AM traffic movements, helping to minimise impacts on the wider road network. As discussed above however, there is no certainty of this and as such a worst-case assessment has been completed. Whilst the Applicant has avoided HGV vehicles routeing through Walkington, it is not possible to avoid cars and vans.

	Indeed, he has indicated that the traffic plan envisages that there would be a total of 368 additional vehicle movements per day 184 vehicles travelling to the site and 184 vehicles leaving the site although he notes that, in practice, the actual figure is expected to be lower than this. The Parish Council recognises that the traffic plan has to be based on worst case scenarios. However, it remains concerned that any increase in cars and vans will be problematic, especially since it is likely to be concentrated in the morning and afternoon rush hour periods, rather than spread evenly throughout the day. This would seriously exacerbate the significant traffic problems which already exist in the village. The Parish Council would therefore strongly urge Orsted to take steps to ensure that all construction traffic (including cars and vans) are required to take alternative routes in order to avoid passing through the main street in Walkington and would welcome firm assurances from Orsted on this point, in			

	respect of both HGVs and other cars / vans involved in the construction work			

EIA topic area: Noise and Vibration

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_012, Phase Two_feedback form_021	Noise attenuation was noted as a concern for some respondents. The stated constructions working hours between 7am and 6pm was also a concern, with one respondent stating that 8:30am - 9am is far more acceptable.	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four has proposed a range of mitigation measure to minimise the impact of noise. See **Volume A3, Chapter 8: Noise and Vibration** for the assessment of noise impacts, with mitigation measures set out in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**). Impacts related to access, including the onshore temporary logistics compound at Lockington, are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). This includes the potential impact of additional traffic on the local road network caused by Hornsea Four. Regarding core working hours, numerous nationally significant infrastructure projects have accepted working hours commencing from 07:00 and are considered to be established and acceptable. Consistency of start time

				across the project holds a number of advantages including consistent construction programming along the route, including the deployment of work fronts and deliveries and ability to utilise daylight hours. A construction start time of 07:00 also provides a mechanism for some of the workforce and vehicle movements to travel outside the standard peak AM traffic movements, helping to minimise impacts on the wider road network.
Phase Two_feedback form_015, Phase Two_feedback form_021	Noise impacts were noted by a number of respondents, with concerns about noise within or above the legal limit, especially at night. 5dB above any background noise was noted as being significant at all times.	N/A	N/A	The project will ensure that sensitive construction management measures, such as noise, dust and traffic control, are considered. These are documented in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Operational noise from the onshore substation will be at a level no greater than 5dB above the representative background (LA90,T) during daytime and night at noise sensitive receptors (Co159). The approach to mitigation measures to accord with this limit is summarised in **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan.**

EIA topic area: Air Quality and Health

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_011	What is the risk to human health?	N/A	N/A	An EMF Compliance Statement (**Volume A4, Annex 4.3: EMF Compliance Statement**) and Health Impact Assessment (**Volume A4, Annex 5.8: Health Impact Assessment**) have been completed to support the DCO.

Phase Two_online_046	The location of this element of Hornsea Four is not suitable. The electrical works at Cottingham is close to my House on Mill Beck Lane and Cottingham High School. I am concerned about the link to cancer. Already as you walk past the existing National Grid construction there you can 'feel' the electricity in the air. Increasing this in the same area and so close to homes and the school is not acceptable.			It is noted that the onshore substation site is located approximately 1.4km from Mill Beck Lane and 1.2km from Cottingham High School. An EMF Compliance Statement (**Volume A4, Annex 4.3: EMF Compliance Statement**) and Health Impact Assessment (**Volume A4, Annex 5.8: Health Impact Assessment**) have been completed to support the DCO.

EIA topic area: Socio-economics

Comment ID (consultation_ feedback type_comment ID)	Comment	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Phase Two_feedback form_013	Orsted could determine the necessary funding receive appropriate funding from all users thus reducing total costs and more important gain the support from 18,000 Cottingham residents for this project.	N/A	N/A	The Applicant will receive the interactions of the project as the proposal is refined, and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. This includes a voluntary Community Benefit Fund (CBF), many of which have been establishment for a number of projects which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Four could be made post-financial investment decision (FID).
Phase Two_feedback form_013	2) Orsted to fund legal pursual of all conditions attached to any planning application that is approved. The Cottingham Parish Council to have the	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

	same conditions of appointment of legal/agents as for landowners who receive compensation			

Table 1.3: Applicant regard to ongoing section 47 feedback via information lines (22 November 2018 – 12 August 2019).

Key
Bold = Contextual information to stakeholder feedback provided by the Applicant for purpose of Table 1.3.

EIA topic area: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A))[6]	Project commitment? [7]	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_002	Looking at the map of where the cable will be laid it is not clear just where it will lie. I live at the west side of Beverley Westwood in open countryside so will this be anywhere near me my postcode is *redacted*.	17/12/2018	N/A	N/A	The route planning and site selection is documented in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**.
Ongoing_Email_005	I own a holiday home in Wilsthorpe. This is closed up over the winter and when I went over to check on the property at the weekend and pick up the post I was shocked to see a copy of your Consultation Summary Report.	13/03/2019	N/A	N/A	See Environmental Statement **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** for selection of the landfall site taken

[6] N/A = Comment is not requesting a project change to be made; Y = Amendments made to the project design as a result of feedback from consultation; N = The applicant has had regard to the comment but determined that a change is not appropriate / justified in the circumstances; I = The applicant has had regard to the comment and incorporated into or considered when producing the assessment

[7] 1o = primary Commitment relevant to this response; Change = any change to the existing Commitment as a consequence of the feedback; New = any new commitment resulting from the comment

	First, may I point out that calling this "Hornsea" project four is totally misleading - I had heard this mentioned, but as my property is not in Hornsea, I was not unduly concerned. I was therefore totally shocked to see how close this project is and would have expected direct correspondence from yourselves as to how this is going to affect me, as opposed to a general (and mis-titled) leaflet. As a result, I ask that you inform me, in full, as to how this project is going to affect the properties in Wilsthorpe: what is the proposed start date, what work will be involved and how this will impact the area.				forward to DCO. This has been confirmed at a site further south from Wilsthorpe.
Ongoing_Email_009	Thank you for providing us with a copy of your March 2019 Community Newsletter re this project. On page 8 you say that "we have also refined our landfall search area to the north of Barmston only". However, the refined plan on page 9 appears to show the refined landfall search area to include the whole of Barmston village possibly as far south as the Barmston drain. Could you clarify this for me please	24/03/2019	N/A	N/A	
Ongoing_Email_010	I had reported to Woodmansey Parish Council that with your refinement of your options, the development would not affect our Council. This is not strictly true as the Council boundary does	31/03/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has confirmed that the proposals do not encroach within 2.4km of Woodmansey. Engagement was undertaken with Woodmansey

	intrude very slightly south of the A1079 into the Rowley Parish Council area. This might possibly be worth bearing in mind when refining your potential options.				throughout the section 42 and section 47 consultation, including as part of the Onshore Substation Consultation Group (see **Chapter 1: Consultation Report**.)
Ongoing_Email_011	We have today received your booklet (Community Newsletter) dated May 2019. We are concerned at the close proximity of the corridor to our cottage at *redacted*. Please advise if this route will be amended in order for us not to be inconvenienced in any way.	28/05/2019	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four has made a commitment (Co49) to routing the onshore ECC a minimum of 50m away from residential properties. See Environmental Statement **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives** for selection of the onshore ECC taken forward to DCO
Ongoing_Email_014	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document 3) On page 7 of the document, we have listed the key opportunities and constraints relating to the siting of the onshore substation. Are there any other opportunities or constraints within our search area which you think should be taken into consideration?** No – apart from comments at Q1 above.	04/07/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Ongoing_Email_015	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document 3) On page 7 of the document, we have listed the key opportunities and constraints relating to the siting of the onshore substation. Are there any other opportunities or constraints within our search area which you think should be taken into consideration?**	19/07/2019	N/A	N/A	Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the Onshore Substation site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through

	Opportunities to improve PRoW network connectivity and accessibility, including NCN, as is required by NPPF. Legend is incorrect - PRoW should read Public Footpath, yellow should read Public Bridleway.				landscape planting. As per Commitment Co79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Enhancement measures are also outlined in **Volume F2, Chapter 14: Outline Enhancement Strategy**.
Ongoing_Email_016	Our interest in the project is that we have a greenhouse site on Park Lane, Cottingham (postcode HU16 5LY) which sits at the extreme southerly spur to your PEIR search area, which extends to the entrance to our site. My concern would be that the proposed work in this area could cause disruption to either access to the site or to utilities serving the site. The site operates year-round and seven days a week for much of the year. Being involved in horticulture and growing plants, it is important to us to have an uninterrupted supply of gas, water, and electricity, and to be able to bring materials in and out of the site daily.	10/08/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has removed all construction and operational access from the south of the onshore substation. As such, all vehicles will route from the north, via the A1079. This will remove any traffic from Park Lane, Cottingham and Dunswell. This change was communicated at the phase two section 47 consultation.

	Could you please let me know what the potential scope of the work would be in this area, and if it is likely to cause interruption to services or access? Could you also please register my concerns as part of your consultation process and for future reference?				

EIA topic area: Project Description

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_006	Received your latest newsletter which shows the grey area either side of the cable passes through our house. What are the implications of this?	14/03/2019	N/A	N/A	This area, which showed the indicative temporary works area, was refined between phase one section 47 and phase two section 47 consultation. This refinement process is detailed in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**.
Ongoing_Email_008	You have a grid connection agreement with National Grid at the Creyke Beck substation for this development. Do you know if the addition of the supply from Hornsea 4 to that substation will require an additional HT distribution line from there to feed the grid?	15/03/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has engaged with NGET to obtain the outline parameters of the NGET substation expansion. This information has been incorporated into the onshore CEA as found Volume A3 of the ES.

EIA topic area: Consultation

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change?	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

			(Y/N/I or N/A)		
Ongoing_Email_007	I wanted to say how impressed my husband and I are with the way you are involving local communities in this project. We both appreciated receiving the newsletter which we found interesting and informative and look forward to more updates.	14/03/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Ongoing_Email_014	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 2) Is the document clearly set out and easy to understand? Please let us know if you have any suggestions for improvement or if there is a particular page which you feel could be set out more clearly.** The document is generally well set out and very informative, but phrases such as 'visual receptors' and 'OnSS built form' may be a bit off-putting for the layman, so perhaps these could be simplified? (Incidentally, 'alongside' would be clearer than 'aside' on p.11, and 'compliment' on page 15 should be 'complement'!) Also, what are SuDS on p.21?	04/07/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment and ensured feedback from OSCG fed into refinement of the Design Vision. A final version is available to view as part of the DCO application (**Volume A4, Annex 4.6: Outline Design Vision Statement**).
Ongoing_Email_015	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 2) Is the document clearly set out and easy to understand? Please let us know if you have any suggestions for improvement or if there is a particular page which you feel could be set out more clearly.**	19/07/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment

	Clarity required as to whether figures relate to public or private areas/access.				

EIA topic area: Landscape and Visual

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_001	Is it intended that the majority of road crossings will be achieved by horizontal drilling technology, or would this only apply to the busier major routes? Obviously, HDD can largely alleviate traffic disruption on major A roads, but different problems can occur when routes in and out of smaller villages are disrupted and 'normal' traffic flows are altered. We see this effect in Lockington every time there is an accident which closes the main Beverley to Driffield road. Traffic diverts onto the single-track roads through villages like Lockington and within the space of the 3 or 4 hours that the main road is closed, the local village roads suffer significant damage. Immediate roadside verges become mud, potholes open up everywhere, and there is significantly increased danger to road users from drivers who are unfamiliar with driving on single track roads. Incidentally, the same thing	15/12/2018	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has committed to crossing all main rivers, Internal Drainage Board (IDB) maintained drains, main roads and railways by HDD or other trenchless technology (Co 1). See **Volume A1, Annex 4.2: Onshore Crossing Schedule**. Impacts related to access, including the onshore temporary logistics compound at Lockington, are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. Peak traffic flow numbers for individual road links, including Station Road, are detailed in **Volume A6, Annex 7.1: Traffic and Transport Technical Report**. It is noted that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be produced to manage access and associated impacts during the construction phase; an outline of this document has been produced to set out the principles of the CTMP and this forms

	happens when there are light-controlled road works on the main Beverley to Driffield road, as drivers seek to avoid the hold-ups that are caused. Station Road going East out of Lockington is a good example. Should this road be closed, there are alternative routes into and out of the village which will involve minor inconvenience for travellers. However, both alternatives will force traffic onto single track roads - which will then suffer the sort of issues described above. I'm sure residents of many East Riding villages would welcome any measures that can be taken to avoid traffic flow disruption on the local routes in and out of villages, as well as the major routes with much heavier traffic flows.				part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**). This includes the potential impact of additional traffic on the local road network caused by Hornsea Four
Ongoing_Email_004	I am pleased to see that HDD is planned for Station Road Lockington and welcome your commitment to keep local residents informed as the project progresses.	18/01/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Ongoing_Email_014	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 4) On pages 15-17 we display options for materials and finishes for the onshore substation. Are these options appropriate for the substation in this area?** Yes – but on p.15, you mention 4 possible colours and seem to indicate that you favour cool grey. Yet, p17 seems to suggest that more than 1 colour might be used? It would be helpful	04/07/2019	N/A	N/A	Further detail regarding the detail design of this onshore substation, including materiality and application of colour, if provided in **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**.

	to know more about possible alternatives to corrugated metal sheeting referred to on p.16.				
Ongoing_Email_014	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 5) On pages 18-20 we outline mitigation options through hard and soft landscaping both within and on the perimeter of the substation site. Do these mitigation options look appropriate?** Yes	04/07/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.
Ongoing_Email_015	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 4) On pages 15-17 we display options for materials and finishes for the onshore substation. Are these options appropriate for the substation in this area?** N/A to PRoW service however there is likely to be a significant negative impact on the visual amenity on parts of the network.	19/07/2019	N/A	N/A	Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the Onshore Substation site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Ongoing_Email_015	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 5) On pages 18-20 we outline mitigation options through hard and soft landscaping both within and on the perimeter of the substation site. Do these mitigation options look appropriate?** Figures not clear as to public highway/private access with PRoW alongside. Width insufficient to meet accessibility guidelines.	19/07/2019	N/A	N/A	

					The visual impacts of the onshore substation in relation to PRoWs is considered in **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment**.

EIA topic area: Historic Environment

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_003	Just read through your December 2018 Hornsea 4 Consultation Summary Report. Could you confirm that the final route for the buried onshore cables from landfall to Creyke Beck will have a detailed archaeological survey carried out prior to landscape disturbance, with time commitments built into the plan in case substantial historic finds are discovered to allow time for full oversight by the East Riding of Yorkshire council's Humber Archaeological Partnership in terms of recording and recovery? This region of the Yorkshire Wolds/Holderness is rich in early settlement and Iron Age/Roman/Anglo-Saxon/Viking and Medieval impact, and the construction of the underground cabling would provide an opportunity to examine a significant tranche of the county.	04/01/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has undertaken pre-application surveys across the Hornsea Four order limits (see **Volume A3, Chapter 5: Historic Environment** and accompanying annexes). Further post-consent surveys are detailed in **Volume F2, Chapter 10: Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation**.

	Will Orsted be prepared to subsidise any archaeological recovery should finds be encountered along the route?				

EIA topic area: Land Use and Agriculture

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_012	As mentioned in the meeting, it's impact on / improvement of the Park Lane bridleway that we're most concerned about from a National Cycle Network standpoint. Decisions around this will need to involve East Riding PROW team. I gather you may be updating the East Riding & Hull LAF in September. What if any detail is there about potential improved / new public access re. where you're proposing to come ashore north of Barmston?	28/06/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has committed to construction traffic routeing from the A1079 (Co150), removing access points from the south of the onshore substation. Furthermore, the national cycle route will not be impacted or stopped up by Hornsea Four. Details regarding PRoW management is included in the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan, which forms an appendix to **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Details regarding PRoW enhancement is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 14: Outline Enhancement Strategy**.
Ongoing_Email_013	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 6) On page 22, we explain that if a Public Right of Way runs through the site of the onshore substation, a diversion will be necessary. In your opinion, what are the most important factors**	29/06/2019	N/A	N/A	It is noted that the onshore substation site had been selected at the point of this consultation and the necessary associated PRoW diversion identified.

	we need to take into account relating to diversions? We feel there is little we can say at this stage. Qu 6 asks for comments on a possible diversion. We feel this is premature until you have identified a site for the substation and the existing footpath likely to be affected. Once you have identified the footpath, then any application for a Definitive Map Modification Order would be considered by statutory consultees and the public .				Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the Onshore Substation site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in the **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Ongoing_Email_014	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 6) On page 22, we explain that if a Public Right of Way runs through the site of the onshore substation, a diversion will be necessary. In your opinion, what are the most important factors we need to take into account relating to diversions?**	04/07/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment.

	The Parish Council agrees with the aims set out on p.22 – no further comments at this stage.				
Ongoing_Email_015	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 1) Is there any aspect relating to the design of the onshore substation which you think has been omitted from the Design Vision Document?** Clarification around types of diversion - is it temporary for duration of the works or permanent as will be obstructed by a structure/building/within fenced compound. What are the timescales for the temporary diversions - when/how long	19/07/2019	N/A	N/A	Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the Onshore Substation site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co.79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Ongoing_Email_015	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 6) On page 22, we explain that if a Public Right of Way runs through the site of the onshore substation, a diversion will be necessary. In your opinion, what are the most important factors**	19/07/2019	N/A	N/A	Any impact to PRoW will be temporary with the exception of two PRoWs, one of which runs through the Onshore Substation site which will be permanently diverted. The second will be

	we need to take into account relating to diversions? What legislation is being used? Public and Statutory groups consultation required at an early stage, including Joint Local Access Forum, to flag up likely reasons for objections that could significantly slow legal procedures and delay Construction start as diversion required beforehand. NPPF requires the impact on the network to be taken into consideration. Clarity required for the ongoing maintenance of the non-authority assets, such as hedges, vehicular access routes, access furniture (gates) etc. Preference is for single boundary for PRoWs as there are concerns for maintenance by owners where routes are confined between two hedges unless there is sufficient width to allow growth and maintenance will be carried out before it impedes on the minimum required width for the status of the PRoW. Please see the attached PRoW and Planning Guidance Document				permanently diverted due to the access road from the A1079. The amended routing of both footpaths has been discussed and agreed with ERYC with the intention to enhance SKID16 through landscape planting. As per Commitment Co.79, signage and/or temporary PRoWs/footpath diversions will be provided during construction. Impacts on PRoW are assessed within **Volume A3, Chapter 6: Land Use and Agriculture**. Details regarding the temporary closure and diversion of PRoWs is outlined in the Public Right of Way Management Plan, in **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. The Applicant has consulted with relevant stakeholders, including ERYC, the JLAF, members of the OSCG, regarding the permanent diversion, which will be authorised as part of the Hornsea Four DCO. Details regarding landscape maintenance is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**.

EIA topic area: Traffic and Transport

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_014	**Hornsea Four Design Vision Document: 1) Is there any aspect relating to the design of the onshore substation which you think has been omitted from the Design Vision Document?** The document appears to cover the most important considerations, but more information about the route of the ECC would be appreciated. The Parish Council have previously expressed concern about the route to be used by construction traffic both for the ECC and the OnSS, as it would not want it to use the B1230 through Walkington village. (This is already heavily congested and there is a 7.5 ton limit in that area.)	04/07/2019	N/A	N/A	Impacts related to access are addressed in **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**. Whilst the Applicant has avoided HGV vehicles routeing through Walkington, it is not possible to avoid cars and vans.

Table 1.4: Applicant regard to ongoing section 47 feedback via information lines (24 September 2019 – 09 September 2021).

EIA topic area: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_018	Arising from the consultation at Cottingham Civic Centre on 24 Sept, we wish to make the following additional comments about aspects of the current scheme for the substation at Creyke Beck: 1. We note the cable will have to cross Skidby PRoW (FP 12), Jillywood Lane, near its western end adjacent to the A164. The hedges along the western section of this Footpath have been claimed to be ancient, thus maybe afforded protection under the Hedgerow Protection Regulation 1997. We have no documentary evidence that this is the case, however the E.R.Y.C may have further information. If the hedge is so deemed, then planning permission must be sought. Therefore, following consultation and investigation by yourselves in liaison with the council, we ask that the cable is taken across, or	14/10/2019	N/A	N/A	The hedgerow at this location has been confirmed as being 'Important' as defined under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Please see **Volume A6, Annex 3.14: Hedgerow and Arboricultural Survey** for further details. The crossing methodology at this location has not been confirmed; however, any hedgerows removed will be either replaced with like for like species (Co26) or more diverse and locally native species, subject to landowner agreement (Co194).

	even under the PRoW causing minimum impact damage to the hedge.				
Ongoing_Email_018	2. We also note that you are planning to move the projected service road from the A1079 bypass to the projected substation east, away from Birkhill Wood, which is said to have ancient status. This would be a very desirable action.	14/10/2019	N/A	N/A	The set back distance from the Birkhill Wood has evolved through consultation with relevant stakeholders. Further detail is provided in **Volume A4, Annex 3.3: Selection and refinement of the Onshore infrastructure**.
Ongoing_Email_018	3. Where the projected service road at its northern end runs adjacent to the Bridleway adjacent to the A1079, we ask that you leave a reasonable gap between the two.	14/10/2019	N/A	N/A	The diversion of the impacted bridleway has been discussed with relevant stakeholders, including ERYC, and details of the diversion are provided in the Outline Public Right of Way Management Plan, which forms an appendix to **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**.
Ongoing_Email_030	Does your scheme take account of the realignment of the A164 and new roads proposed in the project to improve the A164/A1079 junction at Jock's Lodge? In addition, both projects look to be under way at around the same time.	03/06/2020	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has been in contact with ERYC regarding the A164 / Jocks Lodge Highways Improvement scheme, and has considered the interaction of the two projects throughout the site selection and route refinement process (see **Volume A4, Annex 3.3: Selection and refinement of the Onshore infrastructure**). Furthermore, the improvement scheme has been considered as part of the cumulative effect assessment, presented in the technical topic chapters in **Volume A3** of the ES.
Ongoing_Email_031	The above must be a material and compelling factor to locate the Compound where it has least impact	06/08/2020	N/A	N/A	In developing the access strategy for Hornsea Four construction traffic, this has been planned to where possible avoid settlements (see

	and disruption on the local community and on current movement/traffic patterns – this is **not** on the west side of the A164. A location immediately East of the A164 accessed off Aike Road would be more sensible in this respect because, in summary: 1. It greatly reduces the impact and potential problems, delays, etc on the junction with the A164 because there is considerably less volume of traffic from/to Aike/Wilfholme compared with that from/to Lockington which is a much larger settlement. The main vehicular traffic and pressure on the A164 junction is from the west (i.e. Lockington village) - it makes little sense to intensify that traffic and pressure on the A164 junction with traffic from the proposed Compound when such pressures could be avoided by locating it to the East of the A164. This change would seem to have minimal impact on project scope, cost and time, and in fact may prove to be beneficial to the overall project management.				**Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport**). Construction traffic is proposed to travel to the Logistics Compound via the A164 from the south, therefore avoiding traffic travelling through Lockington. An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted with the DCO application (as part of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (**Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**)). The outline CTMP contains details of measures to enforce this construction traffic routeing. A screening exercise was undertaken with ERYC to review all junctions that would be impacted by Hornsea Four construction traffic. Recognising the relatively low flows at the junction of the A164 and Station Road, it was agreed with the ERYC that no further assessment of capacity would be required. With regards to the location of the Logistics Compound, form a traffic perspective the following considerations have been applied: • The routeing strategy is for all HGV deliveries to travel from the south on the A164 (avoiding Lockington). Locating the site compound to the east of the A164 would require inbound traffic to give way to oncoming south bound traffic to turn

	2. However well-intentioned, planned and managed, some disruption to the local community arising from the location and use of the Compound seems inevitable in practice (i.e. traffic movement & queuing, noise & disturbance) – this would be mitigated if the compound was located East of the A164, furthest away from Lockington with its much larger population **and Primary School.** 3. The vehicular route through Lockington is the favoured diversion route by ERYC Highways in the event of an accident or temporary closure of the A164 or B1248 – thus adding to the traffic generation at the A164 junction and 'conflict' with movements from the Compound (as proposed). 4. The road (Station Road) from the A164 to Lockington village is not really wide enough for two vehicles to pass, particularly when HGV's, Farm Vehicles, School Buses, etc. are involved. Traffic emerging from the proposed Compound and queuing to join the				onto Station Road. In contrast, locating the compound to the west removes this point of conflict (traffic can left turn unopposed from the A164 onto Station Road), leading to less delays and potential collisions. • Traffic departing from a Logistics Compound to the west of the A164 and turning onto the A164 would lead to delays to traffic on Station Road, however, traffic right tuning from the A164 to access a Logistics Compound to the east would block Station Road east from clearing leading to delays. • **Volume A3, Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport** identifies Station Road to the east of the A164 as being too narrow for two vehicles to pass and outlines the requirement for mitigation measures. It is considered that on balance, positioning the Logistics Compound to the west of the A164 would be safer and result in less delays. The results of the construction traffic noise assessment have been used to inform the noise assessment undertaken to date. The outcome which has indicated that along Station Road to the west of the A164 there would be only a minor increase of 1.0dB $L_{A10,18h}$ as a result of the change in traffic flow. This level of increase in

	A164 will inevitably present problems, frustration and safety concerns that would be mitigated with the much lower volume of traffic on the road to the East side of the A164. Note: the potential disruption to any community is regrettable but our comments are focussed on minimising the impact on Safety and minimising the number of people affected rather than pushing the problem into the Aike/Wilfholme community. NOTE: As a Parish Council we represent both Aike & Lockington. 5. The proposed Compound is adjacent to nearby houses (Bryan Mills Cottages & Bryan Mills Farm) with all the attendant noise/disturbance problems that may result – this would not be the case with a Compound immediately to the East of the A164. Equally, it would not affect two public footpaths a) Lockington Village to the bus stop on the A-164.				noise level is considered the smallest that could be perceived over a short-term. The standard methodology for the calculation of noise from road traffic is based upon free-flowing movement, traffic that is slower than predicted or stationary is generally quieter than free flowing, making the predicted noise level used in the assessment a 'worst-case' noise level. Regarding the potential impact on project scope, cost and time; it is noted that an amendment to the Order Limits to move the Logistics Compound options to the east of the A164 would necessitate re-consultation under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 and would conflict with consultation feedback previously received from impacted landowners. Feedback from the tenant of land north Station Road, east of the A164, indicates that the land contains natural and running springs, and therefore has stated a preference for Hornsea Four to stay away where possible. These conditions would not be preferable for a logistics compound. The land south of Station Road, east of the A164, is not preferable due to the existing cattle farming operation which is anticipated to expand in future years. The onshore export cable corridor already intersects with 'new lay'

	b) Station Road to Bryan Mills Farm. The comments/constraints about locating a Logistics Compound on the East of the A164 mentioned in your response are noted but we are not convinced that they outweigh the points outlined above or that it is too late to consider a "minor change" to the current proposals. We do not have the data or knowledge to suggest a specific location East of the A164, but there seems to be scope to accommodate a Logistics Compound avoiding the problems described above.				grass field, which is important to the future development of the herd, as well as a network of clay drainage tiles. As such, the addition of a logistics compound in this area would be contrary to consultation feedback received. In light of the information above regarding the routeing of construction traffic, this would mean access to the construction compound prior to reaching the Primary School. The A164 adjacent to the proposed logistics compound is one of the main noise sources at this location. The proposed logistics compound will be for activities such as car parking, storage of plant and materials, welfare facilities and potential working spaces. Due to the nature of the flow of traffic on the A164 there may be periods of time where noise from the compound is audible, however, the noise levels produced by these activities will be transient and generally short in duration. As a result, the noise levels from this compound are not considered to be of an order that would cause significant impacts at nearby noise sensitive locations given the adjacent noise source.

EIA topic area: Project Description

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_020	Please can you explain the transmission method from offshore turbine to Cottingham National grid. Specifically, AC/DC voltages and conversion. Do the turbines primarily generate AC or DC, are inverters involved in this.	16/12/2019	N/A	N/A	HVAC stands for high voltage alternating current, whereas HVDC stands for high voltage direct current. HVAC technology is the principle means of power transmission in all modern power systems. The vast majority of all electrical power is generated, transported and consumed as alternating current, where the voltage and current values oscillate over time at a specific frequency (50Hz in the UK, or 50 cycles per second). Transforming alternating current to higher voltages is relatively simple and enables power transmission over longer distances with reduced losses and fewer power lines than low voltage transmission. HVDC technology is an alternative to HVAC for point-point power transmission and may be appropriate in some circumstances for bulk power transfer over long distances or between different grids. Because most electricity, including that in an offshore wind farm, is generated as alternating current it is necessary to 'convert' the alternating current to direct current (with constant voltage and current values) and 'invert' the direct current back to

					alternating current for onward transmission in the national grid at large converter stations using power electronics devices.
Ongoing_Email_026	I can see that things are moving on with work commencing across the local countryside. Already the hedges have been chopped down and a course marked out across the fields. I do not know who the contractors are? Also, at night we see very bright lights directly opposite our property at Ulrome and wonder how much longer this will be for? The local farmers at and around Dringhoe have received compensation I believe as to how this will affect them. We live at *redacted* and what you are doing will definitely affect us and our lifestyle, yet no one from your company has contacted us either by letter or in person, we have just received general updates. it is very important now that you start a dialogue with us as to how this will affect us and when work on the lane will commence.	21/04/2020	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this response. Hornsea Four has not received a DCO and will not commence construction until earliest Summer 2023.

	redacted has certain medical conditions and I am his part-time career, we require 24-hour use of Barbriggs Lane. We also have several trades people/builder's working at the property usually on a daily basis (once lockdown is finished). Post needs to be delivered amongst other deliveries, refuse collected, and we must be able to come and go from our property as needed and also visitors must be able to gain access to our property. I have the following questions:- When will work on the lane around Dringhoe commence? How long will the disruption be for and what kind of disruption will there be? How will this affect access? Will all potholes on the lane be filled? Wear and tear on our vehicles caused by potholes. The bend at what we call 'Bush Corner' very near to where work will commence is a blind bend and the road very narrow due to the farmer ploughing right up to the tarmac, if possible this needs to be addressed and the road widened.				

EIA topic area: Consultation

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_021	I note from your recent Hornsea 4 newsletter that you have created a fund, would Cottingham Rifle Club of which I am secretary be eligible for a grant to improve our equipment for new members?	18/12/2019	N/A	N/A	The Applicant will receive the interactions of the project as the proposal is refined and consider an appropriate way to feed benefits back into the local community. This includes a voluntary Community Benefit Fund (CBF), many of which have been establishment for a number of projects which are currently under construction. These funds can make a valuable contribution to the local area. However, any decision to establish a community benefit fund for Hornsea Four could be made post-financial investment decision (FID).
Ongoing_Email_022	I understand that community grants will be available from your proposed Hornsea 4 project. I represent a number of local organisations and charities in East Yorkshire in the fields of heritage, sports, arts, and military. I would be grateful to receive information as and when it becomes available.	20/12/2019	N/A	N/A	
Ongoing_Email_025	We have received numerous documents in the past regarding the Hornsea 4 project unfortunately none of the leaflets gives a clear indication of what areas around my postcode are going to be affected. I logged into the Hornsea 4 project website to view more detailed maps, but these do not seem to exist. I also received a letter from a local	22/01/2020	N/A	N/A	The Applicant notes this comment. A detailed map is available through Commonplace via the project website.

	estate agency asking me if I need them. To act on my behalf to sort out any paperwork required for the compulsory land purchase for cabling for the project which is quite disturbing being that we have only received pamphlets so far with limited details and a useless map. Therefore, can you please send me any more detailed information you have regarding the Hornsea 4 project including an up to date map showing cable routes etc. so we can view them.				
Ongoing_Email_033	Thanks for this update in your Nov newsletter. A few queries relating to the development in the substation area : 1. The photo of a meeting in Cottingham, said to be in Sept 2020: I think I am sitting to the left of the projector, perhaps you may mean 2019? 2. Were the Ramblers invited to comment on proposals in Sept 2020?	16/11/2020			The Applicant notes the typographic error which should read 2019. No formal opportunity was extended to the Ramblers to comment on proposals in September 2020.
Ongoing_Email_034	The photo of a meeting in Cottingham, said to be in Sept 2020: I think I am sitting to the left of the projector, perhaps you may mean 2019?	16/11/2020			The Applicant responded directly at the time clarifying that the photograph was taken at a meeting at Arlington Hall, Cottingham, in 2019.

Ongoing_Email_034	Were the Ramblers invited to comment on proposals in Sept 2020?	16/11/2020			The Ramblers were also invited to comment on proposals during our phase two community consultation (between 13 August 2019 and 23 September 2019) and a subsequent meeting on 24th September at Cottingham Civic Hall.

EIA topic area: Ecology and Nature Conservation

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_033	3. You talk of increasing biodiversity within the substation area: how is this to be achieved? 4. I raised before with you and ERYC the results of your vegetation surveys: are these now available for the public to view?	16/11/2020			Details regarding increasing biodiversity at the onshore substation are included in **Volume F2, Chapter 16: Outline Net Gain Strategy**. The results of surveys are presented in relevant technical annexes in **Volume A6: Onshore Annexes**, notably **Annexes 3.1** to **3.15**.
Ongoing_Email_034	You talk of increasing biodiversity within the substation area: how is this to be achieved?	16/11/2020			We aim to increase biodiversity at the onshore substation site through the provision of suitable landscape planting around the perimeter of the site. This will be detailed and secured within relevant management plans and strategies, submitted as part of our Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
Ongoing_Email_034	I raised before with you and ERYC the results of your vegetation surveys: are these now available for the public to view?				The results of all surveys, inclusive of ecological surveys, are available for public view within the relevant technical appendices, submitted as

					part of our DCO application. This includes our vegetation surveys.

EIA topic area: Landscape and Visual

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_023	Concerning the reference to eminent local historian Dr David Neave of University of Hull, and his co-authorship of Pevsner N and Neave D," Yorkshire: York and the East Riding." My memory is that the other volunteers, councillors and Ramblers agreed at the last meeting in Cottingham Civic Centre in Dec that it would be worthwhile your contacting Dr Neave as an expert on vernacular building styles in the East Riding, for the building work at and around the planned substation. He lives in Cottingham (when I last spoke with him about the medieval barn at Watton a couple of years ago). I think it would add to the impression your final report would make on the local community for you to be able write that you have gone to the trouble of consulting Dr Neave.	02/01/2020	N/A	N/A	The need to minimise potential landscape and visual impacts arising from the onshore substation was identified early in the design process. Landscape and visual impacts of all onshore elements of Hornsea Four are assessed in **Volume A3, Chapter 4: Landscape and Visual**. This includes proposed mitigation solutions and visual screening proposed for the onshore substation to minimise impacts (see **Volume F2, Chapter 13: Outline Design Plan**). Indicative proposals are shown within the outline Landscape Management Plan which forms part of the DCO application (**Volume F2, Chapter 8: Outline Landscape Management Plan**). The Hornsea Four design vision is summarised in **Volume A4, Annex 4.6: Outline Design Vision Statement**. The Applicant has considered the existence of 'Important' hedgerows as defined under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Please see

	I asked about the surveys carried out by your plant experts, especially in connection with Hedgerows Protection Regulations 1997. I have also raised the same point with the Conservation Officer at East Riding Yorkshire Council, Mr. Martin George. My understanding is that such surveys are obligatory. I wonder if the survey information is now available for the public online.				**Volume A6, Annex 3.14: Hedgerow and Arboricultural Survey** for further details. Any hedgerows removed will be either replaced with like for like species (Co26) or more diverse and locally native species, subject to landowner agreement (Co194).
Ongoing_Email_035	Just a quick inquiring regarding the maps produced in the documents library highlighting blade tip ZTV. Do you know at what distance from shore blade tip visibility ceases? For example at 60 miles? Are you able to confirm from viewshed analysis if there is any blade tip visibility from the coast around Ravenscar and Ness point near Robin Hoods Bay?	25/05/2021	N?A	N?A	To ascertain if blade tips are visible, the first step is to understand if the tips are theoretically visible from a particular point, and the second step is to consider other factors that affect visibility such as visual acuity, shape of the object and weather conditions. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is based on theoretical intervisibility between two objects and takes into account landform and the curvature of the earth. Ravenscar looks to be approximately 100km away from the Hornsea Four array area and therefore well beyond the extent of any ZTVs that have been prepared for the project (which cover the radius within which any visual effects would be significant i.e. 50km as agreed with consultees including Natural England). Ness Point is more distant than Ravenscar. Theoretical intervisibility of objects out at sea depends, in this case, on the height of the wind turbines,

					their distance in relation to the curvature of the earth and the elevation of the land from which they are to be viewed. Without a ZTV extending out to 100km radius from the turbine, theoretical intervisibility is calculated using the theory of Pythagoras with the potential for additional theoretical visibility also considered in relation to refraction. This indicates that at the elevation of Ravenscar at the Visitor Centre (188m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD)), there is theoretical intervisibility of the turbines above the horizon with approximately one third of the turbine screened by the curvature of the earth. The threshold for theoretical visibility sits at approximately 45m AOD at the Ravenscar coast where there would be no theoretical intervisibility. Intervisibility between places could theoretically occur over a vast distance, particularly where the viewer or object is elevated but in reality visual acuity prevents this from happening. This is particularly the case with relatively slender objects i.e. a wind turbine compared to a mountain. At a range of 100km, it is extremely unlikely that there would be visibility of the Hornsea Four turbines. To be able to see the turbines from this location would require exceptional weather conditions

					to coincide with a particular sun direction and unusual orientation of the turbines.

EIA topic area: Historic Environment

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_029	I have received today the Orsted Community Newsletter for the above project. I appreciate both the newsletter and the map of the proposed route of the onshore cable. I have looked at the map, in particular, with great interest and wonder if you are aware that the proposed route appears to pass in very close proximity to the Memorial for 158 Squadron. 158 Squadron was part of Bomber Command in WWII - based at airfield just to the west of the village of Lissett. During their service, the Squadron's personnel endured both grave injuries and heavy loss of life. Their sacrifice is still remembered and appreciated by the 158 Squadron Association, the local community, and the general public.	01/06/2020	N/A	N/A	The Applicant thanks the consultee for this comment. It is confirmed that the memorial has been considered in **Volume A5, Annex 5.1: Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment** (both in the PEIR and DCO). This document contains other details of World War II features within the Hornsea Four Historic Environment Study Area.

	The award-winning Memorial is situated to the NW of the village of Lissett. It attracts a steady stream of visitors throughout the year - coming to pay their respects. Given the significance and sensitivity of the 158 Squadron Memorial, I was wondering what measures your company might be undertaking to safeguard the integrity of the site - both during and following the laying of the onshore cable. If you would be kind enough to let me know your thoughts on this matter, I would very much appreciate it.				

EIA topic area: Land Use and Agriculture

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_017	So, in summary: improvements to the National Cycle Network Route 1 on Park Lane in the vicinity of the Creyke Beck substation and working with the local community, landowners, ERYC and ourselves in relation to improving cycling & walking access in the north Barmston area.	24/09/2019	N/A	N/A	Hornsea Four will not impact National Cycle Route 1 on Park Lane due to the route planning and site selection process, and the identification of construction traffic routes. Information regarding the enhancement of PRoWs is included in **Volume F2, Chapter 14: Outline Enhancement Strategy**.

	Please would you confirm that these comments are being constructively taken on board and advise on likely next steps for developing each in more detail?				
Ongoing_Email_019	We hope you will be able to address the issues raised in *redacted* email response after our last meeting. We would especially appreciate hearing your views on the status of the hedges and trees along the footpath at Jillywoods Lane and other locations in the area affected by this development- do they constitute ancient woodland, and if so, what protection under law should be afforded them by yourselves and ERYC?	24/11/2019	N/A	N/A	The hedgerow at this location has been confirmed as being 'Important' as defined under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Please see **Volume A6, Annex 3.14: Hedgerow and Arboricultural Survey** for further details. The crossing methodology at this location has not been confirmed; however, any hedgerows removed will be either replaced with like for like species (Co26) or more diverse and locally native species, subject to landowner agreement (Co194).
Ongoing_Email_024	I understand that at the stakeholder events there has been discussions regarding various public rights of way in the project area, including Woodmansey Bridleway 30 and Rowley Bridleway 13, and specific consideration of surfacing. The main concern of bridleway users, particularly horse riders, is that any bridleway lower than an adjacent haul road would be subject to a lot of water	10/01/2020	N/A	N/A	Details regarding the PRoW diversions is included in the outline Public Right of Way Management Plan, which forms an appendix to **Volume F2, Chapter 2: Outline Code of Construction Practice**. Information such as surface materials, height and drainage will be agreed post-consent, with input from ERYC.

	and would poach up in wet weather, potentially making the route unusable. It is therefore recommended that the bridleway is kept at a slightly higher level (than an adjacent road) and if possible has French drains underneath, a membrane, fine rolled sandstone or chalk and a grassed soil topping - this would resultantly make it dry, sustainable and fairly low maintenance.				
Ongoing_Email_028	One matter for which we can find no documentation in your papers relates to the possible level of protection required in law to the trees and vegetation. In March this year, Andrew Acum kindly sent references to the various reports you have so far issued, but we were unable to find reference to any vegetation surveys performed under current legislation e.g. the Hedgerow Regulations. Perhaps your staff will be carrying out this work in the future, possibly to be submitted with your Development Consent Order Application in the Autumn. I do have some information published in about 2000 by a local botanist on	29/05/2020	N/A	N/A	The Applicant has considered the existence of 'Important' hedgerows as defined under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Please see **Volume A6, Annex 3.14: Hedgerow and Arboricultural Survey** for further details. Any hedgerows removed will be either replaced with like for like species (Co26) or more diverse and locally native species, subject to landowner agreement (Co194).

	hedgerows, some of which are within the development area, but it is quite difficult to identify specific hedges. Would there be an opportunity for submitting our queries at a later stage, for example at on online briefing, or perhaps when the Inspectorate consider your DCO material?				

EIA topic area: Traffic and Transport

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_031	As you will be aware from our response and questions at earlier consultations, the proposed logistics compound was, and remains, the Parish Council's main concern with regard to the Hornsea 4 cable route. The detailed information now supplied about the extent, usage and duration of this Primary Logistics Compound only serves to reinforce those concerns, particularly in the current proposed location(s). In our opinion, the potential volume of traffic (and consequential implications, including safety) from the proposed Logistics Compound has not been given sufficient weight in the selection of the	06/08/2020	N	N/A	The Applicant has engaged with Lockington Parish Council on the proposed logistics compound through a series of emails and two zoom meetings during the pandemic (03/07/2020, 13/07/2021). Responses to the parish council's concerns are detailed in full in the meeting minutes (see **Annex 1.33: Stakeholder Working Groups Minutes of Meetings**)

	proposed location of the Compound(s). The traffic generated will be significant considering 60+ staff, attendees at meetings, continual HGV deliveries of materials for storage/use and all the other movement of personnel, vehicles and machines inevitably associated with the only primary Logistics Compound for the onshore cable route. This is for a 3-year minimum duration. The nexus point for this traffic generation is the Station Road junction with the A164 Beverley Road.				
Ongoing_Email_032	Firstly, the total number of daily vehicle movements (30 incoming and 30 outgoing) seems remarkably low given that there will be 60+ staff, attendees at meetings, HGV deliveries and other movement of personnel, vehicles and machines associated with construction of the cable route and use of the only logistics compound – have we misunderstood something?. Secondly, the stated vehicle movement numbers and compass directions are very confusing (i.e. accesses east of Station Road??) – are you saying that the projection is for 61 (including 15HGV's) vehicle movements for a compound west of the A164 and 53 (including	21/10/2020	N	N/A	The Applicant has engaged with Lockington Parish Council on the proposed logistics compound through a series of emails and two zoom meetings during the pandemic. Responses to the parish council's concerns are detailed in full in the meeting minutes (see **Annex 1.33: Stakeholder Working Groups Minutes of Meetings**)

	7HGV's) movements for a compound east of the A164? Can you please clarify.)				
Ongoing_Email_032	Firstly, avoidance of Lockington Village is both welcome and essential. However, it is noted that this refers ONLY to construction traffic – can any assurances be given that Lockington will not become a "rat-run" for other traffic using the compound or involved in the cable route? Secondly, and as mentioned, this is the only primary Logistics Compound for the entire onshore route – it beggars belief that your construction traffic protocols and supply chains are so far advanced that you can say with any certainty that vehicle movements will be "via the A164 from the South", Can we hold you to that if the scheme is approved and are you prepared to giving binding assurances to that effect?)	21/10/2020	N	N/A	The Applicant has engaged with Lockington Parish Council on the proposed logistics compound through a series of emails and two zoom meetings during the pandemic. Responses to the parish council's concerns are detailed in full in the meeting minutes (see **Annex 1.33: Stakeholder Working Groups Minutes of Meetings**)
Ongoing_Email_032	Firstly, our comments above about movements travelling only from the south apply and, hence, may weaken your point or wipe out your conclusion. It is noted that you now mention HGV deliveries rather than 'construction traffic'- very confusing and inconsistent. Secondly, with regard to safety, you appear to be forgetting that a	21/10/2020			The Applicant has engaged with Lockington Parish Council on the proposed logistics compound through a series of emails and two zoom meetings during the pandemic. Responses to the parish council's concerns are detailed in full in the meeting minutes (see **Annex 1.33: Stakeholder Working Groups Minutes of Meetings**)

	compound on the west side of the A164 and all the attendant vehicle movements will automatically present safety issues and potential conflict with pedestrians using the roadside footpath from the bus stop on the A164 down to the village. Thirdly, the width of Station Road east of the A164 is about the same width as west of the A164 contiguous with the first field [if not wider in parts] where a compound could be located. There is also no roadside footpath to the east of the A164 and a source of potential risk and conflict				
Ongoing_Email_032	Safety and the impact on the wider village community must surely take priority.	21/10/2020			The Applicant has engaged with Lockington Parish Council on the proposed logistics compound through a series of emails and two zoom meetings during the pandemic. Responses to the parish council's concerns are detailed in full in the meeting minutes (see **Annex 1.33: Stakeholder Working Groups Minutes of Meetings**)
Ongoing_Email_032	There is an indication of Springs on the OS map to the east of the first field but not in the field itself – has the presence of Springs been validated? No disrespect to the farmer and his preferences, but the Parish Council has preferences too and this would be for a compound immediately east of the A164 (north of Station Road) unless	21/10/2020			The Applicant has engaged with Lockington Parish Council on the proposed logistics compound through a series of emails and two zoom meetings during the pandemic. Responses to the parish council's concerns are detailed in full in the meeting minutes (see **Annex 1.33: Stakeholder Working Groups Minutes of Meetings**)

	there are very sound and validated practical reasons why not.				
Ongoing_Email_032	The point we were making was that parents and contracted bus companies are bussing children to Lockington Primary School and many are using Station Road between the A164 and the School. A compound on the east side of the A164 would avoid any potential conflict or issues with school traffic – the same cannot be said for a compound on the west side.	21/10/2020			The Applicant has engaged with Lockington Parish Council on the proposed logistics compound through a series of emails and two zoom meetings during the pandemic. Responses to the parish council's concerns are detailed in full in the meeting minutes (see **Annex 1.33: Stakeholder Working Groups Minutes of Meetings**)

EIA topic area: Noise and Vibration

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response
Ongoing_Email_032	We do not have the data or knowledge to debate noise decibels but common sense suggests that the further away from houses the compound is located, the less disturbance will be caused. Our point about potential impact on public footpaths and safety implications remains.	21/10/2020		Co123	Hornsea Four has committed (Co49) to routing the onshore export cable corridor a minimum of 50m away from residential properties. Hornsea Four has committed to the following in relation to core construction working hours: • Monday to Friday: 07:00 - 18:00 hours; • Saturday: 07:00 - 13:00 hours; • Up to one hour before and after core working hours for mobilisation ("mobilisation period"), i.e. 06:00 to 19:00 weekdays and 06:00 to 14:00 Saturdays; and

					• Maintenance period 13:00 to 17:00 Saturdays. Activities carried out during mobilisation and maintenance will not generate significant noise levels (such as piling, or other such noisy activities). In circumstances outside of normal working practices, specific works may have to be undertaken outside the normal working hours. In these instances, the project will inform ERYC in writing. Based on noise modelling results, and for locations where noise has the potential to cause disturbance, the use of mufflers, acoustic barriers and directional lighting for areas where HDD is undertaken will be implemented (Co123). ERYC has been, and will continue to be, consulted and included on all planning matters as the project progresses including those associated with lighting, noise and vibration impacts and mitigation.

EIA topic area: Offshore and Intertidal Ornithology

Comment ID	Comment	Date	Project change? (Y/N/I or N/A)	Project commitment?	Applicant Response

Ongoing_Email_027	I was browsing through Crown Estate GIS spatial data and noticed on a data layer for seabird density displayed a proportion of high Kittiwake density overlap with the north-western corner of the Hornsea 4 project. I have attached a map as reference-apologies, it may not be the clearest. The darker the blue, the higher the density. In your commitment's announcement, you mention you will not secure 'Agreement for Lease' in areas of high seabird density. Does this mean no turbines will be placed in areas of the darkest blue? As it stands on your maps-turbines are still proposed in these areas. Is the layout for the turbine placement still in a preliminary stage? Also, another quick question. What was your overall evaluation of offshore elements on land-based receptors, in particular for Flamborough Head? Was it no significant impacts were anticipated due to distance from shore? My main concern with Hornsea 4 remains impacts on seabird populations of the nearby SPA. There is significant data regarding foraging range of	20/05/2020	N/A	N/A	The Applicant gave due consideration to the size and location (within the Area for Lease (AfL) array area) of the final project to be taken forward to consent application. This consideration was captured internally as a "Developable Area Approach" (DAA), which includes the consideration of physical, biological and human constraints in refining the developable area, balancing consenting and commercial considerations with technical feasibility for construction. The outcome of the DAA was the adoption of three major site reductions from the AfL presented at Scoping (846 km^2) to the PEIR boundary (600 km^2), with a further reduction adopted for the ES and DCO application (468 km^2) due to the findings of the impact assessment presented at PEIR, technical considerations and stakeholder feedback. The final reduction within the north of the AfL was undertaken in an effort to reduce/eliminate the potential for Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEoI) upon the guillemot and razorbill features of the FFC SPA by removing the remaining areas of high auk (guillemots and razorbills) density to the northwest of the AfL and thereby significantly reducing bird numbers within the final development footprint (~7% reduction in the mean peak abundance across all bio-seasons).

	conservation species of the SPA with many overlapping the development zone. I believe that with 4 large arrays already planned that significant cumulative impacts on seabirds cannot be ruled out and therefore does not demonstrate sustainable development. I am afraid I see Hornsea 4 as a greedy, opportunistic development at this stage.				The DAA involved meetings with The Crown Estate (TCE), Maritime Coastguard Agency (MCA), Trinity House, Natural England and the RSPB, the narrative of which is captured in **Volume A1, Chapter 3: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives**.
Ongoing_Email_033	In your latest community letter for Hornsea Project Four you say you are engaging with stakeholders, including Natural England and the RSPB, regarding potential impacts to bird features of the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA. Can you explain why you have not entered into any dialogue with Flamborough Bird Observatory?	16/11/2020			The Applicant responded on 27.11.20 with a summary of ornithological consultation undertaken to date.