



Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects

Marine Plan Policy Review

Revision A

February 2023

Document Reference: 13.6

Title:	
Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects Examination submission 13.6 - Marine Plan Policy Review	
PINS document no.: 13.6	
Document no.: C282-EA-Z-GA-00001	
Date:	Classification
20/02/2023	Final
Prepared by:	
Amos Ellis Consulting	
Approved by:	Date:
Sarah Chandler, Equinor	20/02/2023

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	7
	References	36

Table of Tables

	Table 1-1 East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Response to the Marine Planning Items in MMO's Relevant Representation	8
--	--	---

Glossary of Acronyms

AfL	Agreement for Lease
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
CIA	Cumulative Impact Assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
Defra	Department for the Environment and Rural Affairs
DEL	Dudgeon Extension Limited
DEP	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
DOW	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
E.S.	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
E.U.	European Union
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPMP	Offshore In Principle Monitoring Plan
km	Kilometre
MCZ	Marine Conservation Zone
MEEB	Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit
NPS	National Policy Statement
O&G	Oil and Gas
OWF	Offshore Wind Farm
PEXA	Military Practice and Exercise Areas
SEL	Scira Extension Limited
SEP	Sheringham Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
SOW	Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm
U.K.	United Kingdom

Glossary of Terms

Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP)	The Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension onshore and offshore sites including all onshore and offshore infrastructure.
DEP offshore site	The Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension consisting of the DEP wind farm site, interlink cable corridors and offshore export cable corridor (up to mean high water springs).
DEP North array area	The wind farm site area of the DEP offshore site located to the north of the existing Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm
DEP South array area	The wind farm site area of the DEP offshore site located to the south of the existing Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm
DEP wind farm site	The offshore area of DEP within which wind turbines, infield cables and offshore substation platform/s will be located and the adjacent Offshore Temporary Works Area. This is also the collective term for the DEP North and South array areas.
Landfall	The point at the coastline at which the offshore export cables are brought onshore, connecting to the onshore cables at the transition joint bay above mean high water
Offshore cable corridors	This is the area which will contain the offshore export cables or interlink cables, including the adjacent Offshore Temporary Works Area.
Offshore export cable corridor	This is the area which will contain the offshore export cables between offshore substation platform/s and landfall, including the adjacent Offshore Temporary Works Area.
Offshore export cables	The cables which would bring electricity from the offshore substation platform(s) to the landfall. 220 – 230kV.
Order Limits	The area subject to the application for development consent, including all permanent and temporary works for SEP and DEP.
Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (SEP)	The Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension onshore and offshore sites including all onshore and offshore infrastructure.

<p>SEP offshore site</p>	<p>Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension consisting of the SEP wind farm site and offshore export cable corridor (up to mean high water springs).</p>
<p>SEP wind farm site</p>	<p>The offshore area of SEP within which wind turbines, infield cables and offshore substation platform/s will be located and the adjacent Offshore Temporary Works Area.</p>
<p>Study area</p>	<p>Area where potential impacts from the project could occur, as defined for each individual Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) topic.</p>
<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Equinor New Energy Limited. As the owners of SEP and DEP, Scira Extension Limited and Dudgeon Extension Limited are the named undertakers that have the benefit of the DCO. References in this document to obligations on, or commitments by, 'the Applicant' are given on behalf of SEL and DEL as the undertakers of SEP and DEP.</p>

1 Introduction

1. This document presents the Applicant's comments on point 2.1.5 of the Marine Management Organisation's (MMO) Relevant Representation [RR-053] with respect to the Proposed Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension (SEP) and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP) Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
2. The MMO requested the Applicant to provide a single and coherent document, demonstrating the Project's compliance with all relevant marine plans and policies in the area. The MMO's request is set out in paragraph 2.1.5 and 2.1.6 of RR-053:

"2.1.5 The Applicant should demonstrate that they have considered whether the project adheres to all the relevant marine plans and policies in the area. The MMO recommends that this is presented in a single, coherent document instead of a number of separate references throughout the submission. The relevant marine plan policies that should be met can be identified using the Explore Marine Plans tool and policy information on the following website:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/explore-marine-plans>

2.1.6 Once a comprehensive marine plan assessment has been provided, the MMO will provide comment on this."
3. **Table 1-1** sets out the East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plans policies in a coherent format. This table identifies the policies that this Project complies with, and policies that are not applicable to this Project.
4. As the owners of the Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (SEP) and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP), Scira Extension Limited (SEL) and Dudgeon Extension Limited (DEL) are the named undertakers that have the benefit of the Development Consent Order (DCO). References in this document to obligations on, or commitments by, 'the Applicant' are given on behalf of SEL and DEL as the undertakers of SEP and DEP.

Table 1-1 East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan Response to the Marine Planning Items in MMO’s Relevant Representation

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
EC1	Proposals that provide economic productivity benefits which are additional to Gross Value Added currently generated by existing activities should be supported.	To promote more than the most economically beneficial developments and activities. It is also about gaining economic benefit from all developments and activities.	Screened In	SEP & DEP will support local and U.K. employment during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases.	6.1.27 E.S. Chapter 27 Socio-Economics [APP-113] and 6.3.27.2 Volume 3 Appendix 27.2 Socio-Economics and Tourism Technical Baseline [APP-277]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
EC2	Proposals that provide additional employment benefits should be supported, particularly where these benefits have the potential to meet employment needs in localities close to the marine plan areas.	This policy is intended to promote more than solely the most economically beneficial developments and activities. It is also about gaining employment benefit from all developments and activities.	Screened In	SEP & DEP will support local and U.K. employment during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases.	6.1.27 E.S. Chapter 27 Socio-Economics [APP-113] and 6.3.27.2 Volume 3 Appendix 27.2 Socio-Economics and Tourism Technical Baseline [APP-277]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
EC3	Proposals that will help the East marine plan areas to contribute to offshore wind energy generation should be supported.	Optimising the location and methods of deploying offshore wind farms as well as other developments and activities that may affect their delivery.	Screened In	This application is for two offshore wind farms and therefore supports this policy.	6.1.27 E.S. Chapter 27 Socio-Economics [APP-113] and 6.3.27.2 Volume 3 Appendix 27.2 Socio-Economics and Tourism Technical Baseline [APP-277]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
SOC1	Proposals that provide health and social well-being benefits including through maintaining, or enhancing, access to the coast and marine area should be supported.	SOC1 provides more detail and prescription than the Marine Policy Statement for considering the benefits for health and social well-being and coastal and marine access in decisions.	Screened In	The proposal development avoids any reduction in open access land, and minimises any closure of access to the coast. Any disruption of access to parts of the coast will be during construction only. Disruption to any recreational routes will be agreed in advance with relevant authorities before the relevant stage of work.	6.1.19 E.S. Chapter 19 Land Use, Agricultural and Recreation [APP-105] and 6.1.28 ES Chapter 28 Health [APP-114]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
SOC2	Proposals that may affect heritage assets should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not compromise or harm elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset	The aim of this policy is to ensure that existing marine and coastal heritage assets are protected from proposals that may have a detrimental impact upon them. It ensures that all heritage assets (whether formally designated	Screened In	All direct impacts to known heritage assets as a result of SEP and DEP are proposed to be avoided. The approach to mitigation is to avoid these features via	6.2.14 E.S. Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100]; 6.2.21 E.S. Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-106]; Offshore Infrastructure in E.S.	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>b) how, if there is compromise or harm to a heritage asset, this will be minimised</p> <p>c) how, where compromise or harm to a heritage asset cannot be minimised it will be mitigated against or</p> <p>d) the public benefits for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate compromise or harm to the heritage asset</p>	<p>or not), are considered in the decision-making process</p>		<p>Archaeological Exclusion Zones. In order to account for unexpected archaeological finds, a formal protocol for archaeological discoveries will be implemented during construction through the Written Scheme of Investigation</p>	<p>Appendix 21.5 [APP-239]; 9.11 Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-298]</p>	
<p>SOC3</p>	<p>Proposals that may affect the terrestrial and marine character of an area should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they will not adversely impact the terrestrial and marine character of an area</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area, they will minimise them</p> <p>c) how, where these adverse impacts on the terrestrial and marine character of an area</p>	<p>This policy is specific to landscape (seascape) character. It aims to add value to what is described in the Marine Policy Statement by ensuring that the character of specific areas is considered not only in the development of marine plans, but also in all decisions, such as on proposals for development, activities or management measures</p>	<p>Screened In</p>	<p>SEP and/or DEP would extend existing offshore wind farms within areas of sea that are currently influenced by the presence of SOW and DOW adjoining the sites and other existing offshore wind farms in the wider seascape thus minimising these impacts.</p>	<p>6.2.25 E.S. Chapter 25 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-111]; 6.2.26 E.S. Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-112]</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>cannot be minimised they will be mitigated against</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>			<p>SOW and DOW are already characteristic of the existing seascape character, and of views from and the setting of landscape and seascape character areas.</p>		
<p>ECO1</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem of the East marine plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial) should be addressed in decision-making and plan implementation</p>	<p>The policy expects decision makers to identify and manage cumulative impacts when determining applications.</p>	<p>Screened In</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem and with other offshore windfarms in the region and terrestrial development have been addressed and are assessed in each topic chapter of the Environmental Statement. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been included in the application.</p>	<p>6.1.19 E.S. Chapter 19 Land Use, Agricultural and Recreation [APP-105]; Section 8.7 of 6.1.8 of E.S. Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094]</p> <p>Section 10.7 of 6.1.10 E.S. Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096] provides the cumulative impact assessment. Section 11.7.3.2.5 of 6.1.11 of E.S. Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097] has a CIA</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
					for Sandwich tern; 6.3.24.5 Appendix 24.5 Interaction Between Impacts	
ECO2	The risk of release of hazardous substances as a secondary effect due to any increased collision risk should be taken account of in proposals that require an authorisation.	Risks are likely to be identified and addressed through existing mechanisms, such as environmental assessment, navigational risk assessment, safety measures and contingency plans.	Screened In	The application considers the risk of collision and subsequent release of hazardous substance in the entire life cycle of the development. Mitigation measures to minimise collision have been considered.	Section 13.5 in 6.1.13 E.S. Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099]; 6.3.16.1 Appendix 16.1 Vessel Access Study [APP-204]; 9.12 Outline Marine Traffic Monitoring Plan [APP-299]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
BIO1	Appropriate weight should be attached to biodiversity, reflecting the need to protect biodiversity as a whole, taking account of the best available evidence including on habitats and species that are protected or of conservation concern in the East marine plans and adjacent areas (marine, terrestrial).	This plan policy is intended to ensure that all current publicly available evidence relating to biodiversity interest in the East marine plan areas is taken account of by the relevant public authority in the appropriate manner with advice from the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies.	Screened In	The E.S. considers impacts on marine and terrestrial ecology. It identifies mitigation to protect species and habitats, where appropriate.	6.1.8 E.S. Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], 6.1.9 E.S. Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], 6.1.10 E.S. Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096], 6.2.11 E.S. Chapter 11 Offshore	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
					Ornithology [APP-097]	
BIO2	Where appropriate, proposals for development should incorporate features that enhance biodiversity and geological interests.	This policy adds value by providing a clear direction to public authorities that they should show a preference for proposals that enhance benefits to marine ecology, biodiversity and geological conservation requirements apply	Screened In	<p>The application includes the creation of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and a BNG Assessment using a defined BNG metric has been undertaken and includes BNG specific compensation and enhancement measures.</p> <p>For offshore environment, new faunal communities could be established, and new species could colonise on artificial hard substrate, such as foundations and scour protection in</p>	<p>6.3.20.6 Appendix 20.6 Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [APP-219];</p> <p>9.19.2 Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306]</p> <p>Paragraph 287 of, 291 and 292 of 6.1.8 E.S. Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094]</p> <p>Paragraph 351 of 6.1.9 E.S Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish [APP-095]</p> <p>Paragraphs 667 to 670 of 6.1.10 E.S Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096]</p>	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
				<p>soft sediment areas. There could be an increase of the biomass of fish species around the foundations. The potential effects of the increased biomass of fish species around artificial structures are likely to be beneficial to marine mammals, however, the impacts have been assessed as negligible as a precautionary measure.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes planting and maintaining a native oyster bed of 10,000 m² in Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds MCZ as a Measure of</p>		

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
				Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) Plan if deemed to be required by the Secretary of State.		
MPA1	Any impacts on the overall Marine Protected Area network must be taken account of in strategic level measures and assessments, with due regard given to any current agreed advice on an ecologically coherent network.	The policy clarifies the need for public authorities to not only consider impacts on individual sites, but also impacts on the overall ecological coherence of the Marine Protected Area network.	Screened In	The site selection avoids Marine Protected Areas where possible including the Wash and North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation. The majority of impacts are temporary disturbance and/or loss of habitats, increases in suspended sediments and sediment deposition, and impacts on the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone. The Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone is	6.1.3 E.S. Chapter 3 Site Selection [APP-089] and 6.1.8 E.S. Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
				completely avoided through the drilling impacts at landfall.		
CC1	Proposals should take account of: • how they may be impacted upon by, and respond to, climate change over their lifetime and • how they may impact upon any climate change adaptation measures elsewhere during their lifetime Where detrimental impacts on climate change adaptation measures are identified, evidence should be provided as to how the proposal will reduce such impacts.	The policy aim is that new development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change.	Screened In	The design of SEP and DEP included the allowance for predicted erosion rates. SEP and DEP will not be vulnerable to coastal changes or climate change. Cables will be buried at sufficient depth to have no effect on coastal erosion.	6.1.3 E.S. Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternative [APP-089]; 6.1.18 E.S. Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
CC2	Proposals for development should minimise emissions of greenhouse gases as far as is appropriate. Mitigation measures will also be encouraged where emissions remain following minimising steps. Consideration should also be given to missions from	This policy aims to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases which should be taken in account.	Screened In	The proposed offshore windfarm would make a significant contribution in decarbonising by generating low-carbon renewable energy and displacing emissions from	Section 4 of 9.1 Planning Statement – Project Need and Benefits [APP-285]; 6.1.22 of E.S. Chapter 22 Air Quality [APP-108]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	other activities or users affected by the proposal.			fossil fuel sources of energy. Localised emissions associated with the development are assessed in the E.S. and concluded to be non-significant		
GOV1	Appropriate provision should be made for infrastructure on land which supports activities in the marine area and vice versa.	This policy seeks to promote integration between marine and land use plans in the provision of infrastructures. Public authorities must assess the potential positive and negative impacts, on both the marine and terrestrial environments, of development proposals in a collective and cumulative manner	Screened In	The application includes all required infrastructure associated with SEP and DEP, namely offshore wind turbines, offshore electrical platforms, offshore accommodation platforms, offshore export cables, array cables, landfall works, onshore cables, an onshore project substation next to the existing Norwich National Grid Substation.	6.1.4 E.S. Chapter 4 Project Description [APP-090]	Policy has been considered and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
GOV2	Opportunities for co-existence should be maximised wherever possible.	The key aim of this policy is to promote compatibility and reduce conflict (between activities, and also with the environment) in order to manage the use of space within the marine environment in an efficient and effective manner	Screened In	Consultation has been undertaken with all relevant third parties who may interact with the offshore or onshore works and mitigation has been identified where appropriate to maximise the opportunity for coexistence. A Fisheries Coexistence Plan would enhance the success of coexistence.	5.1 Consultation Report [APP-029]; 9.8 Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan [APP-295]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
GOV3	Proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will avoid displacement of other existing or authorised (but yet to be implemented) activities b) how, if there are adverse impacts resulting in	GOV3 aims to ensure GOV2 is implemented proportionally. The policy aim is to facilitate decisions and effective management measures that avoid, minimise or mitigate negative economic, social and environmental impacts	Screened In	The application has a detailed site selection process to minimise interactions of SEP/DEP with existing activities. For offshore, existing activities include shipping	6.1.3 E.S. Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089]; 6.1.12 E.S. Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098]; 9.8 Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>displacement by the proposal, they will minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts resulting in displacement by the proposal, cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated against or</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts of displacement</p>			<p>and navigation, oil and gas platforms, nature conservation designations, commercial fisheries and civil/military and coverage and helicopter main routes. Throughout the E.S., there are proposed mitigations to minimise any remaining potential impacts.</p>	<p>existence Plan [APP-295]</p>	
DEF1	<p>Proposals in or affecting Ministry of Defence Danger and Exercise Areas should not be authorised without agreement from the Ministry of Defence.</p>	<p>This policy supports the need for defence activities to take place within the East marine plan areas for the purpose of national security.</p>	<p>Screened In</p>	<p>There are no Military Practice and Exercise Areas (PEXA) in the study area.</p>	<p>Section 13.4.7.10 in 6.1.13 E.S. Ch 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099]</p>	<p>Policy has been considered and the application is compliant.</p>
OG1	<p>Proposals within areas with existing oil and gas production should not be authorised except where compatibility with oil and gas production and</p>	<p>Plan policy OG1 clarifies that, where existing oil and gas production and infrastructure are in place, the areas should be protected for the activities</p>	<p>Screened In</p>	<p>The SEP and DEP project boundaries were chosen with the aim of avoiding direct interaction</p>	<p>6.1.3 E.S. Ch 3 Site Selection and Alternatives [APP-089]; 6.1.16 E.S. Ch 16 Petroleum Industry</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>infrastructure can be satisfactorily demonstrated.</p>	<p>authorised under the production licence consent until the licence is surrendered, (including completion of any relevant decommissioning activity), or where agreement over co-located use can be negotiated.</p>		<p>with O&G infrastructure as much as possible. There is no surface O&G infrastructure within the SEP or DEP wind farm sites or the proposed offshore export cable corridor. There will be some minor adverse and moderate adverse (not significant) residual impacts on O&G operations, subsea cables and pipelines during construction, operation and decommissioning phases of SEP and DEP. The potential for any major adverse impacts can be mitigated through proximity and crossing agreements with</p>	<p>and Other Marine Users [APP-102]; 6.3.16.1 Appendix 16.1 Vessel Access Study [APP-204]; 6.3.16.2 Appendix 16.2 Helicopter Access Study [APP-205]; 6.3.21.5 App 21.5 Offshore Infrastructure Setting Assessment [APP-240]; 9.5 Offshore In Principle Plan (IPMP) [APP-289]</p>	

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
				other operators, ongoing consultation and layout agreement.		
OG2	Proposals for new oil and gas activity should be supported over proposals for other development.	The policy aim is to afford protection of potential sites to prevent incompatible activities taking place.	Screened In	The Applicant continues to engage and collaborate with oil and gas developers.	5.1 Consultation Report [APP-029]; 6.1.16 E.S Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
WIND1	<p>Developments requiring authorisation, that are in or could affect sites held under a lease or an agreement for lease that has been granted by The Crown Estate for development of an Offshore Wind Farm, should not be authorised unless</p> <p>a) they can clearly demonstrate that they will not compromise the construction, operation, maintenance, or decommissioning of the Offshore Wind Farm</p>	The policy aims to protect sites identified by The Crown Estate from sterilisation by other uses until such time as the site is no longer used, or liable to be reused in the future.	Screened In	Agreement for Lease with The Crown Estate requires the proposed windfarm must share a boundary with the existing parent wind farm. The proposed wind farm must be 5 km away from any other wind farm. The proposed development will clearly not compromise and will in fact facilitate, the	6.1.3 E.S. Chapter 3 Site Selection [APP-089]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>b) the lease/agreement for lease has been surrendered back to The Crown Estate and not been re-tendered</p> <p>c) the lease/agreement for lease has been terminated by the Secretary of State</p> <p>d) in other exceptional circumstances.</p>			<p>construction, operation, maintenance, or decommissioning of the Offshore Wind Farm.</p>		
WIND2	<p>Proposals for Offshore Wind Farms inside Round 3 zones, including relevant supporting projects and infrastructure, should be supported.</p>	<p>This policy aims to ensure that the large potential for Offshore Wind Farms in the East marine plan areas and the ambitions of government for renewable energy are realised by preferring proposals which are compatible with the policy, including supporting infrastructure.</p>	Screened Out	<p>The application is outside of Round 3 zones.</p>	N/A	<p>Policy is not applicable to application.</p>
TIDE1	<p>In defined areas of identified tidal stream resource (see figure 16), proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p>	<p>This policy identifies locations in the East Inshore area by protecting them from other new activities or development, both inside and outside identified areas that</p>	Screened out	<p>The application is not in an area of identified tidal stream resource.</p>	N/A	<p>Policy is not applicable to application.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>a) that they will not compromise potential future development of a tidal stream project</p> <p>b) how, if there are any adverse impacts on potential tidal stream deployment, they will minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>	<p>could impact upon the ability to realise tidal stream energy in the future.</p>				
<p>CCS1</p>	<p>Within defined areas of potential carbon dioxide storage,(mapped in figure 17) proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will not prevent carbon dioxide storage b) how, if there are adverse impacts on carbon dioxide storage, they will minimise them c) how, if the</p>	<p>The policy aims to help ensure that sufficient storage sites are available for Carbon Capture and Storage over the long term in view of the large number of such sites, on a national and international scale.</p>	<p>Screened out</p>	<p>The application is not in an area of potential carbon dioxide storage.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Policy is not applicable to application.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts					
CCS2	Carbon Capture and Storage proposals should demonstrate that consideration has been given to the re-use of existing oil and gas infrastructure rather than the installation of new infrastructure (either in depleted fields or in active fields via enhanced hydrocarbon recovery).	This policy seeks to ensure that the use of hydrocarbon fields for the storage of carbon dioxide is promoted where possible, maximising storage nationally.	Screened out	This application neither captures nor stores carbon.	N/A	Policy is not applicable to application.
PS1	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure or that significantly reduce under-keel clearance should not be authorised in International Maritime Organization designated routes.	This policy seeks to minimise any negative impacts on shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety and ensure that decision makings comply international maritime law.	Screened In	Reduction in under-keel clearance is localised and limited to near landfall location, outside of IMO designated routes. The frequency of impacts to under keel clearance,	6.1.13 E.S. Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099] and 9.7.2 Appendix 9.7.2 – Export Cable Burial Risk Assessment [APP-293]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
				including snagging, is assessed as extremely unlikely given the preference for cable burial where possible and promulgation of information including advance warning of construction activities. Any changes exceeding 5% will be discussed with the Maritime & Coastguard Agency.		
PS2	Proposals that require static sea surface infrastructure that encroaches upon important navigation routes (see figure 18) should not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances. Proposals should: a) be compatible with the need to maintain space for safe	This policy minimises negative impacts on shipping activity, protecting the economic interests of ports and shipping and the United Kingdom economy, and protect the areas used by high intensities of traffic.	Screened in	Impacts to navigation routes / shipping lanes have been assessed. A Navigational Risk Assessment will be implemented to reduce all potential impacts to acceptable or	6.1.13 E.S. Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099]; 6.3.13.1 E.S Appendix 13.1 Navigation Risk Assessment [APP-198]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>navigation, avoiding adverse economic impact</p> <p>b) anticipate and provide for future safe navigational requirements where evidence and/or stakeholder input allows and</p> <p>c) account for impacts upon navigation in-combination with other existing and proposed activities</p>			<p>tolerable risk levels as low as reasonably practicable.</p>		
PS3	<p>Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they will not interfere with current activity and future opportunity for expansion of ports and harbours</p> <p>b) how, if the proposal may interfere with current activity and future opportunities for expansion, they will minimise this</p> <p>c) how, if the interference cannot be minimised, it will be mitigated</p>	<p>This policy gives effect to the need to minimise negative impacts on shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety, as well as protecting the efficiency and resilience of continuing port operations, and further port development and complements the NPS for ports</p>	<p>Screened In</p>	<p>There are no existing or planned ports or harbours within the project area. The project will require port / harbour facilities and will require adequate facilities.</p>	<p>6.1.13 E.S. Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099]; 6.3.13.1 E.S Appendix 13.1 Navigation Risk Assessment [APP-198]</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	d) the case for proceeding if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the interference					
DD1	<p>Proposals within or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas should demonstrate, in order of preference</p> <p>a) that they will not adversely impact dredging and disposal activities</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on dredging and disposal, they will minimise these</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>	<p>This plan policy aims to protect dredging and disposal activities, in or adjacent to licensed dredging and disposal areas, against other new proposals that would compromise the continued access to ports and harbours for the shipping industry.</p>	Screened out	<p>The application avoids dredging activities through site selection process.</p>	N/A	<p>Policy is not applicable to this application.</p>
AGG1	<p>Proposals in areas where a licence for extraction of aggregates has been granted or formally applied for should</p>	<p>This policy protects licenced (and formally applied) aggregate extraction, ensuring the supply of marine aggregates from</p>	Screened out	<p>There are no aggregate dredging licences or application areas</p>	<p>Section 16.5.6 Marine Aggregate Extraction in 6.1.16 E.S. Ch 16 Petroleum Industry and Other</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	not be authorised unless there are exceptional circumstances.	commercially valuable deposits is not compromised.		within 5km of SEP or DEP.	Marine Users [APP-102]	the application is compliant.
AGG2	Proposals within an area subject to an Exploration and Option Agreement with The Crown Estate should not be supported unless it is demonstrated that the other development or activity is compatible with aggregate extraction or there are exceptional circumstances.	This policy ensures applications for authorisation do not compromise the extraction of aggregate resource within an exploration area for aggregates	Screened In	There are no aggregate dredging licences or application areas within 5km of SEP or DEP. The nearest licensed areas for aggregate production are to the north and west of the projects, approximately 8km and 10km away from DEP North array area respectively	Section 16.5.6 Marine Aggregate Extraction in 6.1.16 E.S Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.
AGG3	Within defined areas of high potential aggregate resource, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference: a) that they will not, prevent aggregate extraction	This policy considers how proposals for marine development and activities within areas of high potential aggregate resource may impact the ability to access commercially viable marine	Screened In	SEP and DEP overlap with an area identified as a High Potential Aggregate Resource (AGG3 zone). The AfLs are already in place for the SEP and DEP	Section 16.5.6 Marine Aggregate Extraction in 6.1.16 E.S. Ch 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on aggregate extraction, they will minimise these</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the application if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>	<p>sand and gravel resources in the future</p>		<p>wind farm sites, they take precedence over any future potential aggregate extraction that may have occurred within the respective AfLs.</p>		
<p>CAB1</p>	<p>Preference should be given to proposals for cable installation where the method of installation is burial. Where burial is not achievable, decisions should take account of protection measures for the cable that may be proposed by the applicant.</p>	<p>This policy aims to ensure sub-sea cables are properly protected from damage and do not cause a safety issue for vessels, particularly in navigation channels.</p>	<p>Screened In</p>	<p>The offshore cable is proposed to be buried to ensure that the cables are protected from damage from fishing, shipping and naturally occurring physical processes.</p>	<p>8.1 Cable Statement [APP-283]; 9.7.1 Appendix 9.7.1 - Interim Cable Burial Study [APP-292]; 9.7.2 Appendix Export Cable Burial Risk Assessment [APP-293]; 9.7.3 Appendix 9.7.3 - Cable Protection Decommissioning Feasibility [APP-294]</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
<p>FISH1</p>	<p>Within areas of fishing activity, proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:</p> <p>a) that they will not prevent fishing activities on, or access to, fishing grounds</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on the ability to undertake fishing activities or access to fishing grounds, they will minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with their proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>	<p>This plan policy supports fishing activity by avoiding adverse impacts resulting from development and activities in the East marine plan areas. The policy focuses on access to fishing grounds.</p>	<p>Screened In</p>	<p>The E.S. identifies three key species – whelk, brown crab and lobster within the windfarm sites. U.K. vessels generally target the three species of crustaceans. E.U. registered vessels tend to target four key finfish species in the wind farm site and export cable area: sole, plaice, whiting and mackerel. The impact on E.U. vessels is negligible adverse because they operate large areas and there are alternative locations. For U.K. fleets, the impact is considered to be moderate adverse because the</p>	<p>6.1.13 E.S. Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098]; 6.2.12 E.S Chapter 12 Figures - Commercial Fisheries [APP-124]; 6.3.12.1 E.S. Appendix 12.1 Commercial Fisheries Technical Report [APP-197]; 9.8 Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan [APP-295]</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
				availability of alternative fishing grounds is low. The moderate adverse impacts on the U.K. fleet will be mitigated through justifiable disturbance payments to reduce the significance of residual impacts to minor adverse.		
FISH2	Proposals should demonstrate, in order of preference: a) that they will not have an adverse impact upon spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat b) how, if there are adverse impacts upon the spawning and nursery areas and any associated habitat, they will minimise them	The aim of this policy is to support the recovery of fish stocks by offering protection against adverse impacts to spawning areas from development or activity.	Screened In	The E.S. identifies DEP is the preferred habitat for sandeel and SEP is for herring. The E.S. concludes that the overall impacts are of minor adverse significance. The E.S. proposes mitigation embedded in the design. Burying cable will limit modifying the	6.1.9 E.S Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095]; 6.1.13 E.S. Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098]; 6.3.12.1 E.S. Appendix 12.1 Commercial Fisheries Technical Report [APP-197]; 9.8 Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan [APP-295]	The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with their proposals if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>			<p>habitat and degradation of cable protection material. The depth of the export cable is up to 1m. Offshore work would be twenty four hours per day to reduce the overall period for potential impacts to fish communities. Finally, each piling event will begin with a soft start at a lower hammer energy followed by a gradual ramp for twenty minutes. This soft-start and ramp-up approach allow mobile species to move away from the construction site before the maximum hammer energy with the greatest noise</p>		

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
				impact area is reached.		
AQ1	<p>Within sustainable aquaculture development sites (identified through research), proposals should demonstrate in order of preference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) that they will avoid adverse impacts on future aquaculture development by altering the sea bed or water column in ways which would cause adverse impacts to aquaculture productivity or potential b) how, if there are adverse impacts on aquaculture development, they can be minimised c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised they will be mitigated d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts 	<p>Policy AQ1 is an enabling policy for aquaculture, which seeks to protect opportunities for aquaculture, as they are identified through research and evaluation.</p>	Screened In	<p>Aquaculture off the North Norfolk coast (mariculture) is currently limited to a small number of shellfish farms which produce oysters in the shallow coastal waters of Blakeney Point and Wells-next-the-Sea. The application is away from existing shellfish farms.</p>	<p>Section 16.5.8 Aquaculture in 6.1.16 E.S. Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102]a</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
TR1	<p>Proposals for development should demonstrate that during construction and operation, in order of preference:</p> <p>a) they will not adversely impact tourism and recreation activities</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on tourism and recreation activities, they will minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>	<p>This policy recognises the importance of tourism and recreation in the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plan Areas and seeks to minimise adverse impacts of development on tourism and recreation.</p>	Screened In	<p>The application has considered the effects on the tourism economy of both onshore and offshore infrastructure. The E.S. identifies no impact to Blue Flag Beaches and to Onshore Coastal Recreational Assets.</p>	<p>6.1.19 E.S Chapter 19 Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation [APP-105] and 6.1.27 E.S. Chapter 27 Socio-economics and Tourism [APP-113]</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>
TR2	<p>Proposals that require static objects in the East marine plan areas, should demonstrate, in order of preference:</p>	<p>This policy adds clarification to the Marine Policy Statement through highlighting the benefits of early engagement and aims to ensure that any development takes account</p>	Screened In	<p>Assessment of recreational craft has been undertaken with Royal Yachting Association. Recreational activity</p>	<p>Section 13.6 of 6.1.13 E.S. Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099]</p>	<p>The policy has been considered, and the application is compliant.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy Text	Policy Aim/Rationale	Policy screened in or out from EIA assessment	SEP and DEP assessment of plan policy (include why policy screened out)	Relevant Documents	East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans policy assessment result
	<p>a) that they will not adversely impact on recreational boating routes</p> <p>b) how, if there are adverse impacts on recreational boating routes, they will minimise them</p> <p>c) how, if the adverse impacts cannot be minimised, they will be mitigated</p> <p>d) the case for proceeding with the proposal if it is not possible to minimise or mitigate the adverse impacts</p>	<p>of the recognised boating areas and most used cruising routes for recreational craft in the East marine plan areas.</p>		<p>is highest to the south of the project close to shore. The Navigation Management Plan will disseminate information to recreational clubs about construction details and project vessel movements.</p>		
<p>TR3</p>	<p>Proposals that deliver tourism and/or recreation related benefits in communities adjacent to the East marine plan areas should be supported.</p>	<p>This policy aims to promote and support sustainable tourism and recreation opportunities in the East marine plan areas</p>	<p>Screened Out</p>	<p>The application does not deliver tourism or recreation activities.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Policy is not applicable to application.</p>

References

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), *East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plans* April 2014.