



Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects

Addendum to the Planning Statement

Revision A

Deadline 7

July 2023

Document Reference: 9.1.2

APFP Regulation: 5(2)(q)

Title:	
Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects Examination submission Addendum to the Planning Statement	
PINS document no.: 9.1.2	
Document no.: C282-RH-Z-GA-00273	
Date:	Classification
July 2023	Final
Prepared by:	
Amos Ellis Consulting	
Approved by:	Date:
Sarah Chandler, Equinor	July 2023

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	11
1.1	Draft NPS EN-1	13
1.2	Draft NPS EN-3.....	96
1.3	Draft NPS EN-5.....	141
	References	163

Table of Tables

Table 1	The Applicant’s Response to Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	14
Table 2	The Applicant’s Response to Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	97
Table 3	The Applicant’s Response to Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	142

Glossary of Acronyms

ADR	Air Defence Radar
AEZ	Archaeological Exclusion Zone
AfL	Agreement for Lease
AIA	Aviation Impact Assessment
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
ALO	Agricultural Liaison Officer
AONB	Area of Outstanding and Natural Beauty
ATC	Air Traffic Control
BMP	Best Management Practice
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CION	Connection and Infrastructure Options Note
CNP	Critical National Priority
CNS	Communication Navigation and Surveillance
CRM	Collision Risk Modelling
CSCB	Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds
CSCB MCZ	Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone
CSIMP	Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DEFRA	Department for the Environment and Rural Affairs
DEP	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
DfT	Department for Transport
DML	Deemed Marine Licenses
DOW	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm
DPF	Diesel Particulate Filters
EA	Environmental Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMF	Electromagnetic fields

EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
EPP	Evidence Plan Process
ES	Environmental Statement
ESO	Electricity System Operator
ETG	Expert Topic Group
ETNPR	Electricity Transmission Network Planning Review
ExA	Examining Authority
FEP	Food Enterprise Park
GES	Good Environmental Status
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GW	GigaWatt
HAT	Highest Astronomical Tide
HDD	Horizontal directional drilling
HGV	Heavy Good Vehicles
HND	Holistic Network Design
HRA	Habitat Regulation Assessment
IAPP	International Air Pollution Prevention
IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
IMO	International Maritime Organization
INNS	Invasive Non Native Species
IPC	Infrastructure Planning Commission
IPMP	In Principle Monitoring Plan
IROPI	Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest
JNCC	Joint Nature and Conservation Committee
JTF	Joint Task Force
km	kilometre
LNRS	Local Nature Recovery Strategies
LV	Light Vehicles
LVIA	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
MARPOL	International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ship
MBES	Multibeam Echosounder
MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Agency

MCZ	Marine Conservation Zone
MCZA	Marine Conservation Zone Assessment
MEEB	Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit
MGN	Marine Guidance Note
MMMP	Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MOD	Ministry of Defence
MP	Member of Parliament
MPA	Marine Protected Areas
MPI	Multi-Purpose Interconnectors
NATS	National Air Traffic Services
NCA	Natural Capital Approach
NCAONB	Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
NCC	Norfolk County Council
NH	National Highway
NIC	National Infrastructure Commission
NMP	Navigation Management Plan
NNDC	North Norfolk District Council
NNHC	North Norfolk Heritage Coast
NNR	National Nature Reserves
NPS	National Policy Statement
NRA	Navigational Risk Assessment
NRMM	Non-Road Mobile Machinery
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
NSWWS	National Severe Weather Warning Service
OCoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
OCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
OEMP	Outline Ecological Management Plan
OESEA	UK Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental
Ofgem	Office of Gas and Electricity Markets
OLMP	Outline Landscape Management Plan
OnSS	Onshore Substation Station

OOMP	Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan
OSP	Onshore Substation Platform
OTNR	Offshore Transmission Network Review
OWES	Offshore Wind Environmental Standards
OWF	Offshore Wind Farm
OWIC	Offshore Wind Industry Council
OWSI	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore)
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
PEMP	Outline Project Environmental Management Plan
PEXA	Practice and Exercise Area
PSR	Primary Surveillance Radars
PTS	Permanent auditory injury
RAF	Royal Air Force
RIAA	Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment
RRH	Remote Radar Head
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SAR	Search and Rescue Requirements
SEP	Sheringham Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
SIP	Site Integrity Plan
SMP	Soil Management Plan
SNCB	Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoS	Secretary of State
SOW	Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSS	Side-Scan Sonar
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SVIA	Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment
SWMP	Site Waste Management Plan
TCE	The Crown Estate
TH	Trinity House

TMZ	Transponder Mandatory Zone
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
WQ	Examining Authority's Written Questions
WQ2	Examining Authority's Second Written Questions
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation

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.
Evidence Plan Process (EPP)	A voluntary consultation process with specialist stakeholders to agree the approach, and information to support, the EIA and HRA for certain topics.
Expert Topic Group (ETG)	A forum for targeted engagement with regulators and interested stakeholders through the EPP.
Horizontal directional drilling (HDD) zones	The areas within the onshore cable route which would house HDD entry or exit points.
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.
Onshore cable corridor	The area between the landfall and the onshore substation sites, within which the onshore cable circuits will be installed along with other temporary works for construction.
Onshore export cables	The cables which would bring electricity from the landfall to the onshore substation. 220 – 230kV.
Onshore Substation	Compound containing electrical equipment to enable connection to the National Grid.
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.
The Applicant	Equinor New Energy Limited. As the owners of SEP and DEP, Scira Extension Limited and Dudgeon

	<p>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 On 6th September 2021, following the Energy White Paper: Powering our net zero future, the Government published and consulted on the revised energy National Policy Statements (NPS), including: EN-1, EN-3 and EN-5.
- 2 The Government published two documents, Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener in October 2021 and the British Energy Security Strategy (BESS) in April 2022.
- 3 Following the consultation in 2021 and the publication of these two documents, the Government has amended the revised energy NPS and is consulting on these changes in 2023.
- 4 On 30th March 2023, the Government published updated draft National Policy Statements (NPS) for consultation including:
 - Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1)
 - National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3)
 - National Policy Statement for electricity networks infrastructure (EN-5)
- 5 In relation to transitional arrangements, paragraphs 1.6.2 and 3 of the March 2023 consultation draft EN-1 states *“The Secretary of State has decided that for any application accepted for examination before designation of the 2023 amendments, the 2011 suite of NPSs should have effect in accordance with the terms of those NPS”,* and in the following paragraph that *“The 2023 amendments will therefore have effect only in relation to those applications for development consent accepted for examination, after the designation of those amendments. However, any emerging draft NPSs (or those designated but not yet having effect) are potentially capable of being important and relevant considerations in the decision-making process. The extent to which they are relevant is a matter for the relevant Secretary of State to consider within the framework of the Planning Act 2008 and with regard to the specific circumstances of each development consent order application”*.
- 6 This document has therefore been prepared in response to the March 2023 consultation draft NPSs which are capable of being important and relevant to the examination of and decision on SEP and DEP.
- 7 In summary, whilst the DCO application pre-dates the latest draft NPS, it is compliant with the emerging national policy, both from a strategic perspective, helping to deliver offshore wind generation which is now identified within the NPS documents as a Critical National Priority, and in terms of reducing impacts through the development of a shared landfall, cable route and substation location. Of note:
 - Section 3.3.60 of the March 2023 consultation draft EN-1 states that *“As set out in EN-3, subject to any legal requirements, the urgent need for CNP Infrastructure to achieving our energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will in general outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy. Government strongly supports the delivery of CNP Infrastructure and it should be progressed as quickly as possible”*.

- Section 2.1 (Background) of the March 2023 EN-3 identifies the urgent need for new electricity generating capacity and confirms that electricity generation from renewable sources is an essential element of the transition to net zero.
- The proposals enable the security of supply through enhancing the existing electricity network (paragraph 1.1.1 of March 2023 draft EN-5). The proposed application is innovative, in that it includes provision for the sharing of transmission infrastructure between projects (Sheringham Extension Project (SEP) and Dudgeon Extension Project (DEP)) and as such has been identified as a pathfinder. Further information on this is available in the **Scenarios Statement** [APP-314] and **Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement** [REP3-074].

8 This document should be read in conjunction with the planning policy analysis set out within the **Planning Statement** [AS-031] which assesses the proposals against designated and adopted planning policy.

9 The accordance table contains relevant extracts from the draft NPS (March 2023 version) in the third column. The text in black means the content remains unaltered from the 2021 version. Coloured text means changes have been made in the draft NPS; blue signifies an insertion and green shows the text has been moved. The Applicant's response, showing compliance with the revised March 2023 draft NPS, is in the fourth column from the left.

1.1 Draft NPS EN-1

- 10 As set out within paragraph 1.1.2 of EN-1 which currently has effect “*The Planning Act 2008 also requires that the [Secretary of State] must decide an application for energy infrastructure in accordance with the relevant NPSs*”.
- 11 **Table 1** below lists the draft policies within the March 2023 draft EN-1 that are relevant to the Development Consent Order application and assesses the proposals against each.

Table 1 The Applicant's Response to Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	4.1.8	<p><u>Where the use of land at a specific location is required to facilitate the development by providing for mitigation, landscape enhancement and biodiversity net gain, an applicant may, as part of its application to the Secretary of State, seek the compulsory acquisition of that land, or rights over that land.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition of new permanent rights over land for landscaping and ecological mitigation works relating to the onshore substation(s) and National Grid substation connection works. The Applicant will also seek to enhance biodiversity on sites outside the order limits, including through landscaping works, subject to agreements with landowners and the Applicant continues to engage with persons with interests in the land to reach voluntary agreements.</p> <p>Details of land proposed to be compulsorily acquired are found in the Compulsory Acquisition Schedule (Revision C) [REP5-041]; the Book of Reference (Revision G) [document reference 4.1] and the Statement of Reasons (Revision E) [document reference 4.3].</p> <p>Adequacy of funding for compensation claims is detailed within the Funding Statement (Revision B) [REP3-017].</p> <p>SEP and DEP is therefore in accordance with paragraph 4.1.8 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.1.19	<p><u>Early engagement both before and at the formal pre-application stage between the applicant and key stakeholders, including public regulators, Statutory Consultees (including Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs)), and those likely to have an interest in a proposed energy infrastructure application, is strongly encouraged in line with the Government's pre-application guidance</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has given early and detailed consideration to the development of the project both before and at the pre-application stage and has consulted with a range of stakeholders at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process.</p> <p>A detailed record of engagement is to be found at Consultation Report [APP-029] and its supporting appendices, namely the Consultation Report - Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting minutes and agreement logs.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.1.19 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.2.10	<p><u>The applicant must provide information proportionate to the scale of the project.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has also engaged with a number of stakeholders on topics scoped in and out of the ES Several Expert Topic Groups have been established to enable detailed discussions on particular EIA topics and their mitigation measures. Details of the technical consultation undertaken are presented in the</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>ensuring the information is sufficient to meet the requirements of the EIA Regulations.</p>	<p>Consultation Report [APP-029] and compliance with the EIA Regulations is set out in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 5 EIA Methodology [APP-091]. As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.2.10 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	<p>4.2.17</p>	<p>The Secretary of State should consider the worst-case impacts in its consideration of the application and consent, providing some flexibility in the consent to account for uncertainties in specific project details.</p>	<p>The final design of SEP and DEP will be confirmed through detailed engineering design studies that will be undertaken post-consent prior to the commencement of construction. In order to provide a precautionary but robust impact assessment at this stage of the development process, realistic worst-case scenarios have been defined in terms of the potential effects that may arise. This approach to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), referred to as the Rochdale Envelope, is common practice for developments of this nature, as set out in Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (Planning Inspectorate, 2018). The Rochdale Envelope for a project is defined by the set of parameters established in The Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] and the ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021] and assesses the realistic worst-case scenario for each individual impact. This establishes that any development within the parameters of this design envelope will have impacts equivalent to or lesser than those shown in the assessment. Further details are provided in ES Chapter 5 EIA Methodology [APP-091], the Scenarios Statement [APP-314]. The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP1-036] and the Supplementary Information to Scenario Statement [REP3-074] reiterate the worst case for each scenario has been assessed in this application.</p> <p>The key parameters identified as part of the Rochdale Envelope for SEP and/or DEP are set out in the Draft Development Consent Order (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] and the ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021] include <i>inter alia</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum footprint and height above sea level that the turbines could occupy; • Height of the turbine hubs and blades;

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity of the turbines; • Indicative separation between wind turbines; • Types of wind turbine foundation including pile depth, footprint, area for scour protection. • The length of infield cable length (not including interlink cables); • Number of Onshore Substation Platforms (OSPs) • Relation of turbines with existing offshore wind farms; • The length of export cable to landfall, • The number of export cables and trenches and maximum Export cable corridor width The width of the Onshore Cable Corridor • A new Onshore Substation Station (OnSS) for SEP and DEP next to the Norwich Main substation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Substation would be 3.25ha in size for SEP or DEP alone, or 6ha for SEP and DEP together ○ Substation buildings and electrical equipment up to 15m tall ○ Substation control/switchgear building would be up to 30m long x 14m wide x 15m high SEP or DEP in isolation, 50m long x 25m wide x 15m high for SEP and DEP concurrently or 2 x (30m long x 14m wide x 15m high) for SEP and DEP built in sequence ○ All other external equipment Up to 15m ○ Operational access road width 6m <p>Construction compound Up to 1haAs such the application assesses worst case impacts and establishes flexibility in the design to allow for uncertainties. SEP and DEP can therefore be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.2.17 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.2.28	Through the Environment Act 2021 the Government has set 13 legally binding targets	<p>The Environment Improvement Plan 2023 has ten environmental goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1: Thriving plants and wildlife

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>for England covering the areas of: biodiversity; air quality; water; resource efficiency and waste reduction; tree and woodland cover; and Marine Protected Areas. The Secretary of State must consider duties under the Environment Act 2021 in relation to environmental targets and have regard to the policies set out in the Government's Environmental Improvement Plan for improving the natural environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 2: Clean air • Goal 3: Clean and plentiful water • Goal 4: Managing exposure to chemicals and pesticides • Goal 5: Maximising our resources, minimise our waste • Goal 6: Using resources from nature sustainably • Goal 7: Mitigating and adapting to climate change • Goal 8: Reducing risk of harm from environmental hazards • Goal 9: Enhancing biosecurity • Goal 10: Enhancing beauty, heritage, and engagement with the natural environment <p>The proposed development contributes to meeting these goals by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1: Thriving plants and wildlife - by promoting Biodiversity Net Gain onshore and offshore. Further information is found in ES Appendix 20.6 Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-048] and The Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306] and in paragraphs 667 to 670 of ES Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096]. • Goal 2: Clean air – by displacing the demand for electricity generated from fossil fuels and by producing electricity from a renewable energy source. • Goal 3: Clean and plentiful water – by having minimal impacts on marine water sediments (ES Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093]). • Goal 4: Managing exposure to chemicals and pesticides - is not relevant to the proposed development. • Goal 5: Maximise our resources, minimise our waste – through the waste and disposal arrangements provided in the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) for SEP and DEP to be prepared by the applicant as part of the final CoCP/project environmental management plan secured by the draft

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1], which includes the stated SWMP objectives “to minimise the quantity of waste produced on site; or maximise the amount of waste reused, recycled or recovered” in accordance with the waste hierarchy set out in NPS EN-1 and by producing energy from a renewable resource and by using the local labour supply in the construction and operation of the SEP and DEP as described in the Outline Skills and Employment Plan (Revision B) [REP3-072], the SWMP will be developed on the basis of the ES Appendix 17.2 – Waste Assessment (Onshore Development) [APP-207] and the waste management section of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) (Revision F) [document reference 9.17]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 6: Using resources from nature sustainably - by producing energy from a renewable resource domestically set out in ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021]. • Goal 7: Mitigating and adapting to climate change - by the designing of SEP and DEP with an allowance for predicted erosion rates and flood risk included in the design, SEP and DEP will not be vulnerable to coastal changes, flood risk or climate change as set out in ES. Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104]. The Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] and ES Appendix 18.2.1 Onshore Substation Drainage Study (Revision C) [REP3-036]. • Goal 8: Reduced risk of harm from environmental hazards – by avoiding use of potentially hazardous finite resources, such as Oil and Gas. • Goal 9: Enhancing biosecurity - by – minimising the use of agricultural land, working with landowners to avoid and minimise interaction with livestock and crops and through protecting wildlife and livestock and boosting the resilience of plants and trees with mitigation measures, including the Biosecurity Protocols, as set out in the OCoCP (Revision F) [document

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>reference 9.17] and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.19]. The proposed development also minimises the risk of spread of diseases associated with Invasive Non-Native Species as set out in Section 20.6 of ES Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 10: Enhancing beauty, heritage, and engagement with the natural environment – through the approach established in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] having regard to sensitive receptors during the site selection process in ES Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-090].and the controls established in the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] for approval of detailed design according to the DAS Design Principles and where necessary subject to Design Review (Draft Requirement 10 (5)(a) and (b)) <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.2.28 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	<p>4.3.1 and 4.3.2</p>	<p><u>Energy infrastructure has the potential to impact on the health and well-being (“health”) of the population. Access to energy is clearly beneficial to society and to our health as a whole. However, the construction of energy infrastructure and the production, distribution and use of energy may have negative impacts on some people’s health.</u></p> <p><u>The direct impacts on health may include</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>increased traffic.</u> • <u>air or water pollution.</u> • <u>dust, odour.</u> • <u>hazardous waste and substances.</u> 	<p>The proposed development has been designed to ensure that magnetic fields are below the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) public exposure limits (see the Applicant’s response to Written Question (WQ) 1.6.4.10 in The Applicant’s Responses to the Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP1-036]).</p> <p>The proposed development does not establish habitat favourable to pests and as set out in the Applicant’s response to WQ 2.6.4.1 in The Applicant’s Responses to the Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions [REP3-101] and the development is not considered vulnerable to the risk of insect infestation.</p> <p>The project impacts on human health have been assessed in ES Chapter 28 Health [APP-114].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.3.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise. • exposure to radiation, and • increases in pests. 	
	4.4.3	<p>The cross-government Marine Spatial Prioritisation Programme will review how marine plans and the wider planning regime, legislation and guidance may need to evolve to ensure a more holistic approach to the use of the seas is taken and to maximise co-location possibilities.</p>	<p>Considerations of other marine activities are in ES Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], ES Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098] and the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (Revision B) [document reference 9.8] set out strategies for co-location with commercial fisheries, ES Chapter 13 Shipping Navigation [APP-099], ES Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101] and ES Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102].</p> <p>The proposed development would not compromise the activities of other marine users. Perenco and the Applicant have entered a Joint Position Statement which has been submitted into examination at Deadline 7 as Appendix A.7 within Supporting Documents for the Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Fourth Written Questions [reference 21.5.] summarizing the nature of impacted access. The Applicant has also considered the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans when preparing the DCO application, please refer to the response under paragraph 4.4.8 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>In addition the Applicant's Marine Plan Policy Review [REP1-060] demonstrates compliance with the Policies of the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.4.3 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.4.5	<p>Defra are producing guidance to help applicants and regulators understand how to use the mitigation hierarchy for environmental impacts on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), including strategic approaches.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that Defra is producing guidance to minimise and mitigate impacts on Marine Protected Areas (MPA). The Applicant believes that avoidance is at the top of the mitigation hierarchy for environmental impacts.</p> <p>As such, the site selection avoids MPA where possible including the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC. The project has applied mitigation in relation to its ornithological impacts wherever possible, though it has not been possible to avoid in combination adverse effects on kittiwake at the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA and Sandwich tern at the North Norfolk Coast SPA. The Applicant's</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>approach to mitigation for ornithology with respect to MPA is set out in the RIAA [APP-059] and as updated through submissions in examination namely Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note (Revision D) [document reference 13.3] .</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.4.5 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.4.6	<p><u>Applications for energy infrastructure that falls outside the scope of the Planning Act 2008 or the Electricity Act 1989 may require a marine licence. A deemed marine licence can also be granted as part of the DCO and is developed in consultation with regulators and statutory advisors. A Marine Licence is primarily concerned with the need to protect the environment and human health and to prevent interference with other legitimate uses of the sea. Marine Licences may be required for the marine elements of proposed developments (up to Mean High Water Springs), including associated development and activity such as cabling, dredging and offshore substations. Further information on marine licencing is provided in section 1.2 and 4.11.11 of this NPS and section 2.3.16 to 2.3.22 of EN-3.</u></p>	<p>The Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Revision J) also incorporates four Deemed Marine Licences (DML) (at Schedules 10 – 13 of the Draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1]. Other relevant guidance, including Marine Licensing, are outlined in Section 8.4.1.2 of ES Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.4.6 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.4.7	<p><u>Applicants are encouraged to approach the marine licensing regulator (MMO in England and Natural Resources Wales in Wales) in pre-</u></p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken and is ongoing with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and other stakeholders who may interact with the offshore or onshore works. As set out in the Consultation Report – Evidence Plan</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		application, to ensure that they are aware of any needs for additional marine licenses alongside their DCO application.	<p>[APP-030] documents the Applicant’s approach to the Evidence Plan Process (EPP), which includes timeframes, processes and expectations. Records of discussions and agreements are also included within the Evidence Plan (Annex 5.2.1.1 Expert Topic Group Meeting Minutes and Annex 5.2.1.2 Expert Topic Group Agreement Logs). Additional information is set out in the Consultation Report [APP-029].</p> <p>The Applicant has also agreed with the MMO and Natural England that additional marine licenses would be required post-consent for Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) clearance and export cable protection during operation of SEP and DEP.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.4.7 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.4.8	Applicants for a development consent order must take account of any relevant Marine Plans and are expected to complete a Marine Plan assessment as part of their project development, using this information to support an application for development consent.	<p>The Applicant has considered the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans when preparing the DCO application. The proposed development complies with all marine plan policies as set out in the Marine Plan Policy Review [REP1-060].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.4.8 of the draft EN-1.</p>
Marine Net Gain	4.5.3	Currently environmental net gain only applies to terrestrial and intertidal components of projects. Principles for Marine Net Gain are currently in development by Defra who will provide guidance in due course. There are provisions in the Environment Act 2021 to allow marine net gain to be made mandatory in the future.	<p>The Applicant recognises that Defra is preparing guidance for Marine Net Gain. 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 soft sediment areas. There could be an increase of the biomass of fish species around the foundations. Studies showing the introduction of new hard substrate in areas that are predominantly sandy or soft sediments may cause positive effects through potential habitat enhancement in terms of increased biomass of fish species around artificial structures are recorded in ES Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095]. These benefits mitigate the impact of the introduction of hard substrates around the base of turbines to minor adverse. In relation to impacts on commercially exploited species the reduction in fishing activity at the site of the proposed offshore development offshore, would result in minor beneficial impacts as a result of the development.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>As set out in ES Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096], the potential effects of increased biomass of fish species through introduction of various man-made structures are likely to be beneficial to marine mammals, although these have been assessed as negligible as a precautionary approach.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.3 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.5.4	<p><u>Energy</u> NSIP proposals, <u>whether onshore or offshore</u>, should seek opportunities to contribute to and enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity, <u>or the wider environment</u> where possible.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraphs 4.5.3 of the draft EN-1 for more detail on the proposed offshore enhancement and 4.5.9 for detail of the proposed onshore enhancement including Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).</p>
	4.5.6	<p><u>Where possible, this data should be shared with the Local Authority and Natural England for discussion at the pre-application stage as it can help to highlight biodiversity and wider environmental issues which may later cause delays if not addressed.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant carried out consultation with Natural England and other key stakeholders from the Ecology Expert Topic Group (ETG) as part of the Evidence Plan Process. Details of this engagement are summarised in section 1.3.3 of the Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306], section 3 of the Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-048] and the Consultation Report [APP-029]. The Applicant agreed with Natural England the appropriate approach to take on the use of the Defra Metric (see paragraph 3.4 in ES Appendix 20.6 Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-048]).</p> <p>The Applicant has had careful regard to the pre-application consultation requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the guidance on pre-application consultation issued by the Planning Inspectorate, including with regard to Natural England. A detailed record of engagement is provided within Consultation Report [APP-029] and Consultation Report - Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting minutes and agreement logs.</p> <p>In addition to Local Authorities and Natural England, the Applicant has also engaged with the Norfolk Wildlife Trust and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB). Please refer to the responses under paragraphs 4.5.3 of the</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>draft EN-1 for more detail on the proposed offshore enhancement and 4.5.9 for detail of the proposed onshore enhancement.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.6 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.5.8	<p>Biodiversity net gain should be applied after compliance with the mitigation hierarchy and does not change or replace existing environmental obligations.</p>	<p>The approach to BNG, as presented in the Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306], has been agreed with Natural England. The Strategy provides an appropriate approach to consideration of net gain within the Projects.</p> <p>The BNG approach first includes measures taken to avoid and minimise the impacts on biodiversity, to restore affected areas and finally to offset the residual impacts, to the extent that the gain exceeds the loss.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.8 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.5.9	<p>Biodiversity net gain can be delivered onsite or wholly or partially off-site. Any off-site delivery of biodiversity net gain should also be set out within the application for development consent.</p>	<p>The Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306] provides an outline of the potential habitat enhancement and creation opportunities to achieve BNG commitments across the onshore elements of the project.</p> <p>There are BNG opportunities within the Order Limits, including the landscape design at the onshore substation site and habitat enhancement along the onshore cable corridor. Potential opportunities include Hedgerow infilling of existing gaps to improve connectivity, enhancing existing and new hedgerows with a more diverse mix of woody species, native scrub planting in the area of Weybourne Woods, and tree and shrub planting, wildflower sowing, and tussocky grassland creation within the area of the onshore substation.</p> <p>With the exception of habitats at the onshore substation, BNG would be secured via landowner agreements, including those agreed post-consent.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.9 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.5.10	<p>When delivering biodiversity net gain off-site, developments should do this in a manner that</p>	<p>The current BNG proposals are within the existing Order Limits. Opportunities off-site are being explored in consultation with the local authorities, Natural England, landowners and other stakeholders.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>best contributes to the achievement of relevant wider strategic outcomes, for example by increasing habitat connectivity or enhancing other ecosystem service outcomes. Reference should be made to relevant national or local plans and strategies, to inform off-site biodiversity net gain delivery. If published, the relevant strategy is the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). If an LNRS has not been published, the relevant consenting body or planning authority may specify alternative plans, policies or strategies to use.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraphs 4.2.28 and 4.5.9 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRSs) are not yet fully rolled out and only provisional Responsible Authorities (including Norfolk County Council) are currently in place to begin their preparation. LNRSs are therefore not yet in place and therefore are not available for the Applicant to take into account. However, SEP and DEP, including its commitment to establishing Biodiversity Net Gain, will support nature recovery as set out above.</p>
	4.5.11	<p>In addition to delivering biodiversity net gain, developments may also deliver wider environmental gains and benefits to communities relevant to the local area, and to national policy priorities, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reductions in GHG emissions, • reduced flood risk, • improvements to air or water quality, • climate adaptation, • landscape enhancement, or • increased access to natural greenspace including trees and woodlands. <p>The scope of potential gains will be dependent on the type, scale, and location of specific projects. Applicants should look for a holistic</p>	<p>The proposed development generates energy from renewable resources. If SEP and DEP are both operational, the proposed development has the potential to power up to 785,000 homes in the United Kingdom.</p> <p>ES Appendix 4.2 GHG Footprint Assessment [APP-179] was carried out for SEP and DEP to determine emissions that will arise from construction, operation and decommissioning activities. The assessment considered emissions from the extraction and manufacture of materials, marine vessel and road traffic movements, and the use of plant and equipment.</p> <p>Given the project leads to a reduction in atmospheric GHG concentration compared to the without-project baseline, it is considered that SEP and DEP would have a beneficial effect on GHG emissions and assist the UK's trajectory towards net zero in 2050. The Outline Landscape Management Plan (OLMP) (Revision D) [REP5-031] sets out the detailed plans and operations for the soft landscape proposals (planting and seeding) for the onshore cable corridor and onshore substation site to ensure that the design and mitigation intent is realised. A final Landscape Management Plan will be submitted for discharge of relevant DCO requirement relating to the OLMP ahead of construction.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		approach to delivering wider environmental gains and benefits through the use of nature-based solutions and Green Infrastructure.	<p>The potential impacts associated with flood risk are considered in ES Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104] and within ES Appendix 18.2 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209], Addendum to the Floor Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-096] and the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] submitted as part of the application. This assessment takes into account the allowance for predicted coastal erosion included in the design for SEP and DEP and confirms that the project would not be vulnerable to coastal changes, flood risk or climate change. Furthermore, the project infrastructure would not prevent or change the operation of natural erosion processes, as driven by wave action and subaerial processes.</p> <p>The operation of the proposed built infrastructure will not give rise to any emissions to air and maintenance activities will not lead to a significant change in vehicle flows within the study area, therefore there will be minimal air emissions during the operational phase of SEP and DEP. SEP and DEP will displace the demand for electricity generated from fossil fuels and produce energy from renewable sources, therefore, on a wider, national level, there would be an air quality benefit as a result of the reduction in the generation of air pollutants associated with fossil fuel produced electricity (i.e. nitrogen dioxide, particulates, carbon monoxide). This would contribute towards the UK Government's population exposure reduction target for PM_{2.5} set out within the Environment Act 2021.</p> <p>ESThe approach to Biodiversity Net Gain, as presented in the Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306], provides an appropriate approach to consideration of net gain within the projects.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.11 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.5.12	The Environment Act 2021 mandated the preparation of Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRSSs) across England. They are a new system of spatial strategies for nature	<p>Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRSSs) are not yet fully rolled out and only provisional Responsible Authorities (including Norfolk County Council) are currently in place to begin their preparation. LNRSSs are therefore not yet in place and therefore are not available for the Applicant to take into account. However,</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>recovery and will play a major role in providing detail on the best locations to create, enhance and restore nature and deliver wider environmental benefits. LNRs will also agree priorities for nature recovery and map the most valuable existing areas for nature. They will be critical in delivering new government targets for species abundance and habitat creation commitments, as well as other pressing environmental outcomes for water and flood risk, carbon and tree planting and woodland creations. LNRs will also drive the creation of a Nature Recovery Network (NRN), a major commitment in the government's 25 Year Environment Plan.</u></p>	<p>SEP and DEP, including its commitment to establishing Biodiversity Net Gain, will support nature recovery.</p> <p>Other ways in which SEP and DEP meets the objectives and goals set out in the Government's 2018 . "A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment" are as set out in the above response under paragraph 4.2.28 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.5.14	<p>Applicants should make use of available guidance and tools for measuring natural capital assets and ecosystem services, such as the Natural <u>Capital</u> Committee's 'How to Do it: natural capital workbook', Defra's guidance on Enabling a Natural Capital Approach (ENCA), <u>and other tools that aim to enable wider benefits for people and nature.</u></p>	<p>The Application took an approach similar to those set out in Natural Capital Approach (NCA) when developing the baseline for assessment, the design for the Project and the embedded mitigation measures. A final pre-construction survey will be undertaken to define the final mitigation measures.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.14 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.5.18	<p>The biodiversity gain objective will be set out in a biodiversity gain statement <u>(as defined under the Environment Act 2021)</u>. Normally these statements <u>would</u> be included within <u>an NPS</u>, but the <u>Act</u> allows for the statement to be published separately where a review of an NPS has begun before the <u>provisions are</u></p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraphs 4.2.28 and 4.5.9 for onshore BNG and 4.5.3 for marine BNG of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that BNG would potentially become part of the NPS and has already made provision to increase BNG in the DCO application.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.18 of the draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>commenced, as is the case with these energy NPSs.</p>	
	4.5.19	<p>Under the provision of the Environment Act 2021, any such separate biodiversity statement will be regarded as contained within these NPSs. The Act also contains the power to extend this requirement to offshore development.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraphs 4.5.9 for onshore BNG and 4.5.3 for marine BNG of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that BNG would potentially become part of the NPS and has already made provision to increase BNG in the DCO application.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.5.19 of the draft EN-1.</p>
Good Design	4.6.8	<p>Applicants should consider taking independent professional advice on the design aspects of a proposal. In particular, the Design Council can be asked to provide design review for nationally significant infrastructure projects and applicants are encouraged to use this service. Applicants should also consider any design guidance developed by the local planning authority.</p>	<p>The Design and Access Statement (Revision B) [REP3-056] and Offshore Design Statement [APP-312] set out a series of design principles which have been used to inform the planning and design process to date and which inform the design at later stages of the project.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken an extensive programme of community and stakeholder consultations to inform the design of SEP and DEP. This has included consultations with Expert Topic Groups (ETG), where the design of various elements was discussed. As an example, the emerging design of the substation was discussed several times at the landscape ETG meetings.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to post-consent independent Design Review in respect to the OnSS, if requested to do so by the South Norfolk Council as relevant planning authority. This is secured in requirement 10(5)(b), Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.6.8 of the draft EN-1.</p>
Climate Change	4.9.2	<p>Climate change is already altering the UK's weather patterns and this will continue to accelerate depending on global carbon emissions. This means it is likely there will be more extreme weather events, such as heavy rainfall and very hot days which will be more intense and more frequent. As well as climatic</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that climate change is altering the UK's weather patterns and has considered climate change at the design stage for the proposed development.</p> <p>The National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) Design Group has identified four principles to guide the planning and delivery of major infrastructure projects: Climate, People, Places and Value. These four principles have been used to develop design objectives for SEP and DEP in Design and Access Statement</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>and seasonal changes such as</u> hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters, <u>there</u> is <u>also</u> a likelihood of increased flooding, drought, heatwaves, and intense rainfall events, as well as rising sea levels, <u>increased storms</u> and coastal change. Adaptation is therefore necessary to deal with the potential impacts of these changes that are already happening.</p>	<p>(Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] and Offshore Design Statement [APP-312].</p> <p>“<i>Design for resilience and adaptation to future climate change</i>” is one of the design objectives for the proposed development onshore and offshore.</p> <p>Specifically, the Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097], the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] and ES Appendix 18.2.1 Onshore Substation Drainage Study (Revision C) [REP3-036] apply the latest climate change allowances and provide an assessment of the change in flood risk for a 1 in 100 year plus 45% allowance for climate change event.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.9.2 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.9.8	<p>New energy infrastructure will typically be a long-term investment and will need to remain operational over many decades, in the face of a changing climate. Consequently, applicants must consider the <u>direct (e.g. site flooding, limited water availability, storms, heatwave and wildfire threats to infrastructure and operations) and indirect (e.g. access roads or other critical dependencies impacted by flooding, storms, heatwaves or wildfires)</u> impacts of climate change when planning the location, design, build, operation and, where appropriate, decommissioning of new energy infrastructure.</p>	<p>SEP and DEP are expected to be operational for 40 years whereas the Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] both apply the latest climate change allowances and provide an assessment of the change in flood risk of 1 in 100 years plus 45% allowance for climate change.</p> <p>The potential impacts associated with flood risk are considered in ES Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], ES Appendix 3.1 Onshore Substation Site Selection Report [APP-175], ES Appendix 3.3 Onshore Main Construction Compound Site Selection Report [APP-177], ES Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104] and within ES Appendix 18.2 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209], Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and ES Appendix 18.2.1 Onshore Substation Drainage Study (Revision C) [REP3-036], submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>Please also see the response under paragraph 4.9.2 above of this March 2023 consultation draft NPS EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.9.8 of the draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	4.9.9	<p>The ES should set out how the proposal will take account of the projected impacts of climate change, using government guidance and industry standard benchmarks such as the Climate Change Allowances for Flood Risk Assessments, Climate Impacts Tool, and British Standards for climate change adaptation, in accordance with the EIA Regulations. This information will be needed by the Secretary of State.</p>	<p>Appropriate climate change allowances related to all relevant sources of flood risk have been considered as part of ES Appendix 18.2 Flood Risk Assessment [AS-023] and Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097]. The onshore substation site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is at least 1.2km from the nearest Main River. Therefore, increased fluvial flooding relating to climate change is unlikely to affect the onshore substation site, especially given the elevated nature of the intervening ground. This is the only onshore infrastructure that will not be located below ground following construction. Therefore, future fluvial flood risk associated with climate change will not affect the SPE and DEP onshore infrastructure.</p> <p>The ES also addresses Climate Change and Natural Trends as themes within all the relevant chapters.</p> <p>Please also see the response under paragraph 4.9.2 and 4.9.8 above of the March 2023 consultation draft NPS EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.9.9 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.9.12	<p>Where energy infrastructure has safety critical elements (for example parts of new gas-fired power stations or some electricity sub-stations), the applicant should apply a credible maximum climate change scenario. It is appropriate to take a risk-averse approach with elements of infrastructure which are critical to the safety of its operation.</p>	<p>The Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] and ES Appendix 18.2.1 Onshore Substation Drainage Study (Revision C) [REP3-037] has been undertaken to support the assessment of surface water flood risk at the proposed Onshore Substation. The modelling accounts for the 1 in 100 year (plus 45% climate change) event and concludes that the proposed Onshore Substation and access road will not pose a significant off-site risk to others, or be at significant risk of flooding, for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.9.12 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.9.13	<p>The Secretary of State should be satisfied that applicants for new energy infrastructure have taken into account the potential impacts of climate change using the latest UK Climate Projections and associated research and expert guidance (such as the EA's Climate</p>	<p>Please see the responses under paragraphs 4.9.9 and 4.9.12 of the March 2023 consultation draft NPS EN-1. The ES also addresses Climate Change and Natural Trends as themes within all the relevant chapters.</p> <p>Specifically, the Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision B) [REP3-099] both apply the latest climate change allowances and</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		Change Allowances for Flood Risk Assessments or the Welsh Government's Climate change allowances and flood consequence assessments, including any decommissioning period.:	<p>provide an assessment of the change in flood risk of 1 in 100 years plus 45% allowance for climate change.</p> <p>Given the life of the operational period of the development is 40 years alongside a design approach allowing for flood risk based on the 1 in 100 year plus 45% climate change allowance event, the development would remain invulnerable to flood risk including in the decommissioning period.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.9.13 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.10.4	Transmission network infrastructure and related network reinforcement associated with nationally significant new offshore wind is considered as CNP Infrastructure. Further guidance can be found in 2.8.8 of EN-3 and 2.12.7 of EN-5.	<p>As set out in the response to paragraph 1.1.4 of the March 2023 consultation draft EN-5, the proposed development, an offshore wind farm and associated offshore and onshore infrastructure, meets the definition of a Critical National Priority (CNP).</p> <p>Each of SEP and DEP would making a meaningful contribution to the UK's offshore wind and decarbonization targets and, as such, each project is a Critical National Priority.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant's strategic decision to develop SEP and DEP in a coordinated manner through the DCO application is consistent with the Government's ambition to deploy offshore wind development as quickly as possible and with the wider policy ambition to deliver this Critical National Priority infrastructure in a coordinated manner</p> <p>The proposed designation of offshore wind projects, including SEP and DEP, as CNP projects lends even greater emphasis to current national policy that there is urgent need for renewable electricity Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs), established in section 3.3 of the extant NPS EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.10.4 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	4.10.6	Applicants may wish to take a commercial risk where they have not received or accepted a formal offer of a grid connection from the relevant network operator at the time of the application. In this situation applicants should	<p>Paragraph 4.10.6 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to the proposed development.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>provide information as part of their application confirming that there is no obvious reason why a network connection would not be possible.</p>	
	4.10.8	<p>On some occasions it may not be possible to coordinate applications. For example, different elements of a project may have different lead-in times and be undertaken by different legal entities subject to different commercial and regulatory frameworks (for example grid companies operate within OFGEM controls) making it inefficient from a delivery perspective to submit one application. Applicants may therefore decide to submit separate applications for each element. Where this is the case, the applicant should include information on the other elements and explain the reasons for the separate application confirming that there are no obvious reasons for why other elements are likely to be refused.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.10.8 of the March 2023 draft EN-1 is not relevant to the application.</p>
	4.10.12	<p>The Secretary of State should be satisfied that appropriate network connection arrangements are/will be in place for a given project regardless of whether one or multiple (linked) applications are submitted.</p>	<p>The grid connection position is summarised in the Cable Statement [APP-283] and updated in the Applicant's Responses to Q2.2.2.1 [REP3-101] .</p>
Hazardous substances	4.11.17	<p>Applicants must consult the Hazardous Substances Authority and the HSE at pre-</p>	<p>The proposed development does not require hazardous substances consent. The Applicant has consulted Public Health England and the Environment Agency when preparing ES Chapter 17 Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-103].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		application stage if the project is likely to need hazardous substances consent.	<p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 4.11.17 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Generic Impacts	5.1.6	Sufficient relevant information is crucial to good decision making, particularly where formal assessments are required. To avoid delay, if in any doubt applicants should discuss what information is needed with the Planning Inspectorate, statutory bodies, and other relevant organisations as early as possible. Any assessment should be based on the most up to date data and guidance.	<p>The Applicant has given early and detailed consideration to the requirement for EIA methodology, baseline data collection and mitigation measures, and has consulted with a range of stakeholders at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process.</p> <p>A detailed record of engagement is provided in the Consultation Report [APP-029] and its supporting appendices, namely the Consultation Report - Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting minutes and agreement logs, ES Chapter 5 EIA Methodology [APP-091].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.1.6 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Air Quality	5.2.2	<p>Levels for pollutants in ambient air are set out in the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 and reiterated in the Air Quality Strategy. In addition, two new air quality targets – one for annual mean concentrations of PM_{2.5} and one further long-term target – have been set under the Environment Act 2021. The Secretary of State is required to make available up to date information on air quality to any relevant interested party.</p>	<p>The onshore Order Limits do not pass through nor are close to any locations where air quality standards are unlikely to be achieved (i.e. Air Quality Management Areas), and background concentrations of pollutants are well below the relevant Objectives. This is to be expected in a predominantly rural area away from significant sources of pollution.</p> <p>Offshore air quality and operational impacts were scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p>The air quality assessment was undertaken using the latest tools (i.e. Emission Factor Toolkit, NO_x to NO₂ Calculator) provided by Defra and the assessment showed that predicted pollutant concentrations were below the respective air quality Objectives at all locations during construction. The assessment also includes cumulative construction traffic from consented Hornsea Project Three, Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas OWFs.</p> <p>Best-practice mitigation measures to control dust and construction machinery emissions will be included in a Code of Construction Practice for each onshore phase of the works. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the impact of dust and construction machinery emissions are not considered significant and cumulative impacts with other relevant projects are also assessed as being not significant.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Furthermore, information is found in ES Chapter 22 Air Quality [APP-108]; ES Appendix 22.1 Construction Dust and Particulate Matter Assessment Methodology [APP-259]; ES Appendix 22.2 Air Quality Assessment Traffic Data [APP-260]; ES Appendix 22.3 Air Quality Background Pollutant Concentrations [APP-261]; ES Appendix 22.4 Designated Ecological Sites and Critical Level and Load Values in the Air Quality Study Area [APP-262], and ES Appendix 22.5 Air Quality Ecological Receptor Assessment Tables [APP-263].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.2.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.2.6	<p>Proximity to emission sources can have significant impacts on sensitive receptor sites for air quality, such as education or healthcare sites, residential use or sensitive or protected ecosystems. Projects near a sensitive receptor site for air quality should only be proposed in exceptional circumstances if no viable alternative site is available. In these instances, substantial mitigation of any expected emissions will be required (see para 5.2.10 below).</p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.2.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.2.9	<p>statutory Defra publishes future national projections of air quality limits—based on estimates of future levels of emissions, traffic, and vehicle fleet. Projections are updated as the evidence base changes and the applicant should ensure these are current at the point of an application. The applicant’s assessment should be consistent with this but may include more detailed modelling to demonstrate local impacts.</p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.2.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.2.10	Where a proposed development is likely to lead to a breach of the air quality thresholds or affect the ability of a non-compliant area to achieve compliance within the timescales set out in the most recent relevant air quality plan at the time of the decision , the applicant should work with the relevant authorities to secure appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that those thresholds are not breached .	Please see the response under paragraph 5.2.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
	5.2.15	The Secretary of State should give air quality considerations substantial weight where a project is proposed near a sensitive receptor site, such as an education or healthcare facility, residential use or a sensitive or protected habitat.	Please see the response under paragraph 5.2.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
	5.2.16	Where a project is proposed near to a sensitive receptor site for air quality, if the applicant cannot provide justification for this location, and a suitable mitigation plan, the Secretary of State should refuse consent.	Please see the response under paragraph 5.2.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
	5.2.17	In all cases, the Secretary of State must take account of any relevant statutory air quality limits and statutory air quality objectives. If a project will lead to non-compliance with a statutory limit the Secretary of State should refuse consent.	Please see the response under paragraph 5.2.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
Green House Gas	5.3.7	<p><u>Steps taken to minimise and offset emissions should be set out in a GHG Reduction Strategy, secured under the development consent order. The GHG Reduction Strategy should consider the creation and preservation of carbon stores and sinks including through woodland creation, peatland restoration and through other natural habitats.</u></p>	<p>ES Appendix 4.2 Greenhouse Gas Footprint Assessment [APP-179] was carried out for SEP and DEP to determine emissions that will arise from construction, operation and decommissioning activities. The assessment considered emissions from the extraction and manufacture of materials, marine vessel and road traffic movements, and the use of plant and equipment.</p> <p>Given the Project leads to a reduction in atmospheric GHG concentration compared to the without-project baseline, it is considered that SEP and DEP would have a beneficial effect on GHG emissions and assist the UK's trajectory towards net zero in 2050.</p> <p>As evidenced in ES Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-112] (discussions with the Norfolk Coast Partnership), carbon sequestration has been considered as a byproduct benefit of the landscaping provision that would be made by the SEP and DEP project.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.3.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Biodiversity and Geological Conservation	5.4.2	<p><u>The government's policy for biodiversity in England is set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan, Biodiversity 2020, the National Pollinator Strategy and the UK Marine Strategy. The aim is to halt overall biodiversity loss, support healthy well-functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people. This aim needs to be viewed in the context of the challenge presented by climate change. Healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems and coherent ecological networks will be more resilient and adaptable to climate change</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraphs 4.2.28, 4.5.3 and 4.5.9 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>effects. Failure to address this challenge will result in significant adverse impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides.</u></p>	
Habitat Regulation Assessment	5.4.5	<p><u>The British Energy Security Strategy committed to establishing strategic compensation for offshore renewables NSIPs, to offset environmental effects but also to reduce delays for individual projects. See paragraphs 2.8.292 – 2.8.300 of EN-3 for further information.</u></p>	<p>The Strategic and Collaborative Approaches to Compensation and Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) [APP-084] outlines the Applicant's proposed approach and commitment to strategic and collaborative compensation in order to reduce delays. See also the Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision C) [REP6-009]. These demonstrate that the Applicant has had regard to emerging policy in the British Energy Security Strategy.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Marine Protected Area	5.4.9	<p><u>Marine Protected Area (MPA) is a term used to describe the network of HRA sites, SSSIs and MCZs in the English and Welsh marine environment.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 4.4.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.10	<p><u>It is important that relevant guidance on managing environmental impacts of infrastructure in marine protected areas is followed, and that equal consideration of the effect of proposals should be given to all MPAs regardless of the legislation they were designated under. This is because all sites contribute to the network of MPAs and therefore to overall network integrity.</u></p>	<p>As noted in the response to draft paragraph 4.4.5 of this March 2023 consultation draft NPS EN-1 above the site selection avoids MPAs where possible including the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC as the first requirement of the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>The following submitted documents also establish that the applicant has followed relevant guidance on managing environmental impacts of infrastructure in the marine environment in general and in protected areas in particular. In addition the protections and mitigations set out therein will remain applicable regardless of whether different legislation in future applies in relation to existing MCZs and/or future MPAs. The relevant documents are:</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ES Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes [APP-092]; • ES Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093]; • ES Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094]; • ES Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095]; • ES Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096]; • Outline Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan (CSIMP) (Revision B) [document reference 9.7] • ES Appendix 4 - Assessment of Potential Impacts on Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds Marine Conservation Zone Features from Planting of Native Oyster Beds (Revision B) [REP1-010]; • Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (Revision B) [REP1-013]; • ES Appendix 1: In-Principle Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) Plan (Revision C) [REP2-020]; • The Applicant's Responses on Relevant Representations: Natural England Marine Mammals (Appendix D) [REP2-051]; • Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.14], and; • Marine Processes Technical Note (Revision B) ([REP3-093]. <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.10 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.13	<p><u>Irreplaceable habitats are habitats which would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace</u></p>	<p>Through the site selection process set out in ES Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], and use of embedded mitigation e.g. HDD, the proposed development avoids sensitive and designated areas as much as possible. Ancient woodland is the only irreplaceable habitat that occurs within the Zone of Influence of the onshore cable route. All ancient woodland</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>once destroyed, taking into account their age, uniqueness, species diversity or rarity.</p>	<p>has been avoided through the route selection process. Where ancient woodland is close to the Order Limits then buffers to distance construction activities and mitigation measures are secured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17], submitted at Deadline 7 and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.19] submitted at Deadline 7].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.13 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.14	<p>Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for its diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Ancient or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland are also particularly valuable. Other types of irreplaceable habitats include blanket bog, limestone pavement, sand dunes, salt marsh and lowland fen.</p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.4.30 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.20	<p>The design of Energy NSIP proposals will need to consider the movement of mobile / migratory species such as birds, fish and marine and terrestrial mammals and their potential to interact with infrastructure. As energy infrastructure could occur anywhere within England and Wales, both inland and onshore and offshore, the potential to affect mobile and migratory species across the UK and more widely across Europe (transboundary effects) requires consideration, depending on the location of development.</p>	<p>The ES. has assessed the cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem and with other offshore windfarms. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been included in the application.</p> <p>ES Chapter 29 Transboundary Impacts [APP 115] (and the relevant topic chapters of the ES listed below) provide the necessary assessment of transboundary impacts, including on other European Economic Area states, to enable the Secretary of State to comply with duties under the UNECE Espoo convention on Transboundary Impacts and concluded that no significant transboundary impacts have been identified.</p> <p>Further information is found in ES Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], ES Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], ES Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096], ES Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097], ES Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026], and ES Chapter 29 Transboundary Impacts [APP-115].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.20 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
	5.4.21	Energy projects will need to ensure vessels used by the project follow existing regulations and guidelines to manage ballast water.	<p>The risk of spreading Invasive Non Native Species (INNS) will be mitigated by the following relevant regulations and guidance:</p> <p>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL). The MARPOL sets out appropriate vessel maintenance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environmental Damage Prevention and Remediation (England) Regulations 2015, which set out a polluter pays principle where the operators who cause a risk of significant damage or cause significant damage to land, water or biodiversity will have the responsibility to prevent damage occurring, or if the damage does occur will have the duty to reinstate the environment to the original condition; • The International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM Convention), which provide global regulations to control the transfer of potentially invasive species. <p>Controls for any wastewater discharges (such as effluent discharges, ballast waters, bilge waters, and deck runoff) will be included in the final Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP), in accordance with the latest legislation, regulatory limits and good practice. Monitoring records in relation to the disposal of foul water, bilge water or ballast water during the construction phase must be retained.</p> <p>Further information is found in Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.10], submitted at Deadline 7.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.21 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.23	The applicant should seek the advice of the appropriate SNCB and provide the Secretary of	The submitted Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) [APP-059] concludes that an adverse effect on site integrity cannot be ruled out for:

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>State with such information as the Secretary of State may reasonably require, to determine whether an Appropriate Assessment (AA) is required. Applicants can request and agree 'Evidence Plans' with SNCBs, which is a way to agree and record upfront the information the applicant needs to supply with its application, so that the HRA can be efficiently carried out. If an AA is required, the applicant must provide the Secretary of State with such information as may reasonably be required to enable the Secretary of State to conduct the AA. This should include information on any mitigation measures that are proposed to minimise or avoid likely significant effects.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the kittiwake feature of the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) due to in-combination collision risk impacts the Sandwich tern feature of the North Norfolk Coast SPA and Greater Wash SPA due to in-combination collision impacts and in-combination combined displacement and collision risk impacts <p>For all other sites and features assessed in the RIAA, a conclusion of no adverse effect on site integrity is reached.</p> <p>The Applicant has given early and detailed consideration to the requirement for compensatory measures and has consulted with a range of stakeholders at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process. A detailed record of engagement is provided within Annex 1D - Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068] of the Consultation Report [APP-029] and its supporting appendices, namely the Consultation Report - Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting minutes and agreement logs.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.23 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.26	<p><u>Provision of such information will not be taken as an acceptance of adverse impacts and if an applicant disputes the likelihood of adverse impacts, it can provide this information as part of its application 'without prejudice' to the Secretary of State's final decision on the impacts of the potential development. If, in these circumstances, an applicant does not supply information required for the assessment of a potential derogation, there will be no expectation that the Secretary of State will allow the applicant the opportunity to provide such information following the examination.</u></p>	<p>A derogation case has been provided with respect to the guillemot and razorbill features of the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, although the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment RIAA [APP-059] concludes no adverse effect on integrity for these features. These additional features and their compensatory measures are on a without prejudice basis.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.26 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.4.27	<p><u>It is vital that applicants consider the need for compensation as early as possible in the design process as 'retrofitting' compensatory measures will introduce delays and uncertainty to the consenting process.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has given early and detailed consideration to the requirement for compensatory measures and has consulted with a range of stakeholders at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process. A detailed record of engagement is provided within Annex 1D - Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068], the Consultation Report [APP-029] and its supporting appendices, namely the Consultation Report - Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting minutes and agreement logs Annex 1D - Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068] should be referred to for a more detailed account of all consultation that has been undertaken in relation to the development of compensatory measures.</p> <p>The compensatory measures are found in a suite of documents in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRA Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision C) [REP6-009]; • Appendix 2 - Sandwich Tern Compensation Document Revision B [document reference 5.5.2]; • Appendix 3 - Kittiwake Compensation Document [APP-072]; • Appendix 4 - Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Document (Revision D) [document reference 5.5.4] (N.B. gannet is no longer a derogation species); and • Appendix 5 Derogation Funding Statement (Habitats Regulations and Marine and Coastal Access Act) [APP-076]. <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.27 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.28	<p><u>Applicants should work closely at an early stage in the pre-application process with SNCB and Defra/Welsh Government to develop a compensation plan for all protected sites adversely affected by the development.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.4.27 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.4.29	<p><u>Before submitting an application, applicants should seek the views of the SNCB and Defra/Welsh Government as to the suitability, securability and effectiveness of the compensation plan to ensure the development will not hinder the achievement of the conservation objectives for the protected site. In cases where such views are provided, the applicant should include a copy of this information with the compensation plan in their application for further consideration by the Examining Authority.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.4.27 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.30	<p><u>Applicants should include measures to mitigate the direct and indirect effects of development on ancient woodland, veteran trees or other irreplaceable habitats during both construction and operational phase.</u></p>	<p>Direct impacts to ancient woodland have been avoided through mitigation by design. SEP and DEP Order Limits avoid all ancient woodlands. As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.30 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.40	<p><u>As a general principle, and subject to the specific policies below, development should, in line with the mitigation hierarchy, aim to avoid significant harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests, including through consideration of reasonable alternatives (as set out in Section 4.2 above). Where significant harm cannot be avoided, impacts should be mitigated and as a last resort, appropriate compensation measures should be sought.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.4.27 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.47	<p><u>The Secretary of State must consider whether the project may have a likely significant effect</u></p>	<p>For the project's effect on the Marine Protected Area (Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ)), please refer to the response under paragraph 5.4.50 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>on a protected site which is part of the National Site Network (an HRA Site), a Marine Protected Area (MPA), or on any site to which the same protection is applied as a matter of policy, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.</u></p>	<p>For the project's effect on the National Site Network (an HRA site), please refer to the response under paragraphs 5.4.23 and 5.4.27 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.4.50	<p><u>The Secretary of State should assess the impact, either alone or in combination, on all designated MPA sites when making any decision on development consent.</u></p>	<p>The site selection avoids Marine Protected Areas where possible including the Wash and North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation.</p> <p>Up to 11km of the offshore export cable corridor passes through the CSCB MCZ. The MCZ protects important geological features including the best examples of subtidal chalk beds in the North Sea, as well as subtidal exposures of clay and peat.</p> <p>The Stage 1 CSCB Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (MCZA) (Revision B) [document reference 5.6] confirms the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project will not hinder the conservation objective of maintaining the protected features of the CSCB MCZ in a favourable condition or restoring them to favourable condition. The cumulative impacts of all development scenarios will also not hinder the conservation objective.</p> <p>The chosen route presents the shortest cable corridor overall (and so minimises the footprint of cable installation) and has the additional and distinct advantage of being close and parallel to the existing Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm (DOW) export cable corridor, for which the Applicant has first-hand experience of undertaking successful cable burial works. The latter is considered in detail in the Outline Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Cable Specification Installation and Monitoring Plan (CSIMP) (Revision B) [document reference 9.7].</p> <p>A without prejudice Stage 2 MCZ assessment has also been undertaken Appendix 1: In-Principle CSCB MCZ MEEB Plan (Revision C) [REP2-020]).</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.4.50 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.5.3	<p><u>Whilst energy infrastructure, such as wind turbines, are an established part of the expected built energy environment, issues such as the cumulative impact, location and increasing geographical spread and height of offshore windfarms, can all potentially have a bearing on aviation safety, defence capabilities and weather warnings and forecasts.</u></p>	<p>Consideration of the potential for SEP or DEP to impact on aviation receptors has been undertaken in accordance with the standard consultation distances stated in CAP 764. The Civil Aviation Authority’s (CAA) CAP 764 Policy and Guidelines on Wind Turbines (CAA, 2016a) provides criteria for assessing whether any wind turbine development might have an impact on civil aerodrome related operations. The impacts are assessed in ES Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101] and ES Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102]</p> <p>The airspace in the vicinity of SEP and DEP comprises military exercise areas, restrictive airspace, airways and offshore helicopter platforms and transit routes. Wind turbines can interfere with radar equipment and operations leading to safety implications.</p> <p>The assessment above includes a Cumulative Impact Assessment for aviation and radar, these activities include impacts from SEP and DEP considered alongside those from other developments. This includes all projects that are likely to result in comparable effects on aviation and radar receptors that are not intrinsically considered as part of the existing environmental baseline. ES Chapter 5 EIA Methodology [APP-091] provides further details of the general framework and approach to the CIA.</p> <p>The wind turbines will be detectable and have the potential to affect military low flying operations in addition to the National Air Traffic Services (NATS) Primary Surveillance Radars (PSR) located at Claxby and Cromer, the Ministry of Defence (MOD) Air Defence Radar at Trimingham and the Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR) and air traffic control safe minimum altitude chart at Norwich Airport.</p> <p>The export cable corridor is also within the Royal Air Force (RAF) Weybourne transmitter safeguarding zone.</p> <p>The assessment has identified the potential for unacceptable impacts from SEP and/or DEP on some radar operations without mitigation. Technical solutions have been proposed which reduce impacts to acceptable levels and facilitate continued safe operations and the Applicant will continue to engage with the Ministry of Defence to identify agreed mitigation for the Trimingham Air Defence</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Radar system, in parallel with the work being undertaken by the Offshore Wind Industry Council (OWIC) joint task force to identify an enduring regional solution.</p> <p>No significant cumulative impacts were identified.</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing to engage with stakeholders to agree on appropriate mitigation measures (Draft Statement of Common Ground with Norwich Airport (Revision C)[document reference 16.23]). .</p> <p>Impacts to offshore helicopter operations in support of the oil and gas industry were identified for assessment. The results are within Appendix 16.2 with impacts assessed in ES Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102].</p> <p>Additional information to support the Aviation and Radar assessment includes: ES Appendix 15.1 Technical Report including Radar Line of Sight Images [APP-202] and ES Appendix 15.2 Surveillance Minimum Altitude Chart Analysis [APP-203].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.3 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.20	<p><u>Sufficient air training space and space for civil operations will be required and operation around structures such as wind turbines will become increasingly important as the number of these structures increase.</u></p>	<p>As above in response to paragraph 5.5.3 of draft NPS EN-1 above, assessment of the potential for SEP or DEP to impact on aviation receptors has been carried out in accordance with the standard consultation distances stated in CAP 764. Airborne activity in Practice and Exercise Area (PEXA) may be affected by obstructions created by the physical presence of wind turbines. The Applicant is continuing to engage with stakeholders to agree on appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.20 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.23	<p><u>Windfarms are an integral part of the plan to achieve Net Zero, as well as delivering affordable clean energy to consumers. The government has an official ambition to deliver up to 50GW of offshore wind by 2030 and the</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.5.3 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>Committee on Climate Change's 6th Carbon Budget (CB6) views offshore wind as the backbone of electricity generation across all its scenarios. The Offshore Wind Sector Deal confirmed that government will work collaboratively with the energy sector and wider stakeholders to address strategic deployment issues including aviation and surveillance systems including radar.</p>	
	5.5.24	<p>Whilst it is hoped that future surveillance technologies will enable civil and military aviation, defence and meteorological surveillance providers and offshore windfarms to meet coexistence challenges, it should not be assumed, however, that there will be sufficient advancement in surveillance technologies to meet all future requirements.</p>	<p>The MOD, BEIS, The Crown Estate and the Offshore Wind Industry Council (OWIC) formed a Joint Task Force (JTF) in 2019 with the aim of enabling the co-existence of air defence and offshore wind in the UK.</p> <p>The Applicant is a participating member of the OWIC JTF and is actively engaged in the workstreams being progressed through that forum.</p> <p>The Applicant will remain abreast of the latest advancement in surveillance technologies to ensure co-existence.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.24 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.25	<p>A "system of systems" approach may help address the impacts on air surveillance and routine air traffic control operations for those windfarms that exist when radar or other surveillance systems are procured, however this can add complexity to aviation safety assurance and operating practices.</p>	<p>Section 15.6 of ES Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101] assesses impacts to low flying aircraft, transmitters, civil and military radar systems and flight patterns, helicopter main routes and surveillance minimum altitude. Cumulative impacts in relation to other relevant projects are assessed within Section 15.7 of the [APP-101]. The assessment makes no assumption that a "system of systems" approach will be adopted. However, if such a system was adopted it would represent an improvement on the current levels of mitigation provided by the project.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.25 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.5.26	<p><u>Surveillance methods that rely on cooperation alone, such as Automatic Dependent Surveillance – Broadcast (ADS-B) or Secondary Surveillance Radar transponders, are not sufficient to meet the UKs security and national defence requirements nor would they assure the flight safety of air traffic from non-cooperative threats.</u></p>	<p>The proposed development neither alters nor impacts on the surveillance method.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5.26 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>
	5.5.27	<p><u>MOD recognises that the environmental baseline includes existing windfarms and any mitigation solutions that have been established to support them when procuring future radar systems.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant agreed a position on mitigation for the air defence radar systems at Remote Radar Head (RRH) Neatishead with the MOD.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.27 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.28	<p><u>As existing CNS infrastructure reaches the end of its operational life, replacement options that are more tolerant of wind turbines, if available, should be installed by CNS owners/operators to futureproof aerodromes against possible future turbine installations. In order to maintain or enhance aviation safety, this should be considered on a case-by-case basis, so that the correct solution(s) are identified which strike the balance between surveillance quality/needs and reasonableness of costs being achieved, whilst maintaining safety.</u></p>	<p>Replacement is not an option considered by the Applicant and aviation stakeholders.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5.28 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>
	5.5.29	<p><u>Applicants should provide relevant information on proposed developments to enable CNS owners/operators to consider upgrades appropriately.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has provided relevant information of the proposed development to enable Communication Navigation and Surveillance (CNS) owners/operators to consider appropriate upgrade. This includes the final design of SEP and DEP which will be confirmed through detailed engineering design studies that will be undertaken post-consent. Proposed Requirements 27 and 28 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] submitted at Deadline 7 make provision</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>to secure appropriate mitigation in relation to MOD and Cromer and Claxby PSR respectively.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.29 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Weather warnings and forecasts	5.5.30	<p><u>The UK weather radar network is composed of 15 weather radars that are operated and maintained by the Met Office. Each radar provides data out to 255km that underpin the Public Weather Service and the provision of critical meteorological information to a range of stakeholders including aviation, defence, civil contingencies, and the wider UK population, and in the case of severe weather, through the National Severe Weather Warning Service (NSWWS).</u></p>	<p>The Applicant recognises the importance of the UK weather radar network in providing critical meteorological information.</p> <p>However, there are no weather radar stations within 20km of the SEP and DEP wind farm sites.</p> <p>Met Office radar is scoped out in the ES and any mitigation for effects on meteorological radar is unnecessary.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5.30 of the March 2023 draft EN-1 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>
	5.5.31	<p><u>Weather radars are currently the only means of detecting the presence and location of precipitation in real time. The main hazard from precipitation is flooding and assessment of the potential flood impacts are carried out in consultation with the UKs authoritative flood agencies.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.5.30 of the draft EN-1 above.</p>
	5.5.32	<p><u>Some energy structures, such as wind turbines, have the potential to adversely impact weather radar signals, even beyond 100km from the radar. This can lead to downstream impacts in meteorological and hydrological warning systems that use radar data, which in</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.5.30 of the draft EN-1 above.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>turn decreases the credibility of warning systems. For example, when the size of the affected area exceeds the typical size of storms, warning systems may miss the initial stages of a significant rainfall event, which can cause delays in issuing warnings.</u></p>	
	5.5.33	<p><u>The Met Office protects its weather radars by engaging in the formal planning consultation process. Met Office weather radars are officially safeguarded and as per Secretary of State direction will be consulted directly on all relevant applicable planning applications within safeguarded zones by local planning authorities.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.5.30 of the draft EN-1 above.</p>
	5.5.37	<p><u>The Joint industry and government Air Defence and Offshore Wind Mitigation Task Force was set up to enable the co-existence of UK Air Defence and offshore wind. The Strategy and Implementation Plan sets the direction for that collaboration. The recommendations generated from this Task Force should be referred to by both aviation and energy stakeholders.</u></p>	<p>The MOD, BEIS, The Crown Estate and the OWIC formed a JTF in 2019 with the aim of enabling the co-existence of air defence and offshore wind in the UK.</p> <p>The Applicant is a participating member of the OWIC ATF and is actively engaged in the workstreams being progressed through that forum.</p> <p>In September 2021, the task force published a strategy document titled “<i>Air Defence and Offshore Wind, Working Together Towards Net Zero</i>” (JTF, 2021) which sets out the process of the development of future technical radar mitigation schemes to mitigate Air Defence Radar (ADR) from the impact created by the radar detectability of operational wind turbines. Potential technical radar mitigation solutions have been identified through concept demonstrations, and these systems have demonstrated that they could potentially support wind farm development. The JTF are working towards the joint procurement of an ADR technical mitigation solution in partnership with other participating developers.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.37 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.39	<p><u>The requirement for ATC and non-cooperative surveillance – i.e. radar/tracking technologies -</u></p>	<p>Consultation with regard to Aviation and Radar has been undertaken in line with the general process described in ES. ES Chapter 5 EIA Methodology [APP-</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		forms part of the environmental baseline for proposed developments.	<p>091] and Consultation Report [APP-029]. Stakeholders were consulted and agreed to the scoping report and data collection for establishing the environmental baseline for assessment.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.39 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.41	Any assessment of effects on aviation, meteorological or other defence interests should include potential impacts of the project upon the operation of CNS infrastructure, flight patterns (both civil and military), generation of weather warnings and forecasts, other defence assets (including radar) and aerodrome operational procedures. It should also assess the demonstrable cumulative effects of the project with other relevant projects in relation to aviation, meteorological and defence.	<p>The Applicant has assessed the proposed development effects and cumulative effects of SEP and DEP with other projects in relation to aviation, meteorological and defence.</p> <p>No significant cumulative impacts were identified.</p> <p>Also, please refer to the response under paragraph 5.5.3 of the draft EN-1 for more information.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.41 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.42	<p>In addition, consideration of developments near aerodromes should take into account the following factors:</p> <p>Bird Strike Risk - Aircraft are vulnerable to wildlife strike, in particular bird strike. Birds and other wildlife may be attracted to the vicinity of an aerodrome by various types of development, for example, large buildings with perching/roosting opportunities for birds. It is therefore important that infrastructure, buildings and other elements from energy installations, as well as environmental mitigation are designed in such a way so as not to increase the bird strike risk to the airport for developments within 13km (this can vary):</p>	<p>Aerodromes are not affected by the proposed development and the impacts on aerodromes have been scoped out of the ES. Paragraph 5.5.42 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to the proposed development.</p> <p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.5.3 of the draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>Building Induced Turbulence - If a significant building or structure is proposed close to the airport/runways, there is potential for building induced turbulence/wind shear to be created which has the potential to impact on aircraft on take-off and landing. Studies may be required to identify the extent of any turbulence resulting from the energy infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>Thermal Plume Turbulence - This is caused under certain conditions by the release of hot air from a power plant equipped with a dry cooling system. The plumes generated by these facilities have the potential to create invisible turbulence that can affect the manoeuvrability of aircraft.</u></p>	
	5.5.47	<p><u>Mitigation for effects on meteorological radar and CNS systems may include reducing the scale of a project, although it is likely to be unreasonable for the Secretary of State to require mitigation by way of a reduction or alteration in the scale of development.</u></p>	<p>There are no weather radar stations within 20km of the SEP and DEP wind farm sites and, therefore, Met Office radar is scoped out from the ES and any mitigation for effects on meteorological radar is unnecessary.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5.47 is not considered relevant to the proposed development.</p>
	5.5.48	<p><u>There may be exceptional circumstances where a small reduction in the scale of a development and any associated reduction in generating capacity, will result in proportionately greater mitigation for radar and CNS systems. In these cases, the Secretary of State may consider that the benefits to CNS</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has continuously engaged with aviation stakeholders and the MOD to work out the technical solutions which reduce impacts to acceptable levels and facilitate continued safe operations for aircrafts and radar.</p> <p>Reducing the scale of the proposed development is not a solution proposed by the Applicant, aviation stakeholders and the MOD.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5.48 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<u>and radar mitigation outweighs this loss of capacity.</u>	
	5.5.49	<u>Consideration from energy stakeholders should also be given to the possibility of introducing radar mitigation technology as windfarm assets are renewed and replaced e.g., by using non-radar reflecting materials to manufacture turbine blades.</u>	The proposed development neither renews nor replaces windfarm assets. Paragraph 5.4.49 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.
	5.5.53	<u>In the case of meteorological radars, the Secretary of State should consider the extent to which the provision of weather and flood warnings is compromised.</u>	There are no weather radar stations within 20km of the SEP and DEP wind farm sites and, therefore, Met Office radar is scoped out in the ES. Paragraph 5.5.53 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.
	5.5.54	If there are conflicts between the government's energy and transport policies and military interests in relation to the application, the Secretary of State should expect the relevant parties to have made appropriate efforts to work together to identify realistic and pragmatic solutions to the conflicts. In so doing, the parties should seek to protect the aims and interests of the other parties as far as possible, <u>recognising simultaneously the evolving landscape in terms of the UK's energy security and the need to tackle climate change, which necessitates the installation of wind turbines and the need to maintain air safety and national defence and the national weather warning service.</u>	There are no weather radar stations within 20km of the SEP and DEP wind farm sites and, therefore, Met Office radar is scoped out in the E.SES. With regard to mitigation of impacts on military interests please see the response under paragraph 5.5.3 of the draft EN-1.
	5.5.56	<u>Lighting must also be designed in such a way as to ensure that there is no glare or dazzle to pilots and/or ATC, aerodrome ground lighting is not obscured and that any lighting does not</u>	With respect to lighting and marking, the wind turbines and the OSP topsides will be designed and constructed to satisfy the requirements of the Civil CAA, Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA), Trinity House and the MOD as required. Condition 10 of Schedules 10 and 11 and Condition 9 of Schedules 12

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		diminish the effectiveness of aeronautical ground lighting and cannot be confused with aeronautical lighting	<p>and 13 of the proposed Deemed Marine Licences in the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] submitted at Deadline 7 require the Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding to be consulted and provide for the CAA to direct the lighting (including its shape colour and character) to be exhibited as necessary for aviation safety.</p> <p>SEP and DEP are located adjacent to the existing wind farms of Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm (SOW) and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm (DOW). It is anticipated that any additional lighting produced would not be dissimilar to the lighting produced by the existing wind farms and will be developed in consultation with the relevant authorities during the detailed design of SEP and DEP.</p> <p>Further details including reference to the relevant guidance and regulations is presented in ES Chapter 13 Shipping Navigation [APP-099] and ES Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.56 of the March 2023 consultation draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.57	Where new technologies to mitigate the adverse effects of wind farms on surveillance systems, such as radar, are concerned, the Secretary of State should have regard to any government guidance which emerges from the joint government/Industry Aviation Management Board and the Joint Air Defence and Offshore Wind Task Force	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.5.37 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.5.59	Where a proposed energy infrastructure development would significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of civil or military aviation, meteorological radars, defence assets and/or significantly limit military training, the Secretary of State may consider the use of 'Grampian conditions', or other forms of requirement which relate to the use of	<p>The assessment has identified the potential for unacceptable impacts from SEP and/or DEP on some radar operations without mitigation, however cumulative impacts were found not to be significant. Therefore, the development would not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of civil or military aviation.</p> <p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.5.3 of the draft EN-1 for further details..</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		current or future technological solutions, to mitigate impacts on legacy CNS equipment.	
	5.5.60	<p>Where, after reasonable mitigation, operational changes, obligations and requirements have been proposed, the Secretary of State should consider that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a development would prevent a licensed aerodrome from maintaining its licence and the operational loss of the said aerodrome would have impacts on national security and defence, or result in substantial local/national economic loss, or emergency service needs • it would cause harm to aerodromes' training or emergency service needs, • the development would impede or compromise the safe and effective use of defence assets or unacceptably limit military training • the development would have a negative impact on the safe and efficient provision of en- route air traffic control services for civil aviation, in particular through an adverse effect on CNS infrastructure • the development would compromise the effective provision of weather warnings by the NSWWS, or flood warnings by the UKs flood agencies 	<p>The SoS should be satisfied that, as set out in ES Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101] the proposed development does not prevent a licensed aerodrome from maintaining its license, does not harm training or emergency services, does not have a negative impact on air traffic control services and does not impact on meteorological radars.</p> <p>The Applicant is has reached a finalised SoCG with the MOD [document reference 12.27] and is finalising the proposed mitigation measures with stakeholders [16.23]. Proposed Requirements 27 and 28 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] submitted at Deadline 7 make provision to secure appropriate mitigation in relation to MOD and Cromer and Claxby PSR respectively. The Applicant will continue to engage with the MOD to identify agreed mitigation for the air defence radar systems at RRH Neatishead. Any mitigation measure will be subject to MOD assessment. As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.5.60 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.5.61	<p><u>Provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that the impacts present risks to national security and physical safety, such that they outweigh the urgent need for an acceleration in the deployment of offshore wind, or other technology; and provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that all efforts have been made by the parties to find an acceptable mitigation of the impact, and that such mitigation is not available,</u> consent should not be granted.</p>	<p>The assessment has identified the potential for unacceptable impacts from SEP and/or DEP on some radar operations without mitigation, however cumulative impacts were found not be significant. Therefore, the development would not significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of civil or military aviation.</p> <p>Please refer to the response under paragraphs 5.5.3 and 5.5.60 of the draft EN-1.</p>
Coastal Change	5.6.1	<p><u>The government's Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Policy Statement sets out our ambition to create a nation more resilient to future flood and coastal erosion risk. It outlines policies and actions which will accelerate progress to better protect and better prepare the country against flooding and coastal erosion</u></p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraph 4.9.2, 4.9.8 and 4.9.9 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.7.9	<p><u>Construction should be undertaken in a way that reduces emissions, for example the use of low emission mobile plant during the construction, and demolition phases as appropriate, and consideration should be given to making these mandatory in DCO requirements.</u></p>	<p>During construction, vessel emissions associated with SEP and DEP would comply with International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ship (MARPOL) (Annex VI requirements in relation to ozone depleting substances regulations, nitrogen oxide, sulphur oxide and particulate and volatile organic compounds. Where relevant, vessels must have a valid International Air Pollution Prevention (IAPP) certificate (see Section 5.6 Emissions to Air in the Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (Revision D) [document reference 9.10]. A PEMP is required under Condition 13 of Schedules 10 and 11 (the Generation Deemed Marine Licences (DMLs)) and Condition 12 of Schedules 12 and 13 (the Transmission DMLs) of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] submitted at Deadline 7 and must include the measures that are proposed to manage the environmental risks associated with the construction and operation of the offshore components of SEP and DEP.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision D) [document reference 9.17], submitted at Deadline 7 sets out mandatory measures specific to Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM). NRMM and plant would be well maintained, and the following controls should apply to NRMM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All NRMM should use fuel equivalent to ultralow sulphur diesel (fuel meeting the specification within EN590:2022). • All NRMM will comply with the appropriate NRMM regulations; • All NRMM should be fitted with Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) conforming to defined and demonstrated filtration efficiency (load/duty cycle permitting); • The ongoing conformity of plant retrofitted with DPF, to a defined performance standard, should be ensured through a programme of onsite checks; and • Fuel conservation measures should be implemented, including instructions to (i) throttle down or switch off idle construction equipment; (ii) switch off the engines of trucks while they are waiting to access the site and while they are being loaded or unloaded and (iii) ensure equipment is properly maintained to ensure efficient fuel consumption. <p>A final CoCP will be produced prior to construction of the project and will be in accordance with the content of this Outline CoCP and the final design of the project. The CoCP is secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] submitted at Deadline 7 .</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.7.9 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.7.10	<p><u>Demolition considerations should be embedded into designs at the outset to enable demolition techniques to be adopted that remove the need for explosive demolition.</u></p>	<p>Both unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance and piling have the potential to produce underwater noise capable of causing auditory injury to marine mammals. The Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) details how the Applicant would reduce the risk of underwater noise of UXO clearance and piling from causing auditory injury to marine mammals that could be present in and around the SEP and DEP offshore sites.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Proposed mitigation measures are found in section 1.3.2 of the draft MMMP.</p> <p>A separate Marine Licence (ML) for UXO clearance will be sought, with the necessary information (including the final MMMP for UXO clearance), being provided through the marine licensing process. Proposed measures to mitigate potential impacts from UXO clearance have been provided within this draft MMMP for information purposes only, consistent with Natural England's advice that the DCO application includes an assessment of potential UXO clearance.</p> <p>The final MMMP will be developed in the pre-construction period and will be based upon best available information, methodologies, industry best practice, latest scientific understanding, current guidance and detailed project design. Current guidance includes Joint Nature and Conservation Committee (JNCC) guidelines for minimising the risk of injury and permanent auditory injury (PTS) to marine mammals from using explosives (JNCC, 2010a) and statutory nature conservation agency protocol for minimising the risk of injury to marine mammals from piling noise (JNCC, 2010b).</p> <p>In Principle Site Integrity Plan (SIP) for the Southern North Sea (SNS) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) [APP-290] has been submitted with the DCO application. The SIP sets out the approach for delivery of the required mitigation measures for SEP and DEP to ensure the avoidance of Adverse Effect on Integrity of the SNS SAC in-combination with other plans and projects.</p> <p>With regard to the decommissioning stage, it is not possible to provide details of the methods that will be used during decommissioning at this time. However, it is expected that the activity levels will be comparable to construction (with the exception of pile driving noise which would not occur) and the ES Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096] finds therefore that there would be only minor adverse impacts on marine mammals (species which are amongst most sensitive to noise and vibration) as a result of decommissioning activity.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.7.10 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.7.11	<p>A construction management plan may help clarify and secure mitigation.</p>	<p>For offshore works, the Applicant has prepared an Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (Revision D) [document reference 9.10] submitted at Deadline 7. The OPEMP sets out measures to manage the</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>environmental risks associated with the construction and operation of the offshore components of SEP and DEP.</p> <p>For onshore works, the Applicant has prepared an Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17], submitted at Deadline 7 which sets out secure mitigation identified through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the onshore components of SEP and DEP, onshore development activities. The CoCP is a suite of documents comprising the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Safety Plan • Construction Method Statements • Stakeholder Communications Plan • Construction Fencing Plan • Artificial Lighting Emissions Management and Mitigation Plan • Environmental Emergency/Incident Response Plan • Watercourse crossing scheme • Flood warning and evacuation plan • Dust Management Plan • Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) Management Plan • Construction Noise (and vibration) Management Plan • Scheme for Contamination of Land (including groundwater) • Materials Management Plan • Soil Management Plan • Bentonite Break out Management Plan • Construction Surface Water Drainage Plan <p>A final CoCP will be produced prior to construction of the project and will be in accordance with the content of this OCoCP and the final design of the project.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.7.11 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.8.12	<p><u>Development should be designed to ensure there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere, accounting for the predicted impacts of climate change throughout the lifetime of the development. There should be no net loss of floodplain storage and any deflection or constriction of flood flow routes should be safely managed within the site. Mitigation measures should make as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques.</u></p>	<p>The onshore cable corridor will primarily cross through Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding from rivers or the sea), with some locations in Flood Zone 2 (medium risk of flooding) and 3 (high risk of flooding in any given year). Areas of increased fluvial flood risk are primarily limited to those locations along the onshore cable corridor that cross existing watercourses.</p> <p>The use of HDD has been embedded into the scheme design for Main Rivers (those managed by the Environment Agency) and larger watercourses maintained by the Internal Drainage Board, and as such the flood risk in these locations would remain low.</p> <p>Smaller or less sensitive watercourses along the onshore cable corridor are likely to be crossed using trenched techniques. This will require temporary damming or diversion of affected watercourses. These will be designed to ensure that the bankfull capacity flow can continue to be conveyed to ensure that there is no impact on flood risk. Any temporary damming and rerouting of watercourses along the onshore cable corridor will be designed such that the original flow volumes and rates are maintained to ensure flood risk is not increased.</p> <p>Once operational, all onshore infrastructure, with the exception of the onshore substation, will be located below ground. There will therefore be no effects on flood risk to or from SEP and DEP.</p> <p>The Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C [REP5-045], has been undertaken to support the assessment of surface water flood risk at the proposed Onshore Substation. The modelling accounts for the 1 in 100-year event (plus 45% to allow for climate change) and concludes that the proposed Onshore Substation and access road will not pose a significant off-site risk to others, or be at significant risk of flooding, for the lifetime of the development. Furthermore, the siting of the onshore substation has been determined sequentially to minimise the effects of surface water flooding.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.8.12 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	<p>5.8.17</p>	<p><u>Development (including construction works) will need to account for any existing watercourses and flood and coastal erosion risk management structures or features, or any land likely to be needed for future structures or features so as to ensure:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Access, clearances and sufficient land are retained to enable their maintenance, repair, operation, and replacement, as necessary</u> • <u>Their standard of protection is not reduced</u> • <u>Their condition or structural integrity is not reduced</u> 	<p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17], submitted at Deadline 7 . The CoCP includes a commitment to produce a Soil Management Plan (SMP), watercourse crossing scheme and a flood warning and evacuation plan.</p> <p>The SMP will define the site-specific mitigation measures and best practice techniques required to be followed by all to protect soil resources and minimise soil compaction, erosion and changes to soil drainage.</p> <p>The watercourse crossing scheme details programmes for each watercourse crossing, diversion and reinstatement. It will also include site specific details regarding sediment management and pollution prevention measures.</p> <p>The flood warning and evacuation plan will be produced for the construction phase of the onshore cable corridor, specifically related to construction works at watercourse crossing locations where personnel or materials may be located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 or in an area at increased risk of surface water flooding.</p> <p>The Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045], has been undertaken to support the assessment of surface water flood risk at the proposed onshore substation. The modelling accounts for the 1 in 100-year event (plus 45% to allow for climate change) and concludes that the proposed Onshore Substation and access road will not pose a significant off-site risk to others, or be at significant risk of flooding, for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>The potential impacts on flood risk are considered in ES Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104], ES Appendix 18.2 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209] and the Flood Risk Assessment (Part 1 of 8) - (Part 8 of 8) Revision B [AS-023 – AS030] and Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>With regard coastal erosion risk management structures or features, as set out in the ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision B) [REP5-021] a Ground</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Investigation campaign (involving boreholes) was undertaken in 2021 at the landfall providing a high degree of confidence in the feasibility of HDD at this location. In addition, the Applicant's previous installation campaigns for both SOW and DOW made landfall in proximity to this location and also used HDD to successfully install two export cables per project. As a result, whilst other cable installation projects have needed to consider other construction methodologies at the landfall, for example involving open cut trenching and the creation of cofferdam structures on the beach, these alternative options have been discounted at an early stage for SEP and DEP. Use of HDD at the landfall will therefore minimise interaction with coastal features. In addition, the onshore landfall area comprises the landfall compound located to the west of Weybourne beach car park. This area will include the transition joint bays, located approximately 150m inland from the beach frontage beyond any areas at risk of natural coastal erosion which thereby ensure that there will be no interference with any coastal erosion risk management structures that are extant or that may be needed in future.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.8.17 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	<p><u>5.8.21</u></p>	<p><u>The Sequential Test ensures that a sequential, risk-based approach is followed to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding, taking all sources of flood risk and climate change into account. Where it is not possible to locate development in low-risk areas, the Sequential Test should go on to compare reasonably available sites with medium risk areas and then, only where there are no reasonably available sites in low and medium risk areas, within high-risk areas.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant applied the sequential risk based approach with regard to flooding as a key criterion in the site selection process recorded in the ES Appendix 3.1 Onshore Substation Site Selection Report [APP-175], ES Appendix 3.3 Onshore Main Construction Compound Site Selection Report [APP-177], ES Appendix 18.2.1 Onshore Substation Drainage Study (Revision C) [REP3-037], ES Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], the Flood Risk Assessment [AS-014 - AS-030], Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097]. In addition, further clarification has been provided in the Flood Risk and Planning Practice Guidance Technical Note [REP1-062].</p> <p>As such, SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 5.8.21 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.8.30	<p><u>Where a development may result in an increase in flood risk elsewhere through the loss of flood storage, on-site level-for-level compensatory storage, accounting for the predicted impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the development, should be provided.</u></p>	<p>As demonstrated in the Flood Risk Assessment [AS-014 - AS-030] and Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097], SEP and DEP would not result in an increase in flood risk elsewhere over the lifetime of the development. As such, there is no requirement for the provision of compensatory storage within the design of the project.</p> <p>Please also see the response under paragraph 5.8.12 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>As such, SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 5.8.30 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.”</p>
	5.8.31	<p><u>Where it is not possible to provide compensatory storage on site, it may be acceptable to provide it off-site if it is hydraulically and hydrologically linked. Where development may cause the deflection or constriction of flood flow routes, these will need to be safely managed within the site.</u></p>	<p>The development will not cause the deflection or constriction of flood flow routes. Please see the response under paragraph 5.8.30 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.8.32	<p><u>Where development may contribute to a cumulative increase in flood risk elsewhere, the provision of multifunctional sustainable drainage systems, natural flood management and green infrastructure can also make a valuable contribution to mitigating this risk whilst providing wider benefits.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.8.30 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.8.35	<p><u>Flood resistant and resilient materials and design should be adopted to minimise damage and speed recovery in the event of a flood.</u></p>	<p>As demonstrated in the Flood Risk Assessment [AS-014 - AS-030], Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [document reference 14.34], the platform level of the onshore substation would be elevated above the potential level of surface water flooding, for the lifetime of the development.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Furthermore, appropriate mitigation measures would be incorporated into the design of the Onshore Substation to minimise the risk of flooding from rainfall falling on the platform.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 5.8.35 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Historic Environment	5.9.6	<p>Non-designated heritage assets <u>of</u> archaeological interest <u>that are demonstrably of</u> equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments should be considered subject to the <u>policies for</u> designated heritage assets. <u>The absence of designation for such heritage assets does not necessarily indicate lower significance.</u></p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraph 5.9.9 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.9.9	<p>The applicant should undertake an assessment of any likely significant heritage impacts of the proposed development as part of the EIA and describe these in the ES (see Section 4.2). This should include consideration of heritage assets above, at, and below the surface of the ground. <u>Consideration will also need to be given to the possible impacts, including cumulative, on the wider historic environment. The assessment should include reference to any historic landscape or seascape character assessment and associated studies as a means of assessing impacts relevant to the proposed project.</u></p>	<p>Assessment of heritage impacts is to be found in ES Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100]; ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107], Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-298] and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Onshore) [REP2-031].</p> <p>The ES Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107] assesses impacts on historic landscape character. Impacts on historic seascapes and other offshore heritage assets are assessed in ES Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100].</p> <p>There are no known seabed prehistory sites within the study area, although a number of paleogeographic features, such as former river channels, have been interpreted from the geophysical survey data. The approach to mitigation is to avoid these features via Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZ) and micro-siting during detailed design to ensure that direct impacts will not occur. This will include further investigations prior to the start of construction, such as high-resolution geophysical survey and seabed imagery.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>With the application of recommended measures, significant impacts to offshore archaeology and cultural heritage from SEP and/or DEP (including cumulative and transboundary impacts) will not occur.</p> <p>The onshore cable corridor runs through the Mannington and Wolterton Conservation Area, however all other designated heritage assets within the study area have been avoided as part of the site selection process. With mitigation measures in place, the residual level of impact upon Mannington and Wolterton Conservation Area will be non-significant in EIA terms. .</p> <p>Site selection and project design has sought to avoid designated and non-designated heritage assets as much as possible and where these cannot be avoided HDD will be employed. Outline Written Schemes of Investigation (Onshore) (Revision C) [REP2-031] and Outline Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) (Offshore) [APP-298] have been submitted with the application, which outline the stages of mitigation to be undertaken post-consent. This will inform further decisions regarding the subsequent archaeological mitigation strategy so that the historic environment resource can be safe guarded in a manner that is both appropriate and proportionate to the significance of the archaeological remains identified and present. With this commitment in place any residual impacts are considered to be non-significant in EIA terms. Further WSIs for subsequent post-consent surveys (initial informative stages of mitigation) and subsequent mitigation measures, will be provided where required. Securing of the WSIs is via condition 13 of Schedules 10 and 11 and condition 12 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1]</p> <p>ESAs such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 5.9.9 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.9.16	<p><u>A documentary record of our past is not as valuable as retaining the heritage asset, and therefore the ability to record evidence of the asset should not be a factor in deciding</u></p>	<p>The proposed development does not result in the loss of the whole or part of any designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted an Outline WSI (Onshore) (Revision C) [REP2-031] and Outline WSI (Offshore) [APP298] which will be implemented and supplemented (with additional survey specific, pre-construction mitigation related and construction stage related WSIs) post-consent via requirement 13</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p><u>whether such loss should be permitted, and whether or not consent should be given.</u></p>	<p>of schedule 2, condition 13 of Schedules 10 and 11 and condition 12 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1].Where undesigned assets are encountered the Outline WSI (Onshore) (Revision C) [REP2-031] prioritises “preservation in-situ” in consultation with the relevant planning authority where well-preserved and/or significant archaeological remains survive within or along a development site, in such cases micro siting would be considered where necessary to avoid loss and the methodology of the WSIs is that decisions on loss of an asset or its preservation in situ would be made independently of any ability to record evidence of the asset which is covered elsewhere in the WSIs. OWSIs will inform further decisions regarding the subsequent archaeological mitigation strategy so that loss of any heritage asset is avoided wherever possible and the historic environment resource can be safeguarded in a manner that is both appropriate and proportionate to archaeological remains identified and present.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 5.9.16 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.9.17	<p><u>Where the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset’s significance is justified, the Secretary of State will require the applicant to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost (wholly or in part). The extent of the requirement should be proportionate to the asset’s importance and significance and the impact. The applicant should be required to publish this evidence and to deposit copies of the reports with the relevant Historic Environmental Record. They should also be required to deposit the archive generated in a</u></p>	<p>Please refer to the above response at paragraph 5.9.16 of the draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		local museum or other public repository willing to receive it.	
	5.9.18	Where appropriate, the Secretary of State will impose requirements on the Development Consent Order to ensure that the work is undertaken in a timely manner, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation that complies with the policy in this NPS and which has been agreed in writing with the relevant local authority, and to ensure that the completion of the exercise is properly secured.	<p>Requirement 13 of schedule 2, condition 13 of Schedules 10 and 11 and condition 12 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] would be imposed as a result of the application and would require the submission and approval of Written Schemes of Investigation that must include requirements to carry out works in a timely manner according to the programmes for investigation, recording and post-excavation assessment and other work contained therein.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response under paragraphs 5.9.9 and 5.9.16 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 5.9.18 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Landscape	5.10.4	Virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape, but there may also be beneficial landscape character impacts arising from mitigation.	<p>ES Chapter 25 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment (SVIA) [APP-111] considers the potential impacts of SEP and DEP on seascape, landscape and visual resources.</p> <p>ES Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) [APP-112] describes the potential impacts of the onshore components (cable corridor, landfall and substation) on onshore landscape and visual resources as a result of SEP and DEP.</p> <p>The LVIA is based on a ‘mitigation by design’ approach, which means that during the course of the design development of the onshore components for SEP and/or DEP, landscape considerations, and the mitigation benefits that they represent, have been accounted for as an integral part of the design process. These embedded mitigation measures are described in the ES and the Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [REP5-031].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.10.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.7	The duty to have regard to the purposes of nationally designated areas also applies when	As set out in the ES Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], ES Appendix 3.1 Onshore Substation Site Selection

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>considering applications for projects outside the boundaries of these areas which may have impacts within them. The aim should be to avoid <u>harming</u> the purposes of designation <u>or to minimise adverse impacts on designated areas</u>, and such projects should be designed sensitively given the various siting, operational, and other relevant constraints. This should include projects in England which may have impacts on National Scenic Areas in Scotland <u>or National Parks and AONBs in Wales, as well as projects in Wales which may have impacts on National Parks and AONBs in England</u>.</p>	<p>Report [APP-175], ES Appendix 3.3 Onshore Main Construction Compound Site Selection Report [APP-177] landscape designations have been a key criterion in the site selection and design process.</p> <p>The LVIA is based on a ‘mitigation by design’ approach, which means that during the course of the design development of the onshore components for SEP and/or DEP, landscape considerations, and the mitigation benefits that they represent, have been accounted for as an integral part of the design process. These embedded mitigation measures are described in the ES. and the Outline Landscape Management Plan [APP-303].</p> <p>As set out in the ES Chapter 25 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment (SVIA) [APP-111] and ES Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) [APP-112], relevant consultees agreed with the following study areas as being appropriate to cover all material landscape and visual impacts on the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NCAONB):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1km from the extent of the onshore cable corridor; and • 4km from the site5of the onshore substation site <p>Significant effects during the construction phase of the onshore cable corridor have been identified at Weybourne Wood Open Access Land within the North Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) being at most of a major-moderate significance and adverse. However, impacts are predicted to be of limited spatial extent, temporary and short-term duration and reversible. No other significant effects have been identified during the construction, operation or decommissioning phases of the onshore cable corridor for SEP and/or DEP.</p> <p>The LVIA is based on a ‘mitigation by design’ approach, which means that during the course of the design development of the onshore components for SEP and/or DEP, landscape considerations have been accounted for as an integral part of the design process. These embedded mitigation measures are described in the ES. and the Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [REP5-031].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Further information is found in Impacts on the Qualities of Natural Beauty of Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty [APP-311].</p> <p>The Norfolk Coast Partnership in its response at D3 confirms that the Applicant has evidenced duty of regard to the NCAONB, and that the project does not undermine the statutory purpose of the AONB and has made acceptable steps to mitigate impacts. The Applicant notes that the Norfolk Coast Partnership has provided supplementary information and refers to The Applicant's Comments on Norfolk Coast Partnership's Updated Responses to Second Written Questions [document reference 21.7], submitted at Deadline 7.</p> <p>It is therefore clear that throughout site selection and design, including the embedding of landscape mitigation measures, the aim has been to avoid harming the purposes of designation and to minimise adverse impacts on designated areas.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be in accordance with paragraph 5.10.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.8	<p><u>Heritage Coasts are defined areas of undeveloped coastline which are managed to conserve their natural beauty and, where appropriate, to improve accessibility for visitors.</u></p>	<p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.10.9 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.9	<p><u>Development within a Heritage Coast (that is not also a National Park, The Broads or an AONB) is unlikely to be appropriate, unless it is compatible with the natural beauty and special character of the area.</u></p>	<p>The onshore cabling route avoids sensitive features including settlements, landscape and designated nature conservation sites and designated landscapes such as the North Norfolk Heritage Coast (NNHC) and there would therefore be no development within any heritage coast</p> <p>ES Chapter 25 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment (SVIA) [APP-111] describes how SEP and/or DEP will extend existing offshore wind farms within areas of sea that are currently influenced by the presence of wind farms adjoining the proposed wind farm sites and in the wider seascape.</p> <p>SEP and/or DEP would be visible from the sea and the Norfolk coast, seen in the context of existing wind farms at Inner Dowsing, Lincs, Lynn, Race Bank, Triton Knoll, SOW and DOW are already characteristic of the existing seascape</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>character, and of views from and the setting of landscape character areas, the NCAONB and the NNHC.</p> <p>There will be some effects on seascape, landscape and visual receptors (including designated and defined landscapes) during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of SEP and/or DEP.</p> <p>The SVIA describes how SEP will cause greater or the same effects as DEP, on all seascape, landscape and visual receptors except those within close proximity to the DEP.</p> <p>The Norfolk Coast Partnership confirms in its submission at Deadline 3 [REP3-149] that the NNHC is encompassed by the remit of the NCAONB. Please see the response under paragraph 5.10.7.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be in accordance with paragraph 5.10.9. of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.10	<p>Outside nationally designated areas, there are local landscapes that may be highly valued locally. Where a local development document in England or a local development plan in Wales has policies based on landscape or waterscape character assessment, these should be paid particular attention. However, locally valued landscapes should not be used in themselves to refuse consent, as this may unduly restrict acceptable development</p>	<p>As set out in the ES Chapter 25 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment (SVIA) [APP-111] and ES Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-112], The value of the local landscape is considered as part of the baseline study contained within Section 26.4.6.1, and is informed by local landscape designations identified in local development plans documents. Effects on landscape character are assessed in detail in Section 26.6</p> <p>These assessments also describe how SEP and/or DEP will extend existing offshore wind farms within areas of sea that are currently influenced by the presence of wind farms adjoining the proposed wind farm sites and in the wider seascape.</p> <p>SEP and/or DEP would be visible from the sea and the Norfolk coast, seen in the context of existing wind farms at Inner Dowsing, Lincs, Lynn, Race Bank, Triton Knoll, SOW and DOW are already characteristic of the existing seascape character, and of views from and the setting of landscape character areas, the NCAONB and the NNHC.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>There will be some effects on seascape, landscape and visual receptors (including designated and defined landscapes) during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of SEP and/or DEP.</p> <p>The SVIA describes how SEP will cause greater or the same effects as DEP, on all seascape, landscape and visual receptors except those within close proximity to the DEP.</p> <p>These effects, in line draft NPS policy paragraph 5.10.10 do not amount to reasons to refuse consent.</p> <p>Please see the responses under paragraphs 5.10.4 and 5.10.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.14	<p>The applicant should carry out a landscape and visual impact assessment and report it in the ES, including cumulative effects (see Section 4.2). Several guides have been produced to assist in addressing landscape issues.</p>	<p>Please see the responses under paragraphs 5.10.4 and 5.10.7 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.17	<p>The applicant should consider landscape and visual matters in the early stages of siting and design, where site choices and design principles are being established. This will allow the applicant to demonstrate in the ES how both negative effects have been minimised and opportunities for creating positive benefits or enhancement have been recognised.</p>	<p>Please see the responses under paragraphs 5.10.4 and 5.10.7 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.18	<p>The assessment should include the effects on landscape components and character during construction and operation. For projects which may affect a National Park, The Broads or an</p>	<p>Please see the responses under paragraphs 5.10.4 and 5.10.7 of the draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty the assessment should include effects on the natural beauty and special qualities of these areas'.</p>	
	5.10.27	<p>The Secretary of State should take into consideration the level of detailed design which the applicant has provided and is secured in the DCO, and the extent to which design details are subject to future approvals.</p>	<p>The final design of SEP and DEP will be confirmed through detailed engineering design studies that will be undertaken post-consent to enable the commencement of construction. Detailed engineering design is not commonly carried out until after DCO consent has been obtained, in part because more detailed information remains to be gathered at the post consent stage. Draft policy paragraph 5.10.27 therefore needs to be considered in the context of extant and currently applying NPS EN-1 policy which recognises and endorses the design envelope approach where it states in paragraph 4.2.8 “Where some details are still to be finalised the ES should set out, to the best of the applicant’s knowledge, what the maximum extent of the proposed development may be in terms of site and plant specifications, and assess, on that basis, the effects which the project could have to ensure that the impacts of the project as it may be constructed have been properly assessed” (with a footnote making reference to relevant case law on this matter namely Rochdale MBC Ex. Parte C Tew 1999). The March 2023 consultation draft NPS EN-1 puts it similarly in draft paragraph 4.2.12 “Where some details are still to be finalised, the ES should, to the best of the applicant’s knowledge, assess the likely worst-case environmental, social and economic effects of the proposed development to ensure that the impacts of the project as it may be constructed have been properly assessed”.</p> <p>In view of this approach, known as the Rochdale envelope or design envelope approach, therefore the level of detailed design that would be secured in the DCO to be taken into consideration, is therefore represented by the key parameters identified and set out in draft DCO (Revision J) [document 3.1] and ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision B) [REP5-022] including inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum footprint and height above sea level that the turbines could occupy; • Height of the turbine hubs and blades;

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity of the turbines; • Indicative separation between wind turbines; • Types of wind turbine foundation including pile depth, footprint, area for scour protection. • The length of infield cable length (not including interlink cables); • Number of Onshore Substation Platforms (OSPs) • Relation of turbines with existing offshore wind farms; • The length of export cable to landfall, • The number of export cables and trenches and maximum Export cable corridor width • The width of the Onshore Cable Corridor • A new Onshore Substation Station (OnSS) for SEP and DEP next to the Norwich Main substation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Substation would be 3.25ha in size for SEP or DEP alone, or 6ha for SEP and DEP together; and ○ Substation buildings and electrical equipment up to 15m tall ○ Substation control/switchgear building would be up to 30m long x 14m wide x 15m high SEP or DEP in isolation, 50m long x 25m wide x 15m high for SEP and DEP concurrently or 2 x (30m long x 14m wide x 15m high) for SEP and DEP built in sequence ○ All other external equipment Up to 15m ○ Operational access road width 6m ○ Construction compound Up to 1ha <p>These design details are supplemented by controls offered by the Works Plans, Land Plans and the outline codes and plans that would be secured by the Order which together combine to form a very extensive set of detailed design controls.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Further detail can be found in the Offshore Design Statement [APP 312] and the Design and Access Statement (Revision B) [REP3-056].</p> <p>In relation to the onshore substation along with the Applicant's Onshore Substation Design Response in Appendix B1 Supporting documents to the Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-103] which sets out more fully both the detailed design established and the mechanism that would be established by the DCO to secure good design through the application of the Design and Access Statement, design principles and related documents.</p> <p>In order to provide a precautionary but robust impact assessment at this stage of the development process, realistic worst-case scenarios have therefore been defined in terms of the potential effects that may arise in relation to the above parameters and the design envelope they describe. This Rochdale Envelope approach to EIA, is common practice for developments of this nature, and one supported by the publication of Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (Planning Inspectorate, 2018). As referred to in NPS policy above the Rochdale Envelope for a project outlines the realistic worst-case scenario for each individual impact, so that it can be safely assumed that all lesser options will have less impact. Further details are provided in ES. Chapter 5 EIA Methodology [APP-091], Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074]</p> <p>Having decided upon the appropriate level of detailed design for a project of the scale and complexity of SEP and DEP, it would for the Examining Authority and the SoS's to take this into consideration in the context of currently applying NPS EN-1 policy that it is fundamentally for the market to decide where and how to build, as stated in paragraph 4.9.2: <i>"While the Government may choose to influence developers in one way or another to propose to build particular types of infrastructure, it remains a matter for the market to decide where and how to build, as market mechanisms will deliver the required infrastructure most efficiently"</i>. Draft policy paragraph 5.10.27 therefore requires no more than the level of detailed design that would be secured by the DCO to be taken into account which is set out clearly in the application and further to this, the Applicant</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>has arrived at an appropriate level of detail from a project such as SEP and DEP at its stage of development and complexity.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.10.27 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	5.10.28	<p><u>The Secretary of State should be satisfied that local authorities will have sufficient design content secured to ensure future consenting will meet landscape, visual and good design objectives.</u></p>	<p>The level of design content to be secured by the DCO is set in full above in response to draft policy paragraph 5.10.27 however the meeting of landscape, visual and good design objectives will be secured by an extensive range of post consent controls in addition to the level of detailed design secured at consent.</p> <p>Requirements 10 and 11 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] require full details of all onshore works to be submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority. These also require that “The details submitted ... must:</p> <p><i>“(a) be in accordance with the design and access statement; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) if requested by the relevant planning authority, have been subject to an early independent design review which must consider whether sub-paragraph (a) has been satisfied and make recommendations for design improvements if not”.</i></p> <p>The above requirements in the DCO and the design principles within the Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-057] and Offshore Design Statement [APP-312] underpinned by the Project Vision [APP-313] including project objectives, and related codes, plans and control documents establish a coherent, rigorous and robust approach to securing good design at each stage of the project through to the detailed design stage post consent. The detailed parameters established and these Requirements therefore set out sufficient design content and the processes through which good design will be delivered by SEP and DEP. The Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-057] explains the design evolution of the onshore works to date, proportionate to the application stage of an NSIP, and the considerations that will inform the design of the final onshore works in a clear and structured way. Please also see Onshore Substation Design Response in Appendix B - Supporting documents to the Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Question [REP3-103].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.10.28 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
	5.10.30	<p><u>When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should be given substantial weight by the Secretary of State in deciding on applications for development consent in these areas. The Secretary of State may grant development consent in these areas in exceptional circumstances. Such development should be demonstrated to be in the public interest and consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the need for the development, including in terms of national considerations, and the impact of consenting or not consenting it upon the local economy;</u> • <u>the cost of, and scope for, developing all or part of the development elsewhere outside the designated area or meeting the need for it in some other way, taking account of the policy on alternatives set out in Section 4.2; and</u> • <u>any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.</u> 	<p>The proposed development is not within a National Park. The proposed development is visible from NCAONB and the NNHC; however, with the exception of the underground cable corridor, the proposed development is not within these designated areas.</p> <p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.4.7 and 10 10 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.10.30 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.10.32	<p><u>The duty to have regard to the purposes of nationally designated areas also applies when considering applications for projects outside the boundaries of these areas which may have impacts within them. The fact that a proposed project will be visible from within a designated area should not in itself be a reason for the Secretary of State to refuse consent.</u></p>	<p>Please see the responses under paragraphs 5.10.4 and 5.10.7 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.10.36	<p><u>The Secretary of State should consider whether requirements to the consent are needed requiring the incorporation of particular design details that are in keeping with the statutory and technical requirements for landscape and visual impacts.</u></p>	<p>The final design of SEP and DEP will be confirmed through detailed engineering design studies that will be undertaken post-consent to enable the commencement of construction. The design controls established through the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] and proposed in the Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] and Offshore Design Statement [APP-312] establish a rigorous and informed process for the making of all necessary detailed design decisions at the appropriate stage. It is the applicant's position that to impose detailed design requirements before that process was carried out would be premature and could impose design risks at odds with the statutory requirements yet to be worked through in detailed design terms.</p> <p>Please see the response under paragraph 5.10.27 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.11.2	<p><u>Green Belts, defined in a local authority's development plan in England or regional strategic development plans in Wales, are situated around certain cities and large built-up areas. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. For further information on the purposes of Green Belt</u></p>	<p>The proposed development does not affect any land with a Green Belt designation.</p> <p>As such paragraph 5.11.12 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<u>policy see chapter 13 of the NPPF, or any successor to it.</u>	
	5.11.3	<u>Although the re-use of previously developed land for new development can make a major contribution to sustainable development by reducing the amount of countryside and undeveloped greenfield land that needs to be used, it may not be possible for many forms of energy infrastructure.</u>	<p>The proposed onshore cable corridor is buried underground and does not reduce the amount of countryside.</p> <p>The maximum footprint of the proposed onshore main substation would be 6ha for SEP and DEP together. The site was selected according to criteria including distance from nature conservation areas and is currently land in agricultural use.</p> <p>Through careful site selection and siting, the Applicant has reduced the amount of greenfield for developing the onshore main substation.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.3 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.11.4	<u>Development of land will affect soil resources, including physical loss of and damage to soil resources, through land contamination and structural damage. Indirect impacts may also arise from changes in the local water regime, organic matter content, soil biodiversity and soil process.</u>	Please refer to the response under paragraph 5.11.5 of the draft EN-1.
	5.11.5	<u>Where pre-existing land contamination is being considered within a development, the objective is to ensure that the site is suitable for its intended use. Risks would require consideration in accordance with the contaminated land statutory guidance as a minimum.</u>	<p>Site specific surveys took sediment samples at the wind farm sites and along the offshore cable corridors which were analysed for levels of contamination. The results showed that concentrations of contaminants within the sediments are below sediment guideline values and therefore are low risk with respect to marine water quality. The assessment is in ES Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093].</p> <p>The onshore ground conditions and contamination assessment used a desk-based approach to review the known ground conditions within the Order Limits in ES Chapter 17 Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-103].</p> <p>No potential impacts on existing ground conditions are anticipated during the operation of SEP and DEP. If any pre-commencement remedial work is required</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>in respect of ground contamination, Requirement 32 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] requires a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared an Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] which includes a commitment to produce a Soil Management Plan (SMP). A final CoCP will be produced for each stage of construction, which will provide details of the industry best practice measures and soil management that will be undertaken to reduce potential construction impacts onshore. Provided the best practice measures are in place, the construction of SEP and/or DEP is predicted to have no significant impacts in relation to ground conditions and contamination during construction.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.11.8	<p>The ES (see Section 4.2) should identify existing and proposed land uses near the project, any effects of replacing an existing development or use of the site with the proposed project or preventing a development or use on a neighbouring site from continuing. Applicants should also assess any effects of precluding a new development or use proposed in the development plan. <u>The assessment should be proportionate to the scale of the preferred scheme and its likely impacts on such receptors. For developments on previously developed land, the applicant should ensure that they have considered the risk posed by land contamination and how it is proposed to address this.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the impacts on existing and proposed land uses near the project in the ES Chapter 19 Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation (Revision B) [REP2-022]. The assessment included the potential impacts of the project on the continuation of the current land use (agricultural, environmental stewardship, public access, planning policy, etc).</p> <p>A review of Broadland District Council, North Norfolk District Council and South Norfolk Council local plans was undertaken to identify any areas of land that are allocated for, or restrict, future development or change of use. This included a review of site allocation maps for each of the district councils.</p> <p>The review indicated that the study area does not include or cross through any preferred sites allocated for housing, commercial, employment or special policy under Broadland District Council (2016), North Norfolk District Council (2011) or South Norfolk Council (2015).</p> <p>The Applicant continues to work with stakeholders to reduce impacts and ensure deliverability of SEP and DEP together with other projects within the area, including the Food Enterprise Park (FEP), Solar Docking Farm, transport projects such as the A47 and Norwich Western Link, Hornsea 3 and Norfolk Vanguard/Boreas.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<p>Where impacts to agricultural practices or land under Agri-environmental Schemes are unavoidable, private agreements (or compensation in line with the compulsory purchase compensation code) will be sought with relevant landowners/occupiers.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape Management Plan (Revision D) [REP5-031] also sets out mitigation to be provided for effects on the agricultural land at the onshore substation site including management, new woodland and scrub, hedgerows and grassland maintenance.</p> <p>Further information is found in the Consultation Report [APP-029], Consultation Report - Community Newsletters [APP-042], Consultation Report Section 42 Landowner (Section 44 Consultees) Letters and Questionnaires [APP-045].</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed and assessed the risks posed by land contamination in areas of previously developed land, as well as the potential to restrict the extraction of mineral resources, in ES Chapter 17 Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-103].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.8 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.11.14	<p><u>Applicants are encouraged to develop and implement a Soil Management Plan which could help minimise potential land contamination. The sustainable reuse of soils needs to be carefully considered in line with good practice guidance where large quantities of soils are surplus to requirements or are affected by contamination.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to prepare a final CoCP will be produced for each stage of construction, which will provide details of the industry best practice measures that will be undertaken to reduce potential construction impacts onshore.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] , with which the final CoCP will need to be in accordance, secures the establishment of a Soil Management Plan “detailing measures to maintain soil sustainability during construction”.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.14 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.11.15	<p><u>Developments should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing new and existing developments from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.</u></p>	<p>The proposed development does not put new and existing developments at unacceptable risk from levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.</p> <p>The Applicant will prepare a final CoCP for each stage of construction, which will provide details of the industry best practice measures that will be undertaken to reduce potential construction impacts onshore.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in Section 17.6 of ES Chapter 17 Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-103], Section 18.7 of ES Chapter 18 Water Resource and Flood Risk [APP-104], ES Chapter 22 Air Quality [APP-108] and ES Chapter 23 Noise and Vibration [APP-109].</p> <p>This is secured through Requirement 19 (Code of construction practice) of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document 3.1] which requires a CoCP to be submitted to and approved by the planning authority prior to commencement of any phase of the development.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17], with which the final CoCP will need to be in accordance, secures the establishment of a Soil Management Plan “<i>detailing measures to maintain soil sustainability during construction</i>”.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.15 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.11.16	<p><u>Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans.</u></p>	<p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in ES Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026] and is appropriate for managing construction and post construction impacts from Projects on ecological receptors.</p> <p>The approach to Biodiversity Net Gain, as presented in the Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306], provides an appropriate approach to consideration of net gain within the projects.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.16 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
	5.11.17	<u>Applicants should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.</u>	<p>As detailed in Section 17.6 of ES Chapter 17 Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-103], targeted ground investigations, wastewater collection, pre-construction site characterization works at medium and high sensitivity receptors are considered to be appropriate to avoid impacts.</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] includes all relevant mitigation measures specified in ES Chapter 17 Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-103] and is appropriate for managing construction and post construction impacts from the projects on Ground Conditions and Contamination receptors.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.17 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.11.27	<u>Existing trees and woodlands should be retained wherever possible. The applicant should assess the impacts on, and loss of, all trees and woodlands within the project boundary and develop mitigation measures to minimise adverse impacts and any risk of net deforestation as a result of the scheme. Mitigation may include the use of buffers to enhance resilience, improvements to connectivity, and improved woodland management. Where woodland loss is unavoidable, compensation schemes will be required, and the long-term management and maintenance of newly planted trees should be secured.</u>	Please see the response under paragraphs 5.4.13 and 5.4.30 of the draft EN-1.

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.11.34	<p><u>The Secretary of State should ensure that applicants do not site their scheme on the best and most versatile agricultural land without justification. Where schemes are to be sited on best and most versatile agricultural land the Secretary of State should take into account the economic and other benefits of that land. Where development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality.</u></p>	<p>The proposed onshore cable corridor is buried underground and does not reduce the amount of agricultural land.</p> <p>The maximum footprint of the proposed onshore main substation would be 6ha for SEP and DEP together. As set out in ES Chapter 19 Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation (Revision B) [REP2-022], the location of permanent above ground infrastructure (the substation) would result in permanent loss of less than 10ha of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade 3 land. Such land is not split within ALC mapping, and it is assumed all Grade 3 land within the study area could be Grade 3a and thus Best and Most Versatile land. The Applicant has avoided any permanent loss of Grade 1 or Grade 2 land. Through careful site selection and siting, the Applicant has minimised the footprint of the onshore main substation and minimised the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. SEP and DEP has a locational need for the siting of the onshore substation at this location, which justifies the limited loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.11.34 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.11.36	<p><u>When located in the Green Belt, energy infrastructure projects may comprise 'inappropriate development'. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. The NPPF makes clear that most new building is inappropriate in Green Belt and should be refused permission unless in very special circumstances.</u></p>	<p>Paragraph 5.11.36 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to the proposed development. The proposal is not located in the Green Belt.</p>
	5.11.37	<p><u>Very special circumstances are not defined in national planning policy as it is for the individual decision maker to assess each case on its merits and give relevant circumstances their due weight. However, when considering any</u></p>	<p>Paragraph 5.11.37 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to the proposed development. The proposal is not located in the Green Belt.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>planning application affecting Green Belt land, the Secretary of State should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt when considering any application for such development, while taking account, in relation to renewable and linear infrastructure, of the extent to which its physical characteristics are such that it has limited or no impact on the fundamental purposes of Green Belt designation. Very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewables and other low carbon sources.</p>	
	5.11.38	<p>In England, Local Green Spaces may be designated locally in Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans. These enjoy the same protection as Green Belt in England and the Secretary of State should adopt a similar approach.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.11.38 of the draft EN-1 is not relevant to the proposed development. The proposal is not located in Local Green Spaces.</p>
	5.11.39	<p>In Wales, 'green wedges' may be designated locally. These enjoy the same protection as Green Belt in Wales and the Secretary of State should adopt a similar approach.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.11.39 is applicable to proposed development in Wales and is not relevant to the proposed development. The proposal is located in England.</p>
Noise	5.12.4	<p>Noise resulting from a proposed development can also have adverse impacts on wildlife and biodiversity. Noise effects of the proposed</p>	<p>Noise impacts on marine mammals have been considered in the response under paragraph 5.7.10. In addition, impacts on other marine receptors including fish are addressed where relevant throughout the ES and HRA, including ES</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>development on ecological receptors should be assessed by the Secretary of State in accordance with the Biodiversity and Geological Conservation section of this NPS at Section 5.4. This should consider underwater noise and vibration especially for marine developments. Underwater noise can be a significant issue in the marine environment, particularly in regard to energy production.</p>	<p>Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], ES Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096] and the Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) [APP-059].</p> <p>Noise impacts on onshore ecological receptors are considered in ES Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.12.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.12.11	<p>In the marine environment, applicants should consider noise impacts on protected species, both at the individual project level and in-combination with other marine activities.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraphs 5.7.10, 5.12.4 and 5.12.14 of the draft EN-1.</p>
	5.12.12	<p>Applicants should submit a detailed impact assessment and mitigation plan as part of any development plan, including the use of noise mitigation and noise abatement technologies during construction and operation.</p>	<p>For onshore construction, the Applicant is preparing a Construction Noise (and Vibration) Management Plan, which forms part of the OCoCP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17]. A final CoCP will be produced prior to construction of the project.</p> <p>For offshore works, the Applicant has prepared an outline PEMP (Revision D), [document reference 9.10] submitted at Deadline 7. The outline PEMP sets out measures to manage the environmental risks associated with the construction and operation of the offshore components of SEP and DEP.</p> <p>The Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (Revision B) [REP1-013] and the In-Principle Site Integrity Plan (SIP) for the Southern North Sea Special Area of Conservation (SAC) [APP-290] set out noise and vibration mitigation requirements, which are secured by conditions 13 and 14 of Schedules 10 and 11 and conditions 12 and 13 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.12.12 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.12.14	<p><u>Mitigation measures may include one or more of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>engineering: reducing the noise generated at source and/or containing the noise generated</u> <u>lay-out: where possible, optimising the distance between the source and noise-sensitive receptors and/or incorporating good design to minimise noise transmission through the use of screening by natural or purpose-built barriers, or other buildings</u> <u>administrative: using planning conditions/obligations to restrict activities allowed on the site at certain times and/or specifying permissible noise limits/ noise levels, differentiating as appropriate between different times of day, such as evenings and late at night, and taking into account: seasonality of wildlife in nearby designated sites</u> <u>insulation: mitigating the impact on areas likely to be affected by noise including through noise insulation when the impact is on a building.</u> 	<p>A range of mitigation measures are proposed as part of the application and would be secured by the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>The Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] submitted with this application requires that the final CoCP will include a detailed construction noise and vibration assessment, including predictions of construction noise and vibration levels at nearby receptors for comparison with suitable noise level limits.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures set out in ES Chapter 23 Noise and Vibration [APP-109] include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment to Best Practice Measures (BPM) implemented during the construction phase, detailed in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] The location of the onshore substation which is at least 500m from the nearest residential properties The proposed onshore substation, which is capable of generating tones, can be fully enclosed. The substation will be designed to achieve the operational noise limits included in the relevant DCO condition. The substation plant would be designed and installed as to minimise vibration transmission from any plant items which might generate vibration. Long HDD (up to 1.25km) avoiding trenching works within the intertidal area. Offshore cable laying vessels would be no closer to the shore than 1km. <p>Please also refer to the response above under paragraph 5.12.12 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with 5.12.14 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
Socio-economic	5.13.2	Where the project is likely to have socio-economic impacts at local or regional levels, the applicant should undertake and include in their application an assessment of these impacts as part of the ES	<p>Socio-economic impacts have been assessed in the ES Chapter 27 Socio-Economics and Tourism [APP-113] in section 27.6 (potential impacts) and 27.7 (cumulative impacts).</p> <p>As set out therein the development would have a number of socio-economic impacts (including cumulative impacts), including Increased Employment, Demographic Change, Disturbance to Social, Community and Healthcare Infrastructures, Visual Impact of Offshore Infrastructure on Volume and Value of Tourism Activity, Impact of Onshore Construction on Volume and Value of Tourism and in relation to the local and regional economy on which it is concluded that <i>“The contribution to the East Anglia study area economy is estimated to range from £1.2 million per annum if the port is based in the UK study area but outside the East Anglia study area, to £9.8 million per annum if the port is based in the East Anglia study area”</i>.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.13.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.13.3	The applicant is strongly encouraged to engage with relevant local authorities during early stages of project development so that the applicant can gain a better understanding of local or regional issues and opportunities.	<p>The Applicant has had careful regard to the pre-application consultation requirements of the Planning Act 2008, the guidance on pre-application consultation issued by the Planning Inspectorate, including with regard to local authorities. A detailed record of engagement is provided within Consultation Report [APP-029] and Consultation Report Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting minutes and agreement logs.</p> <p>The Applicant has therefore consulted relevant local authorities from the earliest stages and at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process.</p> <p>Please also see the response under paragraph 5.10.28 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with 5.13.3 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.13.4	The applicant’s assessment should consider all relevant socio-economic impacts, which may include:	<p>The Applicant’s assessment in the ES Chapter 27 Socio-Economics and Tourism [APP-113] considers relevant socio-economic impacts and finds that across the construction and operational phase and including on a cumulative basis:</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the creation of jobs and training opportunities. Applicants may wish to provide information on the sustainability of the jobs created, including where they will help to develop the skills needed for the UK's transition to Net Zero</u> • <u>the contribution to the development of low-carbon industries at the local and regional level as well as nationally</u> • <u>the provision of additional local services and improvements to local infrastructure, including the provision of educational and visitor facilities</u> • <u>any indirect beneficial impacts for the region hosting the infrastructure, in particular in relation to use of local support services and supply chains</u> • <u>effects on tourism</u> • <u>the impact of a changing influx of workers during the different construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the energy infrastructure. This could change the local population dynamics and could alter the demand for services and facilities in the settlements nearest to the construction work (including community facilities and physical infrastructure such as energy, water, transport and waste). There could also be effects on social cohesion depending on how populations and service</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEP and DEP would create 920 and 1,270 jobs in the construction phase respectively (1,810 to 2,190 if built in parallel) and 155 to 230 jobs in the operational phase; • the Outline Skills and Employment Plan (Revision B) [REP3-072] sets out Equinor's intention to deliver long term skills and job-related benefits to the local community from a low carbon energy project, helping to contribute to the development of low-carbon industries at the local and regional level as well as nationally and that the contribution to the East Anglia study area economy is estimated to range from £1.2 million per annum if the port is based in the UK study area but outside the East Anglia study area, to £9.8 million per annum if the port is based in the East Anglia study area, assessed as a major beneficial effect. • whilst the Visual Impact of Offshore Infrastructure on Volume and Value of Tourism Activity is assessed as minor adverse research finds that while there is potential for some visitors to be discouraged from making future visits to an area affected by a wind farm development, this is usually balanced (and in some cases exceeded) by visitors reporting that they will visit more frequently and the research also points out that visitors and tourism-related businesses recognise the potential for positive impacts associated with extra expenditure within the sector and local economy arising from the construction activity, or in some cases the additional interest in the seeing of the development and its construction, and • the change in demographics and Disturbance to Social, Community and Healthcare Infrastructure would have a minor adverse effect. <p>Please also see the response under paragraph 5.13.2 of the draft EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with 5.13.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		<p>provision change as a result of the development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> cumulative effects - if development consent were to be granted to for a number of projects within a region and these were developed in a similar timeframe, there could be some short-term negative effects, for example a potential shortage of construction workers to meet the needs of other industries and major projects within the region 	
	5.13.5	Applicants should describe the existing socio-economic conditions in the areas surrounding the proposed development and should also refer to how the development's socio-economic impacts correlate with local planning policies.	<p>The existing socio-economic conditions are described in Section 27.5 of ES Chapter 27 Socio-Economics and Tourism [APP-113].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with 5.13.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.13.6	Socio-economic impacts may be linked to other impacts, for example visual impacts considered in Section 5.10 but may also have an impact on tourism and local businesses. Applicants are encouraged, where possible, to demonstrate that local suppliers have been considered in any supply chain.	<p>Impacts on tourism and local businesses during the construction phase of the project are assessed in section 27.6.4.6.1 of ES Chapter 27 Socio-Economics and Tourism [APP-113]. Impacts on tourism during the operational phase are assessed in section 27.6.5.6.1.</p> <p>The Applicant has sought to demonstrate within the Outline Skills and Employment Plan (Revision B) [REP3-072] the approach that will be adopted to ensure that local economic benefit derives from SEP and DEP, including supply chain opportunities for local suppliers.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.13.6 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
<u>Traffic and Transport</u>	5.14.5	If a project is likely to have significant transport implications, the applicant's ES (see Section 4.2) should include a transport- appraisal. The	The Applicant has prepared ES Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport [APP-110] and supporting the Transport Assessment [APP-268] in accordance with current transport guidance (referenced within Section 24.4 of the ES). The scope of the transport assessment has been agreed with statutory stakeholders as

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) and Welsh Governments WeITAG provides guidance on modelling and assessing the impacts of transport schemes.	<p>outlined within the Statement of Common Ground with National Highways (Revision D) [document reference 12.22] and Statement of Common Ground with Norfolk County Council (Revision E) [document reference 12.17].</p> <p>ESAs such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.14.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.14.7	<p>The applicant should prepare a travel plan including demand management and monitoring measures to mitigate transport impacts. The applicant should also provide details of proposed measures to improve access by active, public and shared transport to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduce the need for parking associated with the proposal; • contribute to decarbonisation of the transport network; • reduce the need to travel; and • secure behavioural change and modal shift through an offer of genuine modal choice and to mitigate transport impacts. 	<p>ES Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport [APP-110] contains an assessment of the potential impacts on the transport network associated with SEP and DEP and further outlines the mitigation measures for construction, such as demand management measures and heavy goods vehicle (HGV) controls.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP5-027] has been submitted with the DCO application. The Outline CTMP includes outline travel plan measures (including parking controls), which will be developed further in consultation with Norfolk County Council and National Highways prior to the commencement of the authorised project.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraphs 5.14.7 and 5.14.8 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.14.8	<p>The assessment should also consider any possible disruption to services and infrastructure (such as road, rail and airports).</p>	
	5.14.9	<p>If additional transport infrastructure is needed or proposed, it should always include good quality walking, wheeling and cycle routes, and associated facilities (changing/storage etc) needed to enhance active transport provision.</p>	<p>Outline CTMP [REP5-027] has been submitted with the DCO application. The Outline CTMP [REP5-027] includes outline travel plan measures to enhance active travel provision, which will be developed further in consultation with Norfolk County Council and National Highways prior to the commencement of the authorised project.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.14.9 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
<u>Traffic and Transport</u>	5.14.11	<p>Where mitigation is needed, possible demand management measures must be considered. <u>This could include identifying opportunities to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>reduce the need to travel by consolidating trips.</u> • <u>locate development in areas already accessible by active travel and public transport.</u> • <u>provide opportunities for shared mobility.</u> • <u>re-mode by shifting travel to a sustainable mode that is more beneficial to the network.</u> • <u>retime travel outside of the known peak times.</u> • <u>reroute to use parts of the network that are less busy</u> 	Opportunities listed here will be covered in the Travel Plan, please refer to the response under paragraph 5.14.7 of the draft EN-1.
	5.14.12	<p><u>If</u> feasible and operationally reasonable, <u>such mitigation should be</u> required, before considering requirements for the provision of new inland transport infrastructure to deal with remaining transport impacts.</p> <p><u>All stages of the project should support and encourage a modal shift of freight from road to more environmentally sustainable alternatives, such as rail, cargo bike, maritime and inland waterways, as well as making appropriate</u></p>	<p>ES Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport [APP-110] assessment identifies that the local ports of King’s Lynn, Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth Ports to be the most likely source for all materials and therefore HGV mode share is only utilised for the least accessible local routes.</p> <p>ESAs such SEP and DEP can be accordance with paragraph 5.14.12 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		provision for and infrastructure needed to support the use of alternative fuels including charging for electric vehicles.	
	5.14.13	Regard should always be given to the needs of freight at all stages in the construction and operation of the development including the need to provide appropriate facilities for HGV drivers as appropriate.	<p>An Outline CTMP [REP5-027] has been submitted with the DCO application. The Outline CTMP [REP5-027] includes outline of measures to manage the movement of freight via HGVs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> managing the numbers and routing of HGVs; parking and loading/unloading of HGVs; safe passage of HGV traffic via the local highway network. <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.14.13 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.14.16	<p>Applicants should consider the DfT policy guidance “Water Preferred Policy Guidelines for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads” when preparing their application.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 24.2 - Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Study [APP-270] has been prepared by Wynns Ltd (consulting engineers specialising in the transportation of AILs) on behalf of the Applicant. The AIL study informs the management measures required for the transportation of AILs for SEP and DEP.</p> <p>In accordance with the Department for Transport (DfT) policy guidance “Water Preferred Policy Guidelines for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads” the AIL study has identified that the load could come from King’s Lynn Port (the nearest suitable port).</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.14.16 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.14.20	Development consent should not be withheld provided that the applicant is willing to enter into planning obligations for funding new infrastructure or requirements can be imposed to mitigate transport impacts. In this situation the Secretary of State should apply	<p>The project does not have effects on the surrounding transport infrastructure that would justify the provision or funding of new transport infrastructure to mitigate transport impacts.</p> <p>ES Chapter 24 Traffic and Transport [APP-110] concluded that with the application of mitigation (as required) the residual impacts would not be significant. Mitigation measures for traffic and transport are captured within an</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
	5.14.21	<p>appropriately limited weight to residual effects on the surrounding transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The Secretary of State should only consider refusing development on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, or it does not show how consideration has been given to the provision of adequate active public or shared transport access and provision.</p>	<p>Outline CTMP [REP5-027]. The requirement to produce a final CTMP and agree mitigation measures in consultation with Norfolk County Council and National Highways is secured by Requirement 15 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraphs 5.14.20 and 5.14.21 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
Waste	5.15.8	<p>The applicant should set out the arrangements that are proposed for managing any waste produced and prepare a report that sets out the sustainable management of waste and use of resources throughout any relevant demolition, excavation and construction activities.</p>	<p>Informed by the ES Appendix 17.2 Waste Assessment (Onshore Development) [APP-207] the Applicant will prepare a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) for SEP and DEP as part of the final CoCP. A final CoCP will be produced prior to construction of the project and will be in accordance with the content of the Outline CoCP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17] and the final design of the project. The final CoCP is secured in the draft DCO (Revision H) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.15.8 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.15.9	<p>The arrangements described and a report setting out the sustainable management of waste and use of resources should include information on how re-use and recycling will be maximised in addition to the proposed waste recovery and disposal system for all waste generated by the development. They should also include an assessment of the impact of the waste arising from development on the</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.2 Waste Assessment (Onshore Development) [APP-207] assesses the onshore impacts of SEP and DEP in terms of waste generation during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases, considering the proposed options for recycling, recovery or disposal of waste, and the capability and capacity of the existing local or regional waste management facilities to manage the quantities of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>A Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) would be prepared before construction starts and is secured within the Code of Construction Practice (Requirement 19 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1]. The SWMP will record any decisions given to materials resource efficiency when designing and planning the works. It will provide an estimate of the quantity of each type of</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
		capacity of waste management facilities to deal with other waste arising in the area for at least five years of operation..	waste and the proposed waste management option for each waste produced (i.e. re-use, recycling, recovery, or disposal; on or off-site) in accordance with the stated objective for the SWMP recorded in the COCP “to minimise the quantity of waste produced on site; or maximise the amount of waste reused, recycled or recovered” in accordance with the waste hierarchy set out in NPS EN-1. As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.15.9 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.
	5.16.13	<u>The Secretary of State should have regard to any potential impacts on the achievement of resource efficiency and waste reduction targets set under the Environment Act 2021 or wider goals set out in the government’s Environmental Improvement Plan.</u>	Please refer to the response under paragraph 4.2.28 and 5.15.8 of the draft EN-1.
Water	5.16.4	<u>The applicant should make early contact with the relevant regulators, including the local authority, the Environment Agency and Marine Management Organisation, where appropriate, for relevant licensing and environmental permitting requirements.</u>	The Applicant has consulted with the relevant regulators from the earliest stages and at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process. A detailed record of engagement is set out in the Consultation Report [APP-029]. A number of Statements of Common Ground and Statements of Commonality with or relating to regulators and local authorities have been developed evidencing further the nature of the early contact including with regard to permits and licensing (and where relevant Protective Provisions), These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant’s Statement of Commonality (Revision G) [document reference 12.45] • Draft Statement of Common Ground Maritime and Coastguard Agency (Revision B) [REP3-079] • Draft Statement of Common Ground with Marine Management Organisation (MMO) (Revision B) [REP3-078] • Draft Statement of Common Ground Environment Agency (Revision C) [REP4-020]

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-1	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Statement of Common Ground with North Norfolk District Council [REP2-048] • Draft Statement of Common Ground with Natural England (Offshore) [REP2-044] • Draft Statement of Common Ground with Norfolk County Council (Revision D) [document reference 12.17] <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 5.16.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-1.</p>
	5.16.13	<p><u>The SoS must also consider duties under other legislation including duties under the Environment Act 2021 in relation to environmental targets and have regard to the policies set out in the Government's Environmental Improvement Plan.</u></p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraph 4.2.28 of the draft EN-1.</p>

1.2 Draft NPS EN-3

- 12 As set out within paragraph 2.1.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-3, “Applicants should ensure their applications and any accompanying supporting documents and information are consistent with the instructions and guidance in this NPS, EN-1 and any other NPSs that are relevant to the application in question”.
- 13 **Table 2** lists the draft policies within the March 2023 EN-3 that are relevant to the Development Consent Order application and assesses the proposals against each.

Table 2 The Applicant’s Response to Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
	Draft EN-3 3.3.7	<p><u>The Secretary of State should have regard to the aims, goals and targets of the government’s Environmental Improvement Plan (of which the 25 Year Environment Plan⁶ is the first), and other existing and future measures and targets in England, including under the new strategy for nature, as well as Welsh policy, such as the Wales National Marine Plan, Planning Policy Wales and Technical Advice Note (TAN) 5, and comply with the Environment Act 2021.</u></p>	<p>The 25 Year Environment Plan (25YEP) sets out ten goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1: Thriving plants and wildlife • Goal 2: Clean air • Goal 3: Clean and plentiful water • Goal 4: Managing exposure to chemicals and pesticides • Goal 5: Maximise our resources, minimise our waste • Goal 6: Using resources from nature sustainably • Goal 7: Mitigating and adapting to climate change • Goal 8: Reduced risk of harm from environmental hazards • Goal 9: Enhancing biosecurity • Goal 10: Enhanced beauty, heritage, and engagement with the natural environment <p>The proposed development contributes to meeting these goals by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1: Thriving plants and wildlife - by promoting Biodiversity Net Gain onshore and offshore. Further information is found in ES Appendix 20.6 Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-048] and The Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306] and in paragraphs 667 to 670 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096]. • Goal 2: Clean air – by displacing the demand for electricity generated from fossil fuels and by producing electricity from a renewable energy source.

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 3: Clean and plentiful water – by having minimal impacts on marine water sediments (ES Volume 1 Chapter 7 –Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093]). • Goal 4: Managing exposure to chemicals and pesticides - is not relevant to the proposed development. • Goal 5: Maximise our resources, minimise our waste – through the waste and disposal arrangements provided in the Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) for SEP and DEP to be prepared by the applicant as part of the final CoCP/project environmental management plan secured by the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1], which includes the stated SWMP objectives “to minimise the quantity of waste produced on site; or maximise the amount of waste reused, recycled or recovered ” in accordance with the waste hierarchy set out in NPS EN-1 and by producing energy from a renewable resource and by using the local labour supply in the construction and operation of the SEP and DEP as described in the Outline Skills and Employment Plan (Revision B) [REP3-072], the SWMP will be developed on the basis of the ES Appendix 17.2 – Waste Assessment (Onshore Development) [APP-207] and the waste management section of the Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] • Goal 6: Using resources from nature sustainably - by producing energy from a renewable resource domestically set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [document reference 6.1.4].

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 7: Mitigating and adapting to climate change - by the designing of SEP and DEP with an allowance for predicted erosion rates and flood risk included in the design, SEP and DEP will not be vulnerable to coastal changes, flood risk or climate change as set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104]. The Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] and ES Appendix 18.2.1 Onshore Substation Drainage Study (Revision C) [REP3-037]. • Goal 8: Reduced risk of harm from environmental hazards – by avoiding use of potentially hazardous finite resources, such as Oil and Gas. • Goal 9: Enhancing biosecurity - by – minimising the use of agricultural land, working with landowners to avoid and minimise interaction with livestock and crops and through protecting wildlife and livestock and boosting the resilience of plants and trees with mitigation measures, including the Biosecurity Protocols, as set out in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (OCoCP) (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.19]. The proposed development also minimises the risk of spread of diseases associated with Invasive Non-Native Species as set out in Section 20.6 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026].

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal 10: Enhancing beauty, heritage, and engagement with the natural environment – through the approach established in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] having regard to sensitive receptors during the site selection process in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection and Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] and the controls established in the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] for approval of detailed design according to the DAS Design Principles and where necessary subject to Design Review (Draft Requirement 10 (5)(a) and (b)) <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.3.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Other locational considerations	Draft EN-3 3.3.9	<p><u>As most renewable energy resources can only be developed where the resource exists and where economically feasible, and because there are no limits on the need established in Part 3 of EN-1, the Secretary of State should not use a sequential approach in the consideration of renewable energy projects (for example, by giving priority to the re-use of previously developed land for renewable technology developments).</u></p>	<p>In 2017, The Crown Estate defined application criteria for offshore wind project extensions. These criteria formed the first basis, along with technical and commercial feasibilities, for the site selection process for SEP-DEP. The process, and how the Applicant has sought to carry it out, is presented in 6.1.3 ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089].</p> <p>Section 4 “Assessment of Alternative Solutions” of Habitats Regulations Derogation – Provision Evidence [APP-063] demonstrates that there are no alternative solutions which could deliver the project objectives (including generating energy where the resource exists) in accordance with the need for SEP and DEP.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be in accordance with paragraph 3.3.9 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Seabed leasing	Draft EN-3 3.3.12	<p><u>Applicants must obtain a lease from The Crown Estate or Crown Estate Scotland prior to placing any offshore structures on, or passing cables over, the seabed and its foreshore.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant applied, on behalf of the partners of SEL and DEL, for an Agreement for Lease (AfL) for the extension of these two wind farms. An acceptance letter from The Crown Estate was received in September 2019 and AfLs were signed in April 2020 for DEP and August 2020 for SEP (Paragraph 6 of Planning Statement (Revision B) [AS-031]).</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			As such SEP and DEP can be in accordance with paragraph 3.3.12 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.
Marine licensing	Draft EN-3 3.3.16	<u>Marine Licences are required for all the marine elements of a proposed offshore development (up to Mean High Water Springs), including associated development such as the cabling and any offshore substations that are required, and any other matters the MMO may consider relevant under s69 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.</u>	<p>The draft DCO also incorporates four Deemed Marine Licences (DMLs) (at Schedules 10 – 13 of the draft Development Consent Order (Revision J) [document reference 3.1]). Other relevant guidance, including in relation to Marine Licensing, are outlined in Section 8.4.1.2 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.3.16 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Climate change adaptation	Draft EN-3 3.4.7	<u>Offshore wind farms will not be affected by flooding. However, applicants should demonstrate that any necessary land-side infrastructure (such as cabling and onshore substations) will be appropriately resilient to climate-change induced weather phenomena. Similarly, applicants should particularly set out how the proposal would be resilient to storms.</u>	<p>An allowance for predicted coastal erosion was included in the design for SEP and DEP. The assessment presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104], Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] confirmed that the project would not be vulnerable to coastal changes or climate change. Furthermore, the project infrastructure would not prevent or change the operation of natural erosion processes, as driven by wave action and subaerial processes.</p> <p>The potential impacts associated with flood risk are considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104], Addendum to the Floor Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097], and Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [REP5-045] submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.4.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Consideration of “good design” for energy	Draft EN-3 3.5.2	Proposals for renewable energy infrastructure should demonstrate good design, <u>particularly in respect of landscape and visual amenity, opportunities for co-existence/co-location with</u>	Design considerations are set out in the Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056], supporting documents to the Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions - Appendix B.1 Technical Note: The Design of the Onshore

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
infrastructure		<p>other marine uses, and in the design of the project to mitigate impacts such as noise and effects on ecology and heritage.</p>	<p>Substation [REP3-103] and the Offshore Design Statement [APP-312]. The Applicant has also updated Requirement 10(5) of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] to commit to undertaking an independent design review in relation to the onshore substation..</p> <p>The assessment and mitigation on seascape, landscape and visual effects are considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 25 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-111] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-112].</p> <p>The application has a detailed site selection process and mitigation measures to minimise interactions of SEP/DEP with existing activities in ES Volume 1 Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102]. For offshore, existing activities include shipping and navigation, oil and gas platforms, nature conservation designations, commercial fisheries and civil/military and coverage and helicopter main routes. Throughout the ES, there are proposed mitigations to minimise any remaining potential impacts. Considerations of other marine activities are in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], ES Volume 1 Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098] and the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (Revision B) [document [APP-295document reference 9.88] set out strategies for co-location with commercial fisheries.</p> <p>The proposed development would not compromise other marine users to undertake their activities. The proposed development complies with all marine plan policies as set out in the Marine Plan Policy Review [REP1-060].</p> <p>Underwater noise is considered in the Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) (Revision B) [REP1-013] and In Principle Site Integrity Plan (SIP) for the Southern North Sea (SNC) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) [APP-290]. As outlined in Section 10.3.4.2 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096], these documents and the mitigation measures required will be developed in the pre-construction period and will be based upon best available information and methodologies at that time, in consultation with the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies (SNCBs) and Marine Management Organisation (MMO).</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>Noise impacts on terrestrial protected species is considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026]. The impacts and mitigation measures for onshore construction noise are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 22 Air Quality [APP-108], ES Appendix 23.3 Construction Noise Assessment [APP-266], the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Revision D) [REP5-027], and the OCoCP (Revision F) [document reference 9.17].</p> <p>For offshore, the Applicant has prepared the Outline Project Environmental Management Plan (PEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.10]. The OPEMP sets out measures to manage the environmental risks associated with the construction and operation of the offshore components of SEP and DEP.</p> <p>For onshore, the Applicant has prepared OCoCP (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] setting out secure mitigation identified through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the onshore components of SEP and DEP, and onshore development activities.</p> <p>The approach to mitigation is to avoid these features via Archaeological Exclusion Zones (AEZ). 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 (WSI), secured by Requirement 18 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1], ES Volume 1 Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100], ES Volume 1 Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107], Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-298], and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Onshore) (Revision C) [REP2-031]. The OWSIs will inform further decisions regarding the subsequent archaeological mitigation strategy so that the historic environment resource can be safeguarded in a manner that is both appropriate and proportionate to archaeological remains identified and present.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement - Schedule of Mitigation and Mitigation Routemap [APP-282] lists all mitigation measures proposed in the ES for SEP and DEP and sets them out on a topic-by-topic basis.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.5.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
<p>Flexibility in the project details</p>	<p>Draft EN-3 3.6.1</p>	<p>Where details are still to be finalised applicants should explain in the application which elements of the proposal have yet to be finalised, and the reason why this is the case.</p>	<p>As set out in the response to paragraph 1.1.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-5, the Applicant took a strategic decision to develop SEP and DEP in a coordinated manner from an early stage of the project, to minimise impacts on local communities and maximise benefits for the area. It was clear to the Applicant from the outset that the most preferable development of SEP and DEP would be to coordinate the two projects, with an integrated transmission system scenario also being preferable from a technical and economic perspective. The application seeks development consent for both SEP and DEP in the same DCO.</p> <p>The current regulatory regime for offshore wind development does not currently enable the delivery of an integrated transmission system. It has therefore been necessary for the Applicant to continue to incorporate flexibility within the consent application to enable the further development of SEP and DEP under a range of potential scenarios. Doing so ensures that these Critical National Priority developments will be delivered in a timely manner within the prevailing regulatory regime at the time.</p> <p>The Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074] provide an overview and explanation of the project development scenarios within the DCO.</p> <p>The final design of SEP and DEP, including which development scenario they will be developed under, will be confirmed post-consent to enable the commencement of construction, the final design will be informed through detailed engineering design studies that will be undertaken. In order to provide a precautionary but robust impact assessment at this stage of the development process, realistic worst-case scenarios have been defined in terms of the potential effects that may arise. This approach to EIA, referred to as the Rochdale Envelope, is common practice for developments of this nature, as supported by Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope (Planning Inspectorate, 2018). The Rochdale Envelope for a project outlines the realistic worst-case scenario for each individual impact, so that it can be safely assumed that all lesser options will have less impact. Further details are</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>provided in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021], ES Volume 1 Chapter 5 EIA Methodology [APP-091], the Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074].</p> <p>The development scenarios considered for SEP and DEP can be broadly categorised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In isolation – where only SEP or DEP is constructed; • Sequential – where SEP and DEP are both constructed in a phased approach with either SEP or DEP being constructed first; or • Concurrent – where SEP and DEP are both constructed at the same time. <p>The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP1-036] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074] reiterate that the worst-case for each scenario has been assessed in this application.</p> <p>The key parameters identified as part of the Rochdale Envelope for SEP and/or DEP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum footprint and height above sea level that the turbines could occupy; • Height of the turbine hubs and blades; • Quantity of the turbines; • Indicative separation between wind turbines; • Types of wind turbine foundation including pile depth, footprint, area for scour protection; • The length of infield cable length (not including interlink cables); • Relation of turbines with existing offshore wind farms; • Number of Onshore Substation Platforms (OSPs);

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The length of export cable to landfall; • The number of export cables and trenches and maximum export cable corridor width; • The width of the Onshore Cable Corridor; • A new Onshore Substation Station (OnSS) for SEP and DEP next to the Norwich Main substation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Substation would be 3.25ha in size for SEP or DEP alone, or 6ha for SEP and DEP together; and ○ Substation buildings and electrical equipment up to 15m tall. <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.6.1 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	<p>Draft EN-3 3.6.2</p>	<p><u>Where flexibility is sought in the consent as a result, applicants should, to the best of their knowledge, assess the likely worst-case environmental, social and economic effects of the proposed development to ensure that the impacts of the project as it may be constructed have been properly assessed.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the worst-case for each scenario. The project development scenarios within the DCO are explained in the Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074].</p> <p>The Applicant has defined a range of parameters for each aspect of the Proposed Development and the worst-case scenario associated with each parameter and receptor has been used in each impact assessment. This helps to ensure that the EIA process has considered the maximum effects of SEP and/or DEP, whilst also allowing for further optimisation and refinement at the time of construction. The project design envelope therefore provides the maximum extent of the consent sought and the detailed design of the Proposed Development can then be developed, refined and procured within this consented envelope prior to construction. The Applicant's response to Q1.5.1.2 of in The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP1-036] explains how the worst-case scenario has been assessed in relation to, for example, the foundation types for the proposed wind turbines.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to Q1.6.1.2 of [REP1-036] explains the worst-case scenario for the construction of SEP and DEP. This is further supported by the</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>Applicant’s response to the Q2.6.2.2, which provides further information on the Applicant’s approach to assessment of the worst case scenario (see The Applicant’s Responses to the Examining Authority’s Second Written Questions [REP3-101]).</p> <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.6.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.6	<p><u>The British Energy Security Strategy also proposes an offshore wind Environmental Improvement Package, including committing to establishing Offshore Wind Environmental Standards (formerly nature-based design standards), required to assist a project’s passage through the consenting process. Applicants can find further guidance at paragraphs 2.8.102 of this NPS.</u></p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant’s response below under paragraphs 3.8.103 to 106 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.7 to 3.8.11	<p><u>As set out in EN-1, more than half of final energy demand in 2050 could be met by electricity, as transport and heating in particular shift from fossil fuel to electrical technology. The security, reliability, climate change, and cost implications of this requires a focus on renewable and other low carbon sources of electricity.</u></p> <p><u>The UK’s resources, with its shallow seabeds and high winds, offer unique advantages that have made the country a global leader in offshore wind and pioneers of floating wind.</u></p> <p><u>In addition, along with strong public support for offshore projects, the cost of offshore wind power has fallen dramatically. Offshore wind prices in the Round 4 Contracts for Difference</u></p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that the proposed development, an offshore wind farm and associated offshore and onshore infrastructure, meets the definition of a Critical National Priority (CNP). The Applicant understands that, whilst the timing and final wording of the draft NPSs is currently unknown, the Secretary of State may take into account this CNP as an “important and relevant matter” in its decision making on the DCO application for SEP and DEP in accordance with section 104(2)(d) of the Planning Act 2008. The proposed designation of offshore wind projects, including SEP and DEP, as CNP projects lends even greater emphasis to current national policy that there is urgent need for renewable electricity NSIPs, established in section 3.3 of the extant NPS EN-1.</p> <p>Each of SEP and DEP would towards the UK’s offshore wind and decarbonization targets and, as such, each project is a Critical National Priority.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that the urgent need for affordable, reliable and secure source of renewable energy. As set out in the Project Vision [APP-313], the Applicant took a strategic decision to develop SEP and DEP in a</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<p><u>auctions were around 65% less than those achieved in the first allocation round in 2015, making offshore wind one of the lowest cost ways of generating electricity.</u></p> <p><u>With smarter planning the UK can maintain high environmental standards and minimise impacts while increasing the levels of deployment needed to meet our 2030 ambitions and net zero.</u></p> <p><u>Therefore, Government has concluded that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant new offshore wind development and supporting onshore and offshore network infrastructure and related network reinforcements (“CNP Infrastructure”).</u></p>	<p>coordinated manner from an early stage of the project, to minimise impacts on local communities and maximise benefits for the area. The strategy is to coordinate the two separately owned projects as far as possible and includes delivery of the two projects using a common connection route, landfall and substation location.</p> <p>The current regulatory regime for offshore wind development does not currently enable the delivery of an integrated transmission system. It has therefore been necessary for the Applicant to continue to incorporate flexibility within the consent application to enable the further development of SEP and DEP under a range of potential scenarios. Doing so ensures that these Critical National Priority developments will be delivered in a timely manner within the prevailing regulatory regime at the time.</p> <p>It responds to the government’s ambitions by combining two separately owned wind farms into one DCO application.</p> <p>The Applicant’s approach in the DCO application is consistent with the Government’s ambition to deploy offshore wind development as quickly as possible and with the wider policy ambition to deliver this Critical National Priority infrastructure in a coordinated manner.</p> <p>Finally, the National Grid made a grid connection offer in April 2019 for a connection at Norwich Main National Grid Substation that would accommodate both SEP and DEP. The Applicant accepted this offer in May 2019.</p> <p>.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.7 to 3.8.11 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
The critical national priority for	Draft EN-3 3.8.12	<p><u>Applicants for CNP infrastructure must continue to show how their application meets the requirements in EN-1 and this NPS, applying the mitigation hierarchy, as well as any other legal and regulatory requirements.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant has had regard to the mitigation hierarchy. Where the assessment identifies that an aspect of the development is likely to give rise to significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures have been proposed and discussed with the relevant authorities and stakeholders in order to avoid, prevent or reduce impacts to acceptable levels. Mitigation measures</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
offshore wind		<u>Where an applicant has done so and there are residual impacts the following policy will apply.</u>	<p>are detailed in the individual topic chapters of the ES and secured through the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>ES Volume 1 Chapter 2 Policy and Legislative Context [APP-088] sets out the legal and regulatory requirements that are relevant to the impact assessment of the proposed development.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.12 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Secretary of State's approach to non-HRA residual impacts of CNP Infrastructure	Draft EN-3 3.8.13	<u>Where there are residual non-HRA impacts, of any sort other than those that present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health, national defence or navigation, these are unlikely, in all but the most exceptional cases, to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure and are therefore unlikely to result in an application being refused.</u>	<p>The proposed development does not present an unacceptable risk to or unacceptable interference with human health, national defence or navigation as set out in the ES Volume 1 Chapter 13 Shipping Navigation [APP-099], ES Volume 1 Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101], ES Volume 1 Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102], ES Volume 1 Chapter 28 Health [APP-114], ES Appendix 13.1 - Navigation Risk Assessment (NRA) [APP-198], and the Navigational Safety Technical Note [REP3-031]. Therefore, the exceptionality test is not applicable to the proposed development.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.13 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.14	<u>As a result, the Secretary of State will take as the starting point for decision-making that such infrastructure is to be treated as if it has met any test requiring a clear outweighing of harm, exceptionality, or very special circumstances within EN-1, this NPS or any other planning policy.</u>	Please refer to the Applicant's response under paragraph 3.15 of the draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.15	<u>This means that the Secretary of State will take as a starting point that CNP Infrastructure will meet the following, non-exhaustive, list of tests:</u>	<p>The Green Belt test is not relevant to this proposed development because it is not located in or near a Green Belt.</p> <p>SSSI - The onshore cable corridor has the potential to affect a single watercourse designated as a SSSI - the River Wensum. Potential impacts to the River Wensum SSSI are considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 18 Water Resources And Flood Risk [APP-104] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 20</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where development within a Green Belt requires very special circumstances to justify development; • where development within or near a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) requires the benefits (including need) of the development in the location proposed to clearly outweigh the harm; • where development affecting irreplaceable habitats requires the benefits (including need) to clearly outweigh the harm. • Where development is, exceptionally, necessary in coastal change areas, flood risk areas or where an increase in flood risk elsewhere cannot be avoided or mitigated; • where development in nationally designated landscapes requires exceptional circumstances; • and where substantial harm to or loss of significance to heritage assets should be exceptional or wholly exceptional. 	<p>Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026]. The Applicant has committed to cross this designated water body using HDD to minimise the potential for any impacts, and any harm has been neutralised.</p> <p>Irreplaceable habitats – ancient woodland (given as an example of an irreplaceable habitat in the National Planning Policy Framework, no definition is given in draft NPS EN-3) is the only irreplaceable habitat that occurs within the Zone of Influence of the onshore cable route. All ancient woodland has been avoided through the route selection process. Where ancient woodland is close to the Order Limits then buffers to distance construction activities and mitigation measures are secured in the OCoCP (Revision E) [document reference 9.17] and the OEMP (Revision C) [REP3-068].</p> <p>Coastal Change, Flood Risks and Climate Change – an allowance for predicted coastal erosion was included in the design for SEP and DEP. The assessment presented in ES Volume 1 Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104], the Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-097] and the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [document reference 14.34], which confirmed that the project would not be vulnerable to flooding, coastal changes or climate change. Furthermore, the project infrastructure would not prevent or change the operation of natural erosion processes, as driven by wave action and subaerial processes.</p> <p>The potential impacts associated with flood risk are considered in ES Volume 1 Chapter 18 Water Resources and Flood Risk [APP-104] and within ES Appendix 18.2 Flood Risk Assessment [APP-209], the Addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-096], and the Onshore Substation Hydraulic Modelling Report (Revision C) [document reference 14.34] submitted as part of the application.</p> <p>Nationally Designated Landscape – ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] and the Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] demonstrate the process of identifying the routing and site selection between the landfall and Norwich</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>Main Sub Station. The onshore cabling route crosses the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NCAONB) but avoids sensitive features including settlements, landscape and designated nature conservation sites and designated landscapes such as the North Norfolk Heritage Coast (NNHC).</p> <p>Heritage – 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 AEZ. 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 6.1.14, secured by Requirement 18 of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1], ES Volume 1 Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 21 Onshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-107], Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Onshore) (Revision C) [REP2-031], and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-298].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.15 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
<p><u>Secretary of State's approach to HRA derogations for CNPs</u></p>	<p>Draft EN-3 3.16</p>	<p><u>Any HRA residual impacts will continue to be considered under the framework set out in the Habitats Regulations.</u></p>	<p>The Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) [APP-059] concludes that an adverse effect on site integrity cannot be ruled out for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the kittiwake feature of the Flamborough and Filey Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) due to in-combination collision risk impacts; and the Sandwich tern feature of the North Norfolk Coast SPA and Greater Wash SPA due to in-combination collision impacts. <p>For all other sites and features assessed in the RIAA, a conclusion of no adverse effect on site integrity is reached.</p> <p>A derogation case has also been provided with respect to the guillemot and razorbill features of the Flamborough and Filey Coast SPA, although the RIAA concludes no adverse effect on integrity for these features. These additional features and their compensatory measures have been provided on a without prejudice basis.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>An explanation of how the projects meet the Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI) test is set out in Section 5 and Compensatory Measures are set out in Section 6 of the Habitats Regulations Derogation: Provision of Evidence [APP-063].</p> <p>The Applicant has given early and detailed consideration to the requirement for compensatory measures and has consulted with a range of stakeholders at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process. A detailed record of engagement is provided within Annex 1D: Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068], the Consultation Report [APP-029] and its supporting appendices, namely the Consultation Report – Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting minutes and agreement logs.</p> <p>Annex 1D: Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068] should be referred to for a more detailed account of all consultation undertaken in relation to the development of compensatory measures pre-application, as updated through examination in HRA Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision C) [REP6-009].</p> <p>The compensatory measures are found in a suite of documents in (as updated through examination): Appendix 1 – Compensatory Measures Overview [APP-064]; Appendix 2 – Sandwich Tern Compensation Document (Revision B) [document reference 5.5.2]; Appendix 3 - Kittiwake Compensation Document [APP-072]; Appendix 4 - Guillemot and Razorbill Compensation Document (Revision D) [document reference 5.5.4], Appendix 5 Derogation Funding Statement (Habitats Regulations and Marine and Coastal Access Act) [APP-076], and the HRA Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision C) [REP6-009].</p> <p>This approach is in accordance with the draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1), and the draft National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (NPS EN-3).</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP is considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.16 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
	Draft EN-3 3.17	<u>Where, following Appropriate Assessment, CNP Infrastructure has residual adverse impacts on the integrity of sites forming part of the UK national site network, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, the Secretary of State will consider making a derogation under the Habitats Regulations.</u>	The Applicant is making a derogation case, please refer to the response under paragraph 3.16 of the draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.18	<p><u>In doing so, the Secretary of State will consider the particular circumstances of any application, but start from the position that energy security and decarbonising the power sector to combat climate change:</u></p> <p><u>requires a significant number of deliverable locations for CNP Infrastructure and for each location to maximise its capacity. There are no limits to how many such locations may be required. Therefore, the existence of another deliverable location to meet the need for CNP Infrastructure should not be treated as an alternative solution.</u></p> <p><u>Further, the existence of another way of developing the proposed site which results in a significantly lower generation capacity should not be treated as an alternative solution;</u></p> <p><u>and are capable of amounting to imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI) for CNP Infrastructure, which relate to human health, public safety, and/or beneficial consequences of primary importance to the environment.</u></p>	<p>The SEP and DEP sites were selected following the lease agreement with The Crown Estate. The Applicant does not control other deliverable locations for wind farms.</p> <p>Section 4 “Assessment of Alternative Solutions” of the Habitats Regulations Derogation Provision of Evidence [APP-064] demonstrates that there are no alternative solutions which could deliver the project objectives, including the level of generating capacity, in accordance with the need for SEP and DEP. The consideration of another deliverable location or another way of developing the proposed site is not applicable.</p> <p>Section 5 of the Habitats Regulations Derogation Provision of Evidence [APP-063] demonstrates that SEP and DEP meet the necessary statutory IROPI test.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.18 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
	Draft EN-3 3.19	<p><u>Where an applicant has shown there are no alternative solutions, and that there are IROPI, compensatory measures must be secured to offset the adverse effects to site integrity as part of a derogation.</u></p>	<p>The Habitats Regulations Derogation Provision Evidence [APP-063] provides the Applicant’s submission demonstrating there are no alternative solutions and that IROPI apply.</p> <p>The Applicant has given early and detailed consideration to the requirement for compensatory measures and has consulted with a range of stakeholders at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process. A detailed record of engagement is provided within Annex 1D: Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068], the Consultation Report [APP-029] and its supporting appendices, namely the Consultation Report – Evidence Plan [APP-030] including Expert Topic Group meeting minutes and agreement logs.</p> <p>Annex 1D: Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068] and the Habitats Regulations Assessment Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision C) [REP6-009] should be referred to for a more detailed account of all consultation that has been undertaken in relation to the development of compensatory measures.</p> <p>The Strategic and Collaborative Approaches to Compensation and Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) [APP-084] outlines the Applicant’s proposed approach and commitment to strategic and collaborative compensation.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided wording to be included in the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] and Proposed Without Prejudice DCO Drafting (Revision C) [document reference REP5-008] which would secure the proposed compensatory measures if such measures are deemed necessary by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.19 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.20	<p><u>Government will table amendments to the Energy Bill to establish a process of statutory strategic compensation in the offshore environment, including all offshore wind and transmission infrastructure. Further details on</u></p>	<p>The Applicant recognises emerging policy for more collaborative and/or strategic delivery of compensation, the Applicant has also considered strategic and collaborative delivery models alongside project-led delivery of compensation.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		compensation are provided in Section 5.4 of EN-1 and paragraphs 2.8.282-2.8.300 below.	<p>At the strategic level, the Applicant is engaged in the Offshore Wind Industry Council (OWIC) Derogation Subgroup which is seeking to support industry in working towards strategic compensation delivery. This is taking place in parallel with the SEP and DEP consenting process and, where possible, the Applicant has attempted to align its compensatory proposals with emerging developments at the industry level.</p> <p>Further information related to measures proposed on a collaborative and/or strategic basis is provided in the Strategic and Collaborative Approaches to Compensation and Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) [APP-084], which outlines the Applicant’s proposed approach and commitment to strategic and collaborative compensation. The HRA Derogation and Compensatory Measures Update (Revision C) [REP6-009] sets out the stakeholder consultation undertaken in relation to the derogation case with respect to the sites, features and/or effects being considered; predicted impacts and potential scale of compensation required.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.20 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental Assessment	Draft 3.24 EN-3	In proposing sites for offshore wind, NSIP applicants should demonstrate that their choice of site takes into account the government’s Offshore Energy SEA 4 and any successors to it.	<p>The UK Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental Assessment (OESEA) has not yet concluded. The Government response to OESEA4 public consultation was published in September 2022. However, the relevant strategic environmental assessment for the SEP & DEP windfarm extensions was carried out by The Crown Estate. The Crown Estate completed the Offshore Wind Extension Plan-level HRA to assess the potential implications of the 2017 Offshore Wind Extensions Plan, as required under the Habitats Regulations. The record of Appropriate Assessment sets out the key issues considered by The Crown Estate in its role as competent authority, and its conclusions and decision in adopting the 2017 Offshore Wind Extensions Plan.</p> <p>ju.</p> <p>The more detailed offshore site selection process for SEP and DEP took into account and was based on the conclusions of The Crown Estate (2019) Offshore Wind Extensions Plan-level, HRA, and is fully set out in the Offshore Design Statement [APP-312].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with any applicable parts of paragraph 3.24 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.
Marine Planning	Draft EN-3 3.8.28	The cross-Government Marine Spatial Prioritisation Programme will review how marine plans, the wider planning regime, legislation and guidance may need to evolve to ensure a more holistic approach to the use of the seas, and that this is taken to maximise co-existence/co-location possibilities.	<p>Considerations of other marine activities are in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], ES Volume 1 Chapter 13 Shipping Navigation [APP-099], ES Volume 1 Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102]. ES Volume 1 Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098] and the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-existence Plan (Revision B) [document reference 9.8] set out strategies for co-location with commercial fisheries.</p> <p>The proposed development would not compromise other marine users to undertake their activities. The Applicant has also considered the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans when preparing the DCO application. The proposed development complies with all marine plan policies as set out in the Marine Plan Policy Review [REP1-060].</p> <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.28 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.29	The Crown Estate issues leases for offshore wind farms in tendering rounds. Applicants must obtain a lease prior to placing an offshore wind structures on, or passing cables over, the seabed and its foreshore.	See the response under paragraph 3.3.12 of the draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.8.24	Where an assessment concludes that there will still be an adverse impact, a case for derogation can be considered. This must meet strict legal tests, which includes identifying compensatory measures.	See the response under paragraph 2.24.12 of draft EN-3.
Other offshore infrastructure	Draft EN-3 & 3.8.54 3.8.58	There may be constraints imposed on the siting or design of offshore wind farms because of the presence of other offshore infrastructure, such as co-existence/co-	The application followed a detailed site selection process to minimise interactions of SEP/DEP with existing activities. For offshore development, existing activities include dredging, oil and gas platforms, nature conservation designations, commercial fisheries and civil/military and coverage and

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
<p><u>re_____ and activities</u></p>		<p><u>location, oil and gas, Carbon Capture, Usage and Storage (CCUS), co-location of electrolyzers for hydrogen production, marine aggregate dredging, telecommunications, or activities, such as aviation and recreation.</u></p> <p><u>Applicants are encouraged to work collaboratively with those other developers and sea users on co-existence/co-location opportunities, shared mitigation, compensation and monitoring where appropriate.</u> Where applicable, the creation of statements of common ground between developers is recommended. <u>Work is ongoing between government and industry to support effective collaboration and find solutions to facilitate to greater co-existence/co-location.</u></p>	<p>helicopter main routes. The proposed mitigations to minimise any remaining potential impacts are set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101], and ES Volume 1 Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102].</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans which identify defined areas for potential carbon dioxide storage and areas for aggregate dredging. The proposed development does not overlap with these designated areas, The Applicant has also considered the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans when preparing the DCO application. The proposed development complies with all marine plan policies as set out in the Marine Plan Policy Review [REP1-060].</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with all relevant third parties who may interact with the offshore works and mitigation has been identified where appropriate to maximise the opportunity for coexistence.</p> <p>Further information is found in, inter alia, the Consultation Report [APP-029]; ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089]; and Final SoCG with the Ministry of Defence Revision B [document reference 12.27].</p> <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.260 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	<p>Draft EN-3 3.64</p>	<p><u>The British Energy Security Strategy has committed to introducing mechanisms to support strategic compensatory measures, including for projects already in the consenting process (where possible), to offset environmental impacts and reduce delays to individual projects. Only once</u> all feasible alternatives and mitigation measures have been employed, <u>should</u> applicants explore possible compensatory measures to make good any <u>remaining significant</u> adverse effects <u>to</u> site integrity.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response under paragraph 3.20 of the draft EN-3.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
	Draft EN-3 3.8.66	<u>Applicants will also be able to facilitate delivery of strategic compensation measures where appropriate.</u>	Please refer to the response under paragraph 3.64 of the draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.8.78	<u>Applicants are expected to demonstrate compliance with mitigation measures identified by The Crown Estate in any plan-level HRA produced as part of its leasing rounds and with any future statutory requirements, guidance or mitigation measures developed to deliver the commitments in the British Energy Security Strategy, including on Offshore Wind Environmental Standards.</u>	<p>Through the site selection process set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], the proposed development avoids sensitive and designated areas and receptors as much as possible. The Applicant has referred The Crown Estate’s report titled “Plan-Level Habitats Regulations Assessment for the 2017 Offshore Wind Farm Extensions, Cable Route Protocol” (TCE, 2019) when preparing the RIAA.</p> <p>The Environment Statement has been developed with a full understanding of the potential impacts of the proposed development on the environment. The proposed development incorporates mitigation measures embedded in the design, in addition to avoidance and reduction.</p> <p>The Report to Inform Appropriate Assessment (RIAA) [APP-059] and ES – Schedule of Mitigation and Mitigation Routemap [APP-282] set out a range of mitigation measures per topic.</p> <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.78 of the draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.100	<u>Where appropriate, applicants are also encouraged to consider monitoring collaboratively with other developers and sea users. Work is ongoing between government and industry to support effective collaboration.</u>	<p>SEP and DEP are separately owned wind farms in one DCO application. The Applicant seeks to coordinate the development of SEP and DEP as far as possible. This includes taking a coordinated approach to post-construction monitoring.</p> <p>The Applicant is supportive of appropriate strategic monitoring studies. Where the Applicant is made aware of new strategic monitoring studies and they are aligned with the Applicant’s business goals, they will discuss with the relevant authorities if they are appropriate to discharging specific SEP and DEP DML conditions. Details of the monitoring plans are set out in the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (Revision C) [document reference 9.5].</p> <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.100 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
Offshore wind environmental standards	Draft EN-3 3.8.103 to 3.8.106	<p>As part of the Offshore Wind Environmental Improvement Package set out in the British Energy Security Strategy, Government committed to establishing Offshore Wind Environmental Standards (previously referred to as Nature Based Design Standards) to accelerate deployment whilst enhancing the marine environment.</p> <p>In 2023 Defra will consult on guidance setting out Offshore Wind Environmental Standards applicable to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning of offshore wind farms.</p> <p>Once the final guidance setting out Offshore Wind Environmental Standards applicable to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning of offshore wind farms is issued, the Secretary of State will expect applicants to have applied the guidance to their proposals.</p> <p>Applicants should explain how their proposals comply with the guidance and support its targets or, alternatively, the grounds on which a departure from them is justified.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that Offshore Wind Environmental Standards (OWES) is an emerging standard that will be applicable to offshore wind farms but at the time of writing the relevant guidance has not yet been published.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement contains a full assessment of the proposed development's impacts on the environment. A range of mitigation measures have been embedded in the design of SEP and DEP. These mitigation measures include proactive measures to reduce the impact of deployment e.g., micrositing of cable routes to avoid vulnerable habitats, alternative piling or trenching techniques, noise abatement technology, collision avoidance methods, or compensation for habitat loss. These mitigation measures limit residual effects to be not significant.</p> <p>The proposed development cannot comply with OWES because the final guidance is yet to be published.</p> <p>As such paragraphs 3.8.103 to 3.8.106 of the draft EN-3 are not yet relevant to SEP and DEP but the proposed development applies best practice and net gain in environmental standards in sympathy with the aims of the proposed OWES insofar as these are known.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.116 and 3.8.117	<p>Applicants need to consider environmental and biodiversity net gain and should assess the potential of their proposed development to have net positive effects on marine ecology and biodiversity, as well as negative effects.</p>	<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 in Appendix 20.6 Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-048] and Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306]. The assessment identified minor net losses to Habitat Units and River Units with minor net gains to Hedgerow Units. Opportunities include replacing removed</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>habitats with higher distinctiveness, for example, neutral grassland in lieu of modified grassland, although these will require agreement with landowners.</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 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. This is set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096].</p> <p>Further information is found in Paragraphs 667 to 670 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096] and In-Principle CSCB MCZ MEEB Plan (Revision C) [REP2-020].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.116 and 3.8.117 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.119	In developing proposals applicants must refer to the best practice advice provided by the Offshore Wind Enabling Action Programme	Please see the response under paragraph 3.8.121 of the draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.8.121	A range of research programmes are ongoing to investigate impacts of offshore wind farm development, including, but not limited to: BEIS SEA Research Programme, ORJIP, ScotMER, the ORE Catapult and OWEC. Applicants should explain why their decisions on siting, design, and impact mitigation are proportionate and well-targeted, referring to relevant scientific research and literature.	<p>The site selection process has been informed by Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and by specialists, comprising of engineers, planners, land advisors, legal and environmental consultants whose expertise was drawn upon throughout the process.</p> <p>The Applicant has also engaged with a number of stakeholders on site selection matters. ETGs have been established to enable detailed discussions on particular EIA topics and their mitigation measures. Details of the technical consultation undertaken are presented in the Consultation Report [APP-029].</p> <p>More detail with regard to site selection can be found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089]. The Applicant notes that the output of some of the research programmes listed has not yet</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>been finalised. However, where such output was available at the time of writing of the ES, the Applicant considered this and took those findings into account, as reflected within the relevant chapters of the ES and the RIAA.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.121 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.123	<p>Applicants should have regard to Good Environmental Status (GES) under the UK Marine Strategy.</p>	<p>The UK Marine Strategy sets objectives, targets and indicators for achieving the Good Environmental Status (GES) of marine waters. There are 11 qualitative indicators to assess the progress against GES: – Biological diversity (cetaceans, seals, birds, fish, pelagic habitats and benthic habitats), non-indigenous species, commercially exploited fish and shellfish, food webs (cetaceans, seals, birds, fish and pelagic habitats), Eutrophication, sea-floor integrity, hydrographical conditions, contaminants, contaminants in fish and other seafood for human consumption, litter and introduction of energy including noise.</p> <p>The ES has assessed the cumulative impacts affecting the ecosystem and with other offshore windfarms in the region. Where appropriate, mitigation measures have been included in the application. Further information is found in ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.123 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.124	<p>The British Energy Security Strategy commits to reviewing the Habitats Regulation Assessment process for offshore wind farm developments and powers have been sought through the Energy Bill to implement this through secondary legislation. Further guidance will be published as a separate document setting out what information assessments must contain. Once final</p>	<p>The Applicant is aware of emerging changes to the Habitats Regulations Assessment process. The HRA process in this DCO Application is carried out in a sequential manner by the Planning Inspectorate, acting on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) (the competent authority) and follows the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 10 (Planning Inspectorate, 2017).</p> <p>The proposed development cannot comply with guidance not yet published.</p> <p>As such paragraph 3.8.124 of the draft EN-3 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<u>guidance is published applicants will be expected to comply.</u>	
	Draft EN-3 3.8.126	Applicant <u>assessments are expected to include predictions of the physical effects arising from modifications to hydrodynamics (waves and tides), sediments and sediment transport, and seabed morphology</u> that will result from the construction, operation <u>and decommissioning</u> of the required infrastructure.	<p>Predictions of the physical effects arising from modifications to hydrodynamics (waves and tides), sediments and sediment transport, and seabed morphology have been considered within ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes [APP-092] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093]. The associated indirect effects on other receptors are addressed throughout the ES, in particular ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096], ES Volume 1 Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.126 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Fish	Draft EN-3 3.8.133	<u>Applicant assessments</u> should identify <u>the potential implications of underwater noise from construction and unexploded ordnance including, where possible, implications of predicted construction and soft start noise levels in relation to mortality, permanent threshold shift (PTS), temporary threshold shift (TTS) and disturbance and addressing both sound pressure and particle motion) and EMF on sensitive fish species.</u>	<p>Offshore work would be twenty-four hours per day to reduce the overall period for potential impacts to fish communities and marine mammals. 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 allows mobile species to move away from the construction site before the maximum hammer energy with the greatest noise impact area is reached. The Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) (Revision B) [REP1-013] details how the Applicant would reduce the risk of underwater noise of UXO clearance and piling from causing auditory injury to marine mammals that could be present in and around the SEP and DEP offshore sites.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.133 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.138	Applicant assessment of the effects of installing cable across the intertidal/ <u>coastal zone should demonstrate compliance with mitigation measures identified by</u> The Crown Estate <u>in any plan-level HRA produced as part</u>	<p>The Applicant is committing to long Horizontal directional drilling (HDD) at the landfall location at the early stage of the project to avoid any effects on the intertidal environmental. The HDD would completely avoid the subtidal outcropping chalk MCZ feature at Weybourne landfall. The Weybourne landfall also avoids the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and any interaction</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<p>of its leasing round and include information: alternative landfall sites, alternative cable installation methods, loss of habitat, increased suspended sediment loads, and predicted rates of recovery in the intertidal zone.</p>	<p>with National Nature Reserves (NNR) along the Norfolk coast (e.g Mundesley Cliffs SSSI and Paston Great Barn NNR).</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the evidence base set out in The Crown Estate's publications when preparing ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes [APP-092], ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], the Interim Cable Burial Study [APP-292], the Export Cable Burial Risk Assessment [APP-293] and Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7]. The referred The Crown Estate documents are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Crown Estate, 2019, Plan-Level Habitats Regulations Assessment for the 2017 Offshore Wind Farm Extensions, Cable Route Protocol (TCE, 2019) and Offshore Wind Farm Extensions, Cable Route Protocol (TCE, 2019). • The Crown Estate/RPS (2019). Review of Cable Installation, Protection, Mitigation and Habitat Recoverability. <p>ES Appendix 3.2 - Cable Landfall Concept Study [APP-176] details the feasibility of having a landfall at Weybourne and assesses an alternative landfall location.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.138 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Birds	Draft EN-3 3.8.154	<p>Applicants are encouraged to make appropriate applications for amendments to development consent to secure reduced parameters and ornithological impacts.</p>	<p>Table 4.5 "Offshore Scheme Summary" of ES Volume Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021] sets out the maximum amount of development. Table 4.10 of [REP5-021] sets out the minimum and maximum Key Wind Turbine Parameters.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with the applicable parts of paragraph 3.8.154 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Subtidal habitats and species	Draft EN-3 3.8.166	<p>Applicant assessment of the effects on the subtidal environment include:</p>	<p>The effects of the proposed development on the subtidal environmental are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes [APP-092], ES Volume 1 Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093], ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of habitat due to foundation type including associated seabed preparation, predicted scour, scour protection and altered sedimentary processes <u>e.g. sandwave/boulder/UXO clearance</u>; • environmental appraisal of inter-array and export cable routes and installation/maintenance methods, including predicted loss of habitat due to predicted scour and scour <u>cable protection and sandwave/boulder/UXO clearance</u>; • habitat disturbance from construction and maintenance/repair vessels' <u>extendable legs and anchors</u>; • increased suspended sediment loads during construction and from maintenance/repairs; • predicted rates at which the subtidal zone might recover from temporary effects; • protected sites • <u>potential for invasive/non-native species introduction</u>. 	<p>[APP-094], and ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], Stage 1 CSCB MCZA Revision B [document reference 5.6] and the RIAA [APP-059]. The Draft Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (MMMP) (Revision B) [REP1-013] details how the Applicant would reduce the risk of underwater noise of UXO clearance and piling from causing auditory injury to marine mammals that could be present in and around the SEP and DEP offshore sites.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.166 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
<p><u>Commercial</u> fisheries and fishing</p>	<p>Draft EN-3 3.8.171, 3.8.173 and 3.8.175</p>	<p><u>In some circumstances, applicants may seek declaration of safety zones around wind turbines and other infrastructure. Although these might not be applied until after consent to the wind farm has been granted.</u></p>	<p>Safety zones are expected to be applied for and are detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [document reference REP5-021] and included as embedded mitigation within the NRA [APP-198] and Section 13.3 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099], and Navigational Safety Technical Note [REP3-031].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.171, 3.8.173 and 3.8.175 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.
<u>Marine historic environment</u>	Draft EN-3 3.8.188 to 190	<p><u>Applicants are required to determine how any known heritage assets might best be avoided.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant will be expected to conduct all necessary examination and assessment exercises using a variety of survey techniques to plan the development so as to optimise opportunities for avoidance.</u></p> <p><u>Once a site has been chosen, it may be necessary to undertake further archaeological assessment, including field evaluation, to identify as yet unknown heritage assets when considering the options for detailed site development, which may also include ancillary matters</u></p>	Please refer the responses under paragraphs 3.3.8, 3.8.270, 3.8.272, 3.8.237 and 3.8.274 of the draft EN-3.
<u>navigation and shipping</u>	Draft EN-3 3.8.198	<p><u>There may be some situations where reorganisation of traffic activity might be both possible and desirable when considered against the benefits of the wind farm application and such circumstances should be discussed with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA), Government, Trinity House, and the commercial shipping sector.</u></p>	<p>There are no International Maritime Organization (IMO) routing measures in proximity to the wind farm sites or the offshore export cable corridor. The nearest is approximately 30nm north west of the wind farm sites. Main routes are identified in Section 13.5 and 6.1.13.1 ES Volume 1 Appendix 13.1 of Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-198]. The proposed development does not propose to reorganise marine traffic.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.198 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.200	<p><u>Engagement should seek solutions that allow offshore wind farms to successfully co-exist with navigation and shipping uses of the sea.</u></p>	Consultation with stakeholders including national and local stakeholders and regular operators seeking solutions that allow offshore wind farms to successfully co-exist with navigation and shipping uses has been undertaken by The Applicant. Consultation responses received to date are shown in Table 13-1 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 13 Shipping and Navigation [APP-099] including in the process of developing the NRA [APP-198]. The Applicant has engaged with MCA post acceptance, including three Statement of Common

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>Ground (SoCG) meetings on 10 January 2023, 14 February 2023 and 26 April 2023 and a series of ongoing meetings is underway. Table 3.1 in the Navigation Safety Technical Note [REP3-031] summaries the key consultation activities that have taken place to date with the MCA and that engagement remains ongoing. Consultation will continue throughout the life of the development and in line with the relevant guidance.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.200 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.206	<u>In some circumstances, applicants may seek declaration of a safety zone around wind turbines and other infrastructure. Although these might not be applied until after consent to the wind farm has been granted.</u>	Please refer to the response under paragraphs 3.8.171, 3.8.173 and 3.8.175 of the draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.8.210	<u>Should consent for the offshore wind farm be granted, applicants should undertake a detailed Search and Rescue Response Assessment prior to commencement of construction. This assessment could be secured by a requirement to any consent.</u>	<p>The layout and Search and Rescue (SAR) requirements will be agreed with the MCA (as per Marine Guidance Note (MGN) 654 with consideration as to the Design Commitments) and MMO post consent.</p> <p>Conditions of the DCO/DML include the completion of a Search and Rescue Checklist to ensure all elements of MGN 654 have been effectively addressed. Further information is found in the NRA [APP-198].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.210 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.259	<u>Construction vessels and post-construction maintenance vessel traffic associated with offshore wind farms should, where practicable and compatible with operational requirements and navigational safety, avoid rafting seabirds during sensitive periods and follow agreed navigation routes to and from the site and minimise the number of vessel movements overall.</u>	<p>The Navigation Management Plan (NMP) will be developed post consent to mitigate impacts associated with crew transfer vessels during construction and operation of SEP and DEP. The NMP will disseminate information to recreational clubs about construction details and project vessel movements. The NMP is secured by condition 13 of Schedules 10 and 11 and condition 12 of Schedules 12 and 13 of the draft DCO (Revision JH) [document reference 3.1]) The NMP will be implemented to reduce all potential impacts to acceptable or tolerable risk levels as low as reasonably practicable. Further information is found in Section 13.6 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 13 Shipping</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>and Navigation [APP-099], the NRA [APP-198] and the Navigation Safety Technical Note [REP3-031].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.259 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Seascape and visual effects	Draft EN-3 3.8.222 to 3.8.224	<p><u>Seascape is a discrete area, with views of the coast or seas, and coasts and the adjacent marine environment with cultural, historical and archaeological links with each other.</u></p> <p><u>Applicants should follow relevant guidance including, but not limited to seascape character assessments and marine plan seascape character assessments (e.g., NRW Marine Character Areas (with associated guidance) England's marine plans).</u></p> <p><u>Where a proposed offshore wind farm will be visible from the shore and would be within the setting of a nationally designated landscape with potential effects on the area's statutory purpose, a seascape, landscape and visual impact assessment (SLVIA) should be undertaken in accordance with the relevant offshore wind farm EIA policy and the latest Offshore Energy SEA, including the White 2020 report. The SLVIA should be proportionate to the scale of the potential impacts. This will always be the case where a coastal National Park, the Broads or AONB, or a Heritage Coast or their setting is potentially affected.</u></p>	<p>Through the site selection process set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], the proposed development avoids sensitive and designated areas as much as possible.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared ES Volume 1 Chapter 25 Seascape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-111] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-112]. The assessment method draws upon the established Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition (Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA), 2013); An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment (Natural England, 2014); and Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of development proposals (Landscape Institute, 2019), and other recognised guidelines.</p> <p>SEP and/or DEP would be visible from the sea and the Norfolk coast, seen in the context of existing wind farms at Inner Dowsing, Lincs, Lynn, Race Bank, Triton Knoll, Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm (SOW) and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm (DOW) are already characteristic of the existing seascape character, and of views from and the setting of landscape character areas, the NCAONB and NNHC.</p> <p>The seascape, landscape and visual assessments were prepared with stakeholder's inputs and in accordance with standard methodology and follow the most up to date guidance.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.222 to 3.8.224 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Mitigation	Draft EN-3 3.8.229	<p><u>Applicants must always employ the mitigation hierarchy, in particular to avoid as far as is possible the need to find compensatory</u></p>	<p>The Applicant's position with respect to the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ), based on its ecological assessments, is set out in the Stage 1 CSCB MCZA Revision B [document reference 5.6] which</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<p>measures for coastal, inshore and offshore developments affecting HRA sites and/or MCZs. It is essential that applicants involve SNCBs and Defra as early as possible in the planning process to enable discussions of what is and isn't a significant and/or adverse effect, subsequent implications, and if required, mitigation and/or compensation</p>	<p>concludes that the conservation objectives of the CSCB MCZ will not be hindered by SEP and DEP. However, in response to discussions with the Seabed ETG, the Applicant is providing a derogation case, without prejudice of its position that the conservation objectives of the CSCB MCZ will not be hindered. The Applicant's proposed Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit (MEEB) are set out in Appendix 1 In-Principle CSCB MCZ MEEB Plan (Revision C) [REP2-020].</p> <p>The Applicant has given early and detailed consideration to the requirement for compensatory measures and has consulted with a range of stakeholders at regular intervals throughout the pre-application process. A detailed record of engagement is provided within Annex 1D: Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068], the Consultation Report [APP-029] and its supporting documents including ETG meeting minutes and agreement logs.</p> <p>Annex 1D: Record of HRA Derogation Consultation [APP-068] should be referred to for a more detailed account of all consultation that has been undertaken in relation to the development of compensatory measures.</p> <p>Compensation measures and MEEB are proposed when other options in the mitigation hierarchy are exhausted. The mitigation hierarchy is considered in the RIAA [APP-059] (as updated through examination including Apportioning and Habitats Regulations Assessment Updates Technical Note Revision D [document reference 13.3]) and, with respect to the MCZ, in the Stage 1 CSCB MCZA Revision B [document reference 5.6]. As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.229 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	<p>Draft EN-3 3.8.236</p>	<p>Applicants are advised to develop an ecological monitoring programme to monitor impacts during the pre-construction, construction and operational phases to identify the actual impacts caused by the project and compare them to what was predicted in the EIA/HRA.</p>	<p>The Applicant is supportive of appropriate monitoring studies during the pre-construction, construction and operational phases of the project. Details of the monitoring plans are set out in the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (Revision C) [document reference 9.5]. Appendix A of the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (Revision C) [REP3-068] sets out a list of pre-construction onshore ecological and ornithological surveys.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.236 of the draft EN-3.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
Mitigation for Physical Environment	Draft EN-3 3.8.239	<p><u>Applicants are expected to have considered the best ecological outcomes in terms of potential mitigation. These might include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>avoidance of areas sensitive to physical effects;</u> • <u>consideration of micro-siting of both the array and cables;</u> • <u>alignment and density of the array;</u> • <u>design of foundations;</u> • <u>ensuring that sediment moved is retained as locally as possible;</u> • <u>the burying of cables to a necessary depth;</u> • <u>using scour protection techniques around offshore structures to prevent scour effects or designing turbines to withstand scour, so scour protection is not required or is minimised.</u> 	<p>The ES - Schedule of Mitigation and Mitigation Routemap [APP-282] lists all mitigation measures proposed in the ES individual topic chapters of the ES for SEP and DEP and sets them out on a topic-by-topic basis.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.239 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Mitigation for Intertidal and coastal habitats and species	Draft EN-3 3.8.241- 3.8.248	<p><u>Effects on intertidal/coastal habitat cannot be avoided entirely.</u></p> <p><u>Applicants should undertake a review of up-to-date research and all potential avoidance, reduction and mitigation options presented.</u></p> <p><u>Landfall and cable installation and decommissioning methods should be designed appropriately to minimise effects on</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is committing to long HDD at the landfall location at the early stage of the project to avoid any effects on the intertidal environment. The HDD would completely avoid the subtidal outcropping chalk MCZ feature at Weybourne landfall. The Weybourne landfall also avoids the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and any interaction with National Nature Reserves (NNR) along the Norfolk coast (e.g Mundesley Cliffs SSSI and Paston Great Barn NNR).</p> <p>The landfall area at Weybourne was chosen as the result of a site selection process, considering environmental and technical constraints. The site selection process is described in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection &</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<p><u>intertidal/coastal habitats, taking into account other constraints.</u></p> <p><u>Where applicable, use of horizontal directional drilling techniques (HDD) should be considered as a method to avoid impacts on sensitive habitats and species.</u></p> <p><u>Where HDD is proposed, the Applicant should provide an alternative plan for installing the infrastructure in the event that HDD fails.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant should explain their justification for the alternative plan and ensure this is the least impactful method possible.</u></p> <p><u>Where cumulative effects on intertidal habitats are predicted as a result of the cumulative impact of multiple cable routes, applicants of various schemes are encouraged to work together to ensure that the number of cables crossing the intertidal/coastal zone are minimised and installation and decommissioning phases are coordinated to ensure that disturbance is also reasonably minimised.</u></p>	<p>Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089]. ES Appendix 3.2 - Cable Landfall Concept Study [APP-176] details the feasibility of having a landfall at Weybourne and assesses an alternative landfall location.</p> <p>The Applicant's previous installation campaigns for both SOW and DOW made landfall in proximity to this location and also used HDD to successfully install two export cables per project. As a result, whilst other cable installation projects have needed to consider other construction methodologies at the landfall, for example involving open cut trenching and the creation of cofferdam structures on the beach, these alternative options have been discounted at an early stage for SEP and DEP.</p> <p>One HDD duct will be required for the installation of each of the SEP and DEP export cables. As such, up to two drills will be undertaken for the landfall works. An extra drill per project has been allowed for contingency (i.e. up to four drills in total to install two ducts). Each drill will be launched from a compound inland, drilled under the beach and intertidal area, and will exit out at sea. The landfall construction onshore parameters are set out in Table 4.31 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021].</p> <p>The Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7] provides information on the proposed cable installation methodologies and mitigation that may be adopted to minimise the impact on the CSCB MCZ as far as practicable. The conditions within the draft DMLs of the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1] secure submission and approval of a final CSCB MCZ CSIMP before works commence in the MCZ.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to removal of any external cable protection in the MCZ at decommissioning. The decommissioning program is set out in the ES Appendix 9.7.3 Decommissioning Feasibility Study [APP-294].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.241 to 3.8.248 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
<p><u>Subtidal habitats</u></p>	<p>Draft EN-3 3.8.249,</p>	<p><u>Applicants should design construction, maintenance and decommissioning methods</u></p>	<p>In the early design, the Applicant completely avoids the subtidal outcropping chalk MCZ feature at Weybourne landfall by using HDD. ES Appendix 3.2 -</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
<p>and species</p>	<p>3.8.250 and 3.8.253</p>	<p>appropriately to minimise effects on subtidal habitats, taking into account other constraints and coordinate with onshore transmission.</p> <p>Applicants should undertake a review of up-to-date research and all potential avoidance, reduction and mitigation options presented.</p>	<p>Cable Landfall Concept Study [APP-176] details the feasibility of having a landfall at Weybourne and assesses an alternative landfall location.</p> <p>The effects of the proposed development on the subtidal environment are assessed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes [APP-092], ES Volume 1 Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093], ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], Stage 1 CSCB MCZA Revision B [document reference 5.6] and the RIAA [APP-059].</p> <p>Tables 4, 5 and 6 of the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] set out the proposed monitoring for Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes, Benthic Ecology and Fish Ecology respectively. The Applicant is committed to an adaptive monitoring approach, set out in Section 1.3 of REP4-014, in which all monitoring work should be finalised and agreed with stakeholders following review of the results of any preceding survey/monitoring work.</p> <p>The Applicant will undertake periodic surveys to ensure the export cables remain buried. If they become exposed, reburial works would be undertaken. The Outline Offshore Operations and Maintenance Plan (OOMP) (Revision C) [REP3-058] sets out a schedule of cable inspection works in Annex 1.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to decommission external export cable protection in the MCZ at the end of the project life. (Appendix 9.7.3 - Cable Protection Decommissioning Feasibility [APP-294].)</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.249, 3.8.250 and 3.8.253 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
<p>Marine Mammals</p>	<p>Draft EN-3 3.146, 3.148, 3.8.255 and 3.8. 256</p>	<p>The Applicant should discuss any proposed noisy activities with the relevant statutory body and must reference the joint JNCC and SNCB underwater noise guidance in relation to noisy activities (alone and in-combination with other plans or projects) within HRA sites.</p>	<p>Section 10.6 of 6.1.10 ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096] provides an assessment of the underwater noise levels and maximum impact ranges that could cause injury or disturbance to marine mammals from UXO clearance, piling and other noise sources. The</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<p>in addition to the JNCC mitigation guidelines to piling, explosive use, and geophysical surveys.</p> <p>The Applicant should develop a Site Integrity Plan (SIP) to allow the cumulative impacts of underwater noise to be reviewed closer to the construction date, when there is more certainty in other plans and projects.</p> <p>Where noise impacts cannot be avoided, other mitigation should be considered, including alternative installation methods and noise abatement technology, spatial/temporal restrictions on noisy activities, alternative foundation types.</p> <p>Applicants should undertake a review of up-to-date research and all potential mitigation options presented as part of the application, having consulted the relevant JNCC mitigation guidelines</p>	<p>requirements of the marine mammal surveys were discussed with the relevant SNCBs as part of the Evidence Plan Process (EPP).</p> <p>The Applicant has discussed noisy activities through the EPP as outlined in Section 10.2 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096]. Reference has been made to the Joint Nature and Conservation Committee (JNCC) underwater noise guidance (JNCC et al., 2020) in relation to noisy activities (alone and in-combination with other plans or projects) for the assessment of effects on the SNS SAC in the RIAA [APP-059].</p> <p>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 impact area is reached.</p> <p>The Draft MMMP (Revision B) [REP1-014] has been submitted with the DCO application which details the marine mammal monitoring requirements during piling.</p> <p>Mitigation to reduce the impacts from underwater noise are provided in the Draft MMMP (Revision B) [REP1-013], Marine Mammals Technical Note and Addendum (Revision B) [document reference 16.6] and the In Principle Site Integrity Plan (SIP) for the Southern North Sea (SNC) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) [APP-290]. As outlined in Section 10.3.4.2 of the ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096], these documents and the mitigation measures required will be developed in the pre-construction period and will be based upon best available information and methodologies at that time, in consultation with the relevant SNCBs and MMO.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.146, 3.148, 3.8.255 and 3.8.256 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.260	<p>The exact timing of peak migration events is inherently uncertain, although research is ongoing into estimates for peak migration periods for a number of bird species and</p>	<p>The Applicant has consulted all relevant stakeholders regarding the methodology for estimating migration and bird surveys as set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097]. The Applicant acknowledges that the methodology and detection technologies are constantly</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		detection technologies (e.g. using radar and integrated sensors) are improving.	<p>evolving and will consult with relevant stakeholders during the monitoring phase.</p> <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.260 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft EN-3 3.8.261	Currently, shutting down turbines within migration routes during estimated peak migration periods is unlikely to offer suitable mitigation, but this might be a possibility in the future.	<p>The project designs of SEP and DEP assessed in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) had an air gap of 26m at Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT). This was set at a value greater than the minimum of 22m to reduce the potential collision risk for offshore ornithology receptors. The air gap has been further increased to 30m above HAT in response to consultation feedback, providing further significant reduction of potential collision risk for offshore ornithology receptors. It is considered that increasing the airgap is a suitable mitigation measure which has been accepted by Natural England.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for offshore ornithology have been considered within the SEP and DEP assessment process where relevant (Table 11-4 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097]). Additional risks with regards to migratory movements are further considered within Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) Updates (EIA Context) Technical Note (Revision B) [REP3-089] and assessed in Section 4.12 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097].</p> <p>As such SEP-DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.261 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Fish	Draft EN-3 3.8.262 and 3.8.265	Applicants should undertake a review of up-to-date research and present all potential mitigation options as part of their proposal. It is therefore important to monitor EMF emissions which may provide the evidence to inform future EIAs.	<p>An assessment of potential EMF effects is presented in Appendix 28.1 EMF Assessment [APP-279] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095].</p> <p>Section 9.6.2.8 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095] identifies and assesses potential impacts on fish and shellfish receptors due to EMF during operation. The use of armoured cables and cable burial as mitigation is discussed in Section 9.3.3 of [APP-095].</p> <p>Typical burial depth for SEP and DEP cables, excluding in areas of sand waves, is expected to be between 0.5m to 1.5m (or up to 1m for the export</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>cables), although in challenging ground conditions the required depth of burial may not be achieved. In this event, the installation of external cable protection would be considered. The residual impacts of EMF on fish and shellfish ecology receptors are assessed as minor adverse.</p> <p>Cable burial matters are addressed through the requirement for the construction method statement, as detailed in the DMLs. Further detail on the anticipated cable burial depths, specifically within the CSCB MCZ, is also provided within the CSCB MCZ CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 9.7] which will be updated at the pre-construction stage to include detailed design information and cable burial depths for all offshore cables.</p> <p>EMF impacts on benthic invertebrates was scoped out of the assessment (Table 8-1 of ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094].)</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.262 and 3.8.265 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Marine historic environment	Draft 3.3.8 EN-3	<p><u>In considering the impact on the historic environment as set out in Section 5.9 of EN-1 and whether it is satisfied that the substantial public benefits would outweigh any loss or harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should take into account the positive role that large-scale renewable projects play in the mitigation of climate change, the delivery of energy security and the urgency of meeting the net zero target.</u></p>	<p>All direct impacts to known heritage assets as a result of SEP and DEP are proposed to be avoided and are assessed in ES Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100] and ES Appendix 21.5 Offshore Infrastructure Setting Assessment [APP-239]. As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.3.8 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p> <p>Please refer to the responses under paragraphs 3.8.270 and 3.8.272 to 3.8.274 of the draft EN-3.</p>
	Draft 3.8.270 EN-3	<p><u>The avoidance of important heritage assets to ensure their protection in situ, is the most effective form of protection.</u></p>	<p>The approach to mitigation is to avoid these features via AEZ. 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. Further information is found in the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-298].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.270 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.8.272, and 3.8.273 and 3.8.274	<p><u>These boundaries can be drawn around either discrete sites or more extensive areas identified in the Environmental Statement produced to support an application for consent.</u></p> <p><u>The ability of the applicants to microsite specific elements of the proposed development during the construction phase should be an important consideration by the Secretary of State when assessing the risk of damage to archaeology.</u></p> <p><u>Where requested by the Applicant, the Secretary of State should consider granting consents which allow for micrositing/microrouting within a specified tolerance.</u></p>	<p>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. Further information is found in the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-298].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.272, 3.8.273 and 3.8.274 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Seascape and visual effects	Draft EN-3 3.8.280 and 3.8.281	<u>the siting layout of the turbines should be designed appropriately to minimise harm. The reduction in scale is unlikely to mitigate wind turbines; impact on seascape and visual effects.</u>	<p>The approach the detailed siting of wind turbines and the design principles proposed for SEP and DEP in the offshore environment are fully set out in the Offshore Design Statement [APP-312].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.280 and 3.8.281 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Compensatory measures	Draft EN-3 3.8.282	Compensatory measures may be required where adverse effects on HRA sites and MCZs may not be addressed by avoidance, reduction or mitigation alone.	Please refer to the response under paragraphs 3.16, 3.18 and 3.19 of the draft EN-3.

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
Compensatory measures	Draft EN-3 3.8.284	Applicant should include information as may reasonably be required to assess potential derogations under the Habitats Regulations or the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.	Please refer to the response under paragraphs 3.16, 3.18 and 3.19 of the draft EN-3.
Compensatory measures	Draft EN-3 3.8.285 and 287	<p>This information should include: <u>assessment of alternative solutions, showing the relevant tests on alternatives have been met; a case showing that the relevant tests for IROPI or Measures of Equivalent Environmental Benefit have been met; and appropriate securable environmental compensation.</u></p> <p><u>This information can be provided, 'without prejudice' to the Secretary of State's final decision on the impacts of the potential development.</u></p>	Please refer to the response under paragraphs 3.16, 3.18 and 3.19 of the draft EN-3.
Strategic compensation	Draft EN-3 3.8.294 to 296	<p><u>Strategic compensation refers to environmental actions by/on behalf of government or third parties to offset the impacts of multiple marine developments on the national site network or MCZs.</u></p> <p><u>This may include central coordination for measures delivered across a series of projects or biogeographic region.</u></p> <p><u>Applicants will be able to access tools and mechanisms to support identification of suitable compensation and facilitate delivery of strategic compensation measures where appropriate.</u></p>	Please refer to the response under paragraph 3.20 of the draft EN-3.

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
	Draft EN-3 3.8.297	<u>The government is still developing its policies on strategic compensation and guidance will be published in due course.</u>	The Applicant will monitor the changes in the strategic compensation and guidance. Please refer to the response under paragraph 3.20 of the draft EN-3.
Compensatory measures	Draft EN-3 3.8.300	<u>Applicants may also want to coordinate with other marine industry sectors who also need to find compensatory measures. This will ensure compensatory measures are complementary and/or take advantage of opportunities to join together to deliver strategic compensation. Applicant's may also want to consult with those industries/stakeholders who are affected by any proposed compensation measures.</u>	Please refer to the response under paragraph 3.20 of the draft EN-3.
Water depth and foundation conditions	Draft EN-3 3.8.301	<u>the foundations will not have an unacceptable adverse effect on marine biodiversity, the physical environment or marine heritage assets.</u>	Please refer to the response under paragraph 3.8.166 of the draft EN-3.
Micrositing and microrouting	Draft EN-3 3.8.89, 3.8.92 and 3.8.309	Where <u>the Applicant requests micrositing or microrouting tolerance, and insofar as it is reasonably possible to do so, the Applicant should factor this tolerance into the environmental impact assessment of the development's worst-case scenario.</u> <u>Any consent granted by the Secretary of State should be flexible enough to allow for such micrositing or microrouting changes as may be advised during and after the application stage. This allows for unforeseen events, such as the discovery of previously unknown marine archaeology that it would be preferable to leave in situ.</u>	Through the site selection process set out in ES Volume 1 Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], the proposed development avoids sensitive and designated areas as much as possible. Micro-siting is part of the embedded mitigation measures for onshore and offshore cabling installation. The offshore cable export corridor is up to 100 metres wide, allowing the cables to bypass sensitive features should they be discovered during the pre-construction survey. Similarly, the onshore cable corridor is (with the exception of the crossing of the Food Enterprise Park (FEP)) 60 metres wide and up to 100 metres wide for trenchless crossing zones near the rivers and A road. Further information is in ES Volume 1 Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [document reference 6.1.4] and the OCoCP (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] provides further details on 'zones near the rivers and A roads.'

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
Future monitoring	Draft EN-3 3.8.90, 3.8.91 and 3.8.312	<p><u>the Secretary of State should, where appropriate, request the Applicant undertake environmental monitoring (e.g. ornithological surveys, geomorphological surveys, archaeological surveys) prior to and during construction and operation.</u></p>	<p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.89, 3.8.92 and 3.8.309 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p> <p>The Outline PEMP (Revision C) [REP3-060] outlines the proposed measures to manage the environmental risks associated with the construction and operation of the offshore components of SEP and DEP. A final PEMP will be prepared post-consent detailed design as required under Condition 13 of Schedule 10 and 11 (the Generation Deemed Marine Licences (DMLs)), Condition 12 of Schedules 12 and 13 (the Transmission DMLs) in the draft DCO (Revision J) [document reference 3.1].</p> <p>An Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (Revision C) [document reference 9.5] Revision C [document reference 9.5] and ES Schedule of Mitigation and Mitigation Routemap [APP-282] are provided with the DCO application, outlining the approach to monitoring and mitigation for SEP and DEP based on the outcomes of the offshore impact assessments detailed in ES Volume 1 Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Process [APP-092], ES Volume 1 Chapter 7 Marine Water and Sediment Quality [APP-093], ES Volume 1 Chapter 8 Benthic Ecology [APP-094], ES Volume 1 Chapter 9 Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-095], ES Volume 1 Chapter 10 Marine Mammal Ecology [APP-096], ES Volume 1 Chapter 11 Offshore Ornithology [APP-097], ES Volume 1 Chapter 12 Commercial Fisheries [APP-098], ES Volume 1 Chapter 13 Shipping Navigation [APP-099], ES Volume 1 Chapter 14 Offshore Archaeology and Cultural Heritage [APP-100], ES Volume 1 Chapter 15 Aviation and Radar [APP-101] and ES Volume 1 Chapter 16 Petroleum Industry and Other Marine Users [APP-102].</p> <p>Appendix A of the OEMP (Revision D) [document reference 9.19] sets out a list of pre-construction onshore ecological and ornithological surveys.</p> <p>Before construction, there will be a full seabed coverage swath bathymetric, Multibeam Echosounder (MBES) and Side-Scan Sonar (SSS) surveys of the area(s) within the Order Limits in which it is proposed to carry out construction works, including a 500m buffer area around the site of each works. There will</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
			<p>be post construction survey for assessing the structural integrity, sand wave recovery/migration and sediment mounds in shallow areas (see Table 3 of the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan (IPMP) (Revision C) [document reference 9.5].</p> <p>Archaeological Surveys – 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, set out in the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Offshore) [APP-298]. The Applicant has committed to completing a specific WSI post-consent in consultation with Historic England..</p> <p>The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (Onshore) (Revision C) [REP2-032] sets out the proposed approaches and commitments to archaeological survey and investigation to be undertaken post-consent. This includes both initial informative survey stages of mitigation work and subsequent additional mitigation measures, where required. As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraphs 3.8.90, 3.8.91 and 3.8.312 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>
Offshore wind environmental standards	Draft EN-3 3.8.315 & 317	<p><u>Once final guidance setting out Offshore Wind Environmental Standards is issued, the Secretary of State should expect applicants to have applied the guidance to their proposals. Whether an application conforms to the guidance or targets (or any justification for departing from them) is likely to be material to the decision on development consent and, where relevant, will inform the Secretary of State's Habitats Regulations Assessment.</u></p>	Please see the response under paragraphs 3.8.103 to 106 of the draft EN-3.
	Draft EN-3 3.8.328	<p><u>The use of external cable protection has been suggested as a mitigation for EMF (by increasing the distance between fish species and individual cables). However, the Secretary of State should also consider any</u></p>	An assessment of the potential impacts of the installation and maintenance of cable infrastructure (including consideration of the potential impact of cable protection measures) is undertaken for the relevant construction and operation impacts in ([APP-077] Stage 1 CSCB MCZA Revision B) [document document reference 5.6], Section 6.6.4 and 6.6.5 of 6.1.6 ES Volume 1

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-3	Applicant Response
		<p><u>negative impacts from external cable protection on benthic habitats, and a balance between protection of various receptors must be made, with all mitigation and alternatives reviewed.</u></p>	<p>Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Processes [APP-092], the Cable Statement [APP-283], the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP (Revision B) [document reference 5.6], The Interim Cable Burial Study [APP-292] and the Export Cable Burial Risk Assessment [APP-293].</p> <p>The Applicant will make reasonable endeavours to bury offshore cables, minimising the requirement for external cable protection measures and thus minimising habitat loss impacts on benthic ecology receptors.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation includes minimising external cable protection measures and effects on sediment transport. Use of external cable protection would be potentially used in the nearshore at the HDD exit point.</p> <p>The proposed development has balanced the practicality of using external cable protection with the technical feasibility of burying cables and protecting the environment.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered to be in accordance with paragraph 3.8.328 of the March 2023 draft EN-3.</p>

1.3 Draft NPS EN-5

- 14 As set out within paragraph 1.1.8 of the March 2023 draft EN-5, “*the NPS, taken together with the Overarching NPS for Energy (EN-1), provides the primary policy for decisions taken by the Secretary of State on applications it receives for electricity networks infrastructure*”.
- 15 **Table 3** lists the draft policies within the March 2023 EN-5 that are relevant to the Development Consent Order application and assesses the proposals against each.

Table 3 The Applicant’s Response to Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
	Draft EN-5 1.1.4	<p><u>Offshore wind development, and the supporting onshore and offshore transmission infrastructure and related network reinforcements, are viewed by the government as being a critical national priority [CNP] and should be progressed as quickly as possible.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that the proposed development, an offshore wind farm and associated offshore and onshore infrastructure, meets the definition of a Critical National Priority (CNP). Whilst the Applicant understands that the timing and final wording of the draft NPSs is currently unknown, the Secretary of State (SoS) may take into account this CNP as an “important and relevant matter” in its decision making on the DCO application for SEP and DEP in accordance with section 104(2)(d) of the Planning Act 2008. The introduction of draft policy on offshore wind as a CNP also lends even greater emphasis to current national policy that there is urgent need for renewable electricity NSIPs, established in section 3.3 of the extant NPS EN-1.</p> <p>Each of SEP and DEP would make a meaningful contribution to the UK’s offshore wind and decarbonization targets and, as such, each project is a Critical National Priority.</p> <p>As set out in the Project Vision [APP-313], the Applicant took a strategic decision to develop SEP and DEP in a coordinated manner from an early stage of the project, to minimise impacts on local communities and maximise benefits for the area. It was clear to the Applicant from the outset that the most preferable development of SEP and DEP would be to coordinate the two projects, with an integrated transmission system scenario also being preferable from a technical and economic perspective. The projects were subsequently selected as a Pathfinder project in coordinated offshore transmission development under the UK Government’s Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR).</p> <p>The strategy is to coordinate the two separately owned projects as far as possible and includes delivery of the two projects using the same integrated connection route, landfall and substation location.</p> <p>The regulatory regime for offshore wind development does not currently enable the delivery of an integrated transmission system. It has therefore been necessary for the Applicant to continue to incorporate flexibility within the consent application to enable the further development of SEP and DEP under a range of potential scenarios. Doing so ensures that these Critical National</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<p>Priority developments will be delivered in a timely manner within the prevailing regulatory regime at the time.</p> <p>The Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074] provide an overview and explanation of the project development scenarios within the DCO.</p> <p>If delivered under the preferred option, the projects will be an industry first, and will be delivered in direct response to the government ambition for greater coordination in offshore wind with respect to transmission systems whilst limiting the impacts on the environment and local community.</p> <p>The Applicant's approach in the DCO application is consistent with the Government's ambition to deploy offshore wind development as quickly as possible and with the wider policy ambition to deliver this Critical National Priority infrastructure in a coordinated manner.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 1.1.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	<p>Draft EN-5 1.1.6</p>	<p><u>The DESNZ-led Offshore Transmission Network Review [OTNR] and the Ofgem-led Electricity Transmission Network Planning Review [ETNPR] seek to deliver more strategic onshore and offshore transmission network planning, considering the networks as a whole, rather than just individual transmission projects.</u></p> <p><u>This approach aims to ensure network development can allow decarbonisation targets to be met in the most efficient and timely manner. It considers and seeks to strike an appropriate balance between costs to consumers, timely delivery and the minimisation of community and environmental</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is a member of the Offshore Transmission Network Review (OTNR) Expert Advisory Group and has been proactively engaged with the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ), the Office of Gas and Electricity Markets (Ofgem) and National Grid ESO with the regards to the OTNR process and regulatory changes required to enable greater co-ordination in offshore wind.</p> <p>This is evidenced by the letter from The Rt Hon Greg Hands MP, Minister of State for Energy, Clean Growth and Climate Change to Equinor's Senior Vice-President of North Sea Renewables dated 29 June 2022 ('the award of Pathfinder status letter') (Appendix A of the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074]).</p> <p>'Pathfinder' projects are proposals that have the potential to deliver benefits on better co-ordinated offshore transmission systems in the near-term and provide important learnings for the other parts of the OTNR process.</p> <p>SEP and DEP is a co-ordinated project in the terms of the OTNR and by co-ordinating two windfarm extensions into a single application with shared</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		impacts of new network infrastructure from an early stage of network planning.	<p>cable corridor, landfall and onshore substation location, it is maximising the potential for co-ordination of the aspects of the project under the Applicant's control.</p> <p>The co-ordination of both extension projects into the same application, despite the differing ownerships involved, is significant because the impacts would have been greater had the extension projects been applied for separately and developed on different timescales, potentially leading, in particular, to two separate onshore export cable routes and substation locations being developed to serve the respective windfarm extensions.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 1.1.6 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
Factors influencing site selection and design	Draft EN-5 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.4	<p>The Applicant does not substantially control the initiating and terminating points of new electricity networks infrastructure. The siting is determined by the location of new generating stations and/or system capacity by the Electricity System Operator.</p> <p>However, the draft NPS expects a strategic and holistic approach to onshore and offshore network planning and the Applicant to identify the most efficient way of meeting the decarbonisation targets and should reduce the overall amount of network infrastructure required.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021], Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] and ES Appendix 3.1 – Onshore Substation Site Selection Report [APP-175] set out the iterative process that has influenced the design of electricity network infrastructure for SEP and DEP, including the onshore and offshore cabling and substation.</p> <p>The detailed description of the transmission system and the associated electricity infrastructure is in the Applicant's Cable Statement [APP-283]. The Applicant's response to WQ2.2.2.1 within The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [REP3-101] outlines the Connection and Infrastructure Options Note (CION) process that culminated in a Grid Connection Agreement for connection at Norwich Main. The CION process, led by National Grid Electricity System Operator (NG ESO), is designed to identify the most economic and efficient point for the grid connection.</p> <p>As set out in the response to paragraph 1.1.4 above, in light of the Government initiative to see greater coordination in offshore wind, and reduce disruption to the local community, the Applicant reinforced the strategic decision to develop SEP and DEP together from an early stage of the projects. The strategy is to coordinate the two separately owned projects as far as possible, with the ambition to deliver the two projects with an integrated transmission system.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<p>The Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074] provide an overview and explanation of the project development scenarios within the DCO. Each of the development scenarios offer a range of benefits, with the preferred option (integrated transmission system built concurrently) particularly benefitting the planning and construction of the Projects, being likely to reduce the overall environmental impact and disruption to local communities and responding to concerns regarding the lack of a holistic approach to offshore wind development in general.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraphs 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	Draft EN-5 2.2.5	<p><u>Additionally, applicants</u> retain control <u>in managing the identification of</u> routing and site selection <u>between</u> the identified <u>initiating and terminating points</u> or <u>within the</u> development zone.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] and Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] demonstrate the process of identifying the routing and site selection between the landfall and Onshore Substation. The onshore cable route avoids sensitive features including settlements, landscape and designated nature conservation sites and designated landscapes such as the North Norfolk Heritage Coast (NNHC). The NNHC is 0.6 km west of the onshore Order Limits and 0.2 km west of the offshore Order Limits.</p> <p>The offshore export cable corridor is designed to include sufficient space for the cable trenches and micrositing the cable around any sensitive feature. The export cable corridor will allow a separate trench with a spacing of up to 100 m between the cables allowing SEP and DEP to be constructed separately, sequentially and concurrently.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.2.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	Draft EN-5 2.2.7	<p><u>The</u> connection between the initiating and terminating points of a proposed new electricity line <u>will often</u> not <u>be</u> via the most direct route. <u>Siting constraints, such as</u> engineering, environmental <u>or</u> community</p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] and ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021] describe the selection process for onshore and offshore transmission route, avoiding the most sensitive habitats and considering other technical and environmental constraints.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		considerations will be important in determining a feasible route	<p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.2.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
Strategic Network Planning	Draft 2.8.1 EN-5	A strategic approach to network planning proposed through the Centralised Strategic Network Planning process under the Ofgem-led Electricity Transmission Network Planning Review [ETNPR] will identify strategic investments intended to facilitate achieving net zero and decarbonisation targets.	<p>The March 2023 draft EN-5 refers to strategic investments to the electricity network led by Ofgem.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.8.1 of the March 2023 draft EN-5 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>
	Draft 2.9.14 EN-5	<p>Where the nature or proposed route of an overhead line will likely result in particularly significant landscape and visual impacts, the applicant should demonstrate that they have given due consideration to the costs and benefits of feasible alternatives to the line. This could include – where appropriate – re-routing, underground or subsea cables and the feasibility e.g. in cost, engineering or environmental terms of these.</p>	<p>At an early design of the project, the Applicant made the decision to reduce potential impacts by not having overhead lines when crossing sensitive landscapes as set out in the Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056]. Therefore, the proposed development does not include overhead lines. The entire onshore cabling is buried underground. The onshore substation at Norwich Main Substation would have the greatest effects during the operational phase of SEP and DEP which are fully considered in Section 26.6 of ES Chapter 26 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-112].</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.9.14 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	Draft 2.9.24 EN-5	<p>The government has not laid down any further rule on the circumstances requiring use of underground or subsea cables, the Secretary of State must weigh the feasibility, cost, and any harm of the undergrounding or subsea option against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the adverse implications of the overhead line proposal; • the cost and feasibility of re- routing overhead lines or mitigation proposals for the relevant line section; and; 	<p>This policy relates to a decision to promote overhead lines (which are not included in the application) as compared to alternative solutions and is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the cost and feasibility of the reconfiguration, rationalisation, and/or use of underground or subsea cabling of proximate existing or proposed electricity networks infrastructure. 	
	<p>Draft EN-5 2.9.25</p>	<p>In such cases the Secretary of State should only grant development consent for underground or subsea sections of a proposed line over an overhead alternative if it is satisfied that the benefits accruing from the former proposal clearly outweigh any extra economic, social, or environmental impacts that it presents, and that any technical obstacles associated with it are surmountable. In this context it should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the landscape and visual baseline characteristics of the setting of the proposed route, (in particular, the impact on high sensitivity visual receptors (as defined in the current edition of the Landscape Institute’s Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment), residential areas, designated landscapes, designated heritage assets and Heritage Coasts (including, where relevant, impacts on the setting of designated features and areas)); 	<p>The proposed cabling is underground for onshore and (where possible) buried up to 1 m below the seabed for offshore transmission. The proposed development therefore does not have an overhead alternative element in the DCO application.</p> <p>For onshore transmission, any overhead cabling would have visual, seascape and landscape impacts across a large geographic area that would be difficult to mitigate against. ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] and the Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056] demonstrate the process of identifying the routing and site selection between the landfall and Norwich Main Substation. The onshore cabling route avoids sensitive features including settlements, the Heritage Coast and other heritage assets, landscape and designated nature conservation sites and designated landscapes such as the NNHC.</p> <p>As referred to in ES Chapter 19 Land Use, Agricultural and Recreation (Revision B) [REP2-022], the Applicant has sought to minimise land take and avoid wherever possible the likelihood of sterile land parcels resulting from construction activity within the study area. This has involved aligning the study area with field boundaries and utilising existing vehicle access tracks where possible. During construction, the construction easement will be kept to a minimum and access to severed land for farm vehicles would be maintained using agreed crossing points with landowners and occupiers. Furthermore, an Agricultural Liaison Officer (ALO) will be appointed to assist with the appropriate planning and timings of works to minimise disruption to agricultural activities.</p> <p>For offshore transmission, the subsea cable route has been selected, in part, based on lessons learnt from the cable installation for the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Wind Farms. As set out in section 3.5 of ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], key site selection criteria</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the additional cost of the proposed underground or sub-sea alternatives, including their significantly higher lifetime cost of repair and later uprating; the potentially very disruptive effects of undergrounding on local communities, habitats, archaeological and heritage sites, soil, geology, and, for a substantial time after construction, landscape and visual amenity. (Undergrounding an overhead line will mean digging a trench along the length of the route, and so such works will often be disruptive – albeit temporarily – to the receptors listed above than would an overhead line of equivalent rating); 	<p>for SEP and DEP included achieving the shortest and most direct route for the export cables to reduce environmental impacts, transmission losses and costs. The routing sought to avoid key sensitive features and to minimize the disruption to existing infrastructure and other marine users. The proposed routing runs parallel and then makes an eastern approach to landfall avoiding crossing the cabling for Hornsea Project Three and pipelines as well as the area of outcropping chalk nearshore.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.9.25 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <u>potentially very disruptive effects of subsea cables on the seabed and the species that live in and on it, including physical damage to and full loss of seabed habitats. Cable protection can also be required where cables cross each other, or where they cannot be buried deep enough to protect them from becoming exposed. Such protection causes additional impacts that are often greater than those of the cable much coastal land is protected habitat and landfall connections could cause additional disruption to coastal communities itself due to the large areas covered. There can also be issues where subsea cables make landfall, as much coastal land is protected habitat and landfall connections could cause additional disruption to coastal communities.</u> 	

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the applicant's commitment, as set out in their ES, to mitigate the potential detrimental effects of undergrounding works on any relevant agricultural land and soils, particularly regarding Best and Most Versatile land. Such a commitment must guarantee appropriate handling of soil, backfilling, and return of the land to the baseline Agricultural Land Classification (ALC), thus ensuring no loss or degradation of agricultural land. Such a commitment should be based on soil and ALC surveys in line with the 1988 ALC criteria and due consideration of the Defra Construction Code 	
Mitigation	Draft EN-5 2.10.1	Applicant should consider and address routing and avoidance/minimisation of environmental impacts both onshore and offshore at an early stage in the development process.	<p>ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] sets out the process adopted for selecting the routing of the onshore and offshore transmission network.</p> <p>The proposed onshore cable corridor was selected based upon guiding design principles and a cable corridor refinement process which included consultation feedback. The onshore cable corridor is largely determined by the location and configuration of the onshore substation relative to the landfall.</p> <p>A route refinement process was undertaken at the ES stage to reduce the 200 m wide corridor to a route that (with the exception of the crossing of the Food Enterprise Park (FEP)) has a final width of 60m for the DCO application, increasing to a width of 100m for trenchless crossing zones, such as main rivers and A roads.</p> <p>The proposed offshore export cable corridor will avoid crossing the Hornsea Project Three export cable as it runs to the south of existing Dudgeon Offshore</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<p>Windfarm (DOW). The proposed offshore export cable routes to the east and parallel to the existing DOW and thus avoids any unnecessary cable crossings.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant proposes to use a long HDD at the landfall which completely avoids the subtidal outcropping chalk MCZ feature at Weybourne landfall. The Weybourne landfall also avoids the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and any interaction with National Nature Reserves (NNR) along the Norfolk coast (e.g Mundesley Cliffs SSSI and Paston Great Barn NNR).</p> <p>The proposed onshore export cables between the landfall and the electrical connection point at Norwich Main Substation would involve a new underground [buried] cable system rather than any new overhead lines. The preference is to have the shortest onshore export cable to minimise the overall footprint and the number of receptors that could be affected.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.10.1 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
<p>Special assessment principles for offshore-onshore transmission</p>	<p>Draft EN-5 2.12.3 to 2.12.5</p>	<p>It is important that the network planning for offshore transmission is much more closely co-ordinated with the planning of connections to reinforcements of the onshore transmission network than previously. This includes interconnectors, multi-purpose interconnectors [MPIs] and offshore 'bootstraps' reinforcing the onshore network.</p> <p>The above offshore-onshore transmission co-ordination work is undertaken through a process of ongoing reform as part of the OTNR.</p> <p>In addition, a more co-ordinated approach to designing transmission offshore is expected to be adopted compared with the previous standard approach of radial routes to shore. This applies to spatially close groups of</p>	<p>The OTNR was launched in July 2020 to ensure that transmission connections for offshore wind generation can be delivered to support the UK Government's ambitions to increase offshore wind power to 50GW by 2030 and to deliver on its Net Zero ambitions. It is essential to understand that the OTNR is following a multi-stranded approach in relation to different categories of offshore projects, depending on the timeline of each project. SEP and DEP necessarily fell into the category of 'Early Opportunities/Pathfinders' which had least general opportunity for co-ordination because they were so far advanced when the OTNR was launched.</p> <p>As explained in the Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenario Statement [REP3-074], the Applicant had, however, already committed to co-ordination of SEP and DEP into a single DCO application, prior to the launch of the OTNR and the September 2021 drafts of the Energy NPSs. The Applicant went on to seek, and subsequently be awarded, 'Pathfinder' status as part of the Early Opportunities strand of the OTNR.</p> <p>The application is a 'Pathfinder' in co-ordination principally because it:</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		offshore windfarms, interconnectors, multi-purpose interconnectors and bootstraps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-ordinates two offshore windfarm projects, which come under separate ownerships, into a single DCO application; • Aligns the two export cable systems serving the two windfarm extension projects into a single co-ordinated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ offshore and onshore export cable corridor; ○ landfall; and ○ onshore substation location; and • Provides for the possibility for the integrated transmission system, and for co-ordinated and/or concurrent construction of the works serving both windfarm extension projects. Whilst the Applicant prefers an integrated transmission system constructed concurrently, this cannot be guaranteed for the reasons explained in the Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenario Statement [REP3-074]. <p>Multi-purpose interconnectors (MPI) / interconnectors combine offshore wind with links to neighbouring countries. The proposed development intends to supply all of its electricity for domestic use and therefore does not make provision for exporting to other countries. The Applicant does not control how electricity is allocated domestically or internationally. Therefore, the reference to interconnectors / MPI in the draft EN-5 is not relevant to the proposed development.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraphs 2.12.3 to 2.12.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
Critical national priority	Draft EN-5 2.12.7	Offshore wind development and the supporting onshore and offshore transmission infrastructure and related network reinforcements required is viewed by the government as being a CNP and should be progressed as quickly as possible. This includes infrastructure identified in the	<p>The Applicant recognises the urgent need for affordable, reliable and secure sources of renewable energy. It responds to the UK Government’s ambitions by combining two separately owned wind farms into one DCO application. The DCO application seeks to consent a range of development scenarios in the same overall corridor to allow for separate development if required, and to accommodate either sequential or concurrent build of the two projects. The development scenarios are explained in the Scenarios Statement [APP3-14]</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		Holistic Network Design and its follow-on exercises in Section 2.13.	<p>and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074].</p> <p>The Applicant understands that, whilst the timing for adoption and final wording of the draft NPSs is currently unknown, the SoS may take into account the Critical National Priority as an “important and relevant matter” in its decision making on the DCO application for SEP and DEP in accordance with section 104(2)(d) of the Planning Act 2008. The introduction of draft policy on offshore wind as a Critical National Priority also lends even greater emphasis to current national policy that there is urgent need for renewable electricity NSIPs, established in section 3.3 of the extant NPS EN-1.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can considered in accordance with paragraph 2.12.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
Consenting process	Draft EN-5 2.12.8	As part of the transition to a more coordinated approach, it is anticipated that some proposals for transmission may be consented separately to those for the windfarm [array] application.	Paragraph 2.12.8 of the draft EN-5 is not relevant to SEP and DEP as it has included the grid connection within the application.
Offshore-onshore transmission: Applicant assessment [Consideration of strategic network design]	Draft EN-5 2.13.1 to 2.13.4	<p>The strategic network designs such as those led or enabled by National Grid Electricity System Operator [ESO] will usually form the basis for identifying proposals for co-ordinated transmission. This includes the Holistic Network Design [HND] for onshore-offshore transmission prepared by ESO for projects under the Pathway to 2030 workstream.</p> <p>The HND and its follow-on network design and planning exercises identify the transmission infrastructure needed, both onshore and offshore, to support offshore wind developments. These include the onshore connection points for offshore</p>	<p>According to “<i>Pathway to 2030, A holistic network design to support wind deployment for net zero</i>”, the National Grid does not have a Holistic Network Design for its Southeast and South Coast of England Region which the proposed development is in.</p> <p>Finally, National Grid has made an offer for connection at Norwich Main Substation to which the proposed onshore transmission network connects. It is considered the proposed development has embedded co-ordination in its design because the application comprises of two separate windfarms (SEP and DEP). In that respect SEP and DEP can be said to be ahead of their time in relation to the emergence of the grid coordination agenda. SEP and DEP are Pathfinder projects within the OTNR process to seek to facilitate the delivery of an integrated grid solution for both projects.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		<p>transmission and potential future Multi-Purpose Interconnector opportunities.</p> <p>The work of the HND considered the objectives for designs to be economic and efficient, deliverable and operable, minimise impact on the environment and minimise the impact on the local communities for the offshore transmission aspects. Through this work steps have already been taken to reduce avoidable cumulative impacts. Assessment of projects coming forward from this design should acknowledge these prior steps.</p> <p>In the case of infrastructure identified through the HND, applicants should identify any variations to or developments from that work and justify these in accordance with the same objectives or criteria above, i.e. economic and efficient, deliverable and operable, minimise impact on the environment and minimise the impact on the local communities, giving these four criteria equal weight.</p>	<p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraphs 2.13.1 to 2.13.4 of the March 2023 draft EN-5, to the extent it is relevant given that HND did not formally apply to East Anglia.</p>
<p>Offshore-onshore transmission: Applicant assessment Co-ordinated approach, including for 'Early</p>	<p>Draft EN-5 2.13.5</p>	<p>Radial offshore transmission options to single windfarms should only be proposed where options assessment work identifies that a co-ordinated solution is not feasible. For OTNR Early Opportunities projects, co-ordinated design work should be brought forward by applicants.</p>	<p>SEP and DEP are in the category 'Early Opportunities/Pathfinders' of the OTNR which had the least opportunity for co-ordination because they were so far advanced when the OTNR was launched. Nevertheless, the Applicant committed to co-ordinating SEP and DEP prior to the launch of the OTNR. The co-ordination of both extension projects into the same application, despite the differing ownerships involved, includes a single shared cable corridor, landfall and onshore substation site and is significant because, had the extension projects been applied for separately and developed on different timescales, the connection points offered may have been different, leading, in particular, to two</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
Opportunities' projects			<p>separate onshore cable routes being developed to serve the respective windfarm extensions.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.13.5 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	Draft EN-5 2.13.6	<p>The identification of co-ordinated solution options, and any radial option, should consider the criteria for designs to be deliverable and operable, economic and efficient, minimise impact on the environment and minimise impact on the local communities. Options should seek to identify the most appropriate balance between these criteria.</p>	<p>The proposed offshore export cable corridor and the landfall location result from iterative designs and assessments taking account of technical constraints and impacts on the environment. Furthermore, SEP and DEP also accord with designated NPS policy relating to co-ordination (and minimisation of impacts generally) by combining the two requirements for offshore export cable corridors, landfalls, onshore export cable corridors and onshore substations for both windfarm extensions into the same shared location in each case and under all project development scenarios set out in Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to Scenarios Statement [REP3-074].</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] and ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021] set out the Applicant's rationales for the co-ordinated design.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.13.6 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	Draft EN-5 2.13.7	<p>The coordinated solutions assessed should seek to be ambitious in the degree of co-ordination, wherever possible. This includes taking account of geographic and temporally proximate projects including opportunities to connect wind farms and multi-purpose interconnectors and/or bootstraps with each other. Evidence should demonstrate that this has been considered in the assessment of options.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], ES Chapter 4 Project Description (Revision C) [REP5-021], the Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074] set out the Applicant's design process for a co-ordinated solution. This explains that SEP and DEP have been ambitious in pursuing coordination before the OTNR process was even launched. There were no geographically relevant MPI or bootstrap proposals at the time this approach was determined (2019) and, in any event, the regulatory regime had barely begun to address the regulatory challenges of allowing such connections.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.13.7 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
	Draft EN-5 2.13.8	<u>If, through the coordinated options assessment work, a radial route is deemed to be the only feasible solution, applicants should evidence each co-ordination option and the accompanying assessment. These assessments should detail the application of the criteria identified above versus the radial counterfactual.</u>	<p>The proposed offshore export cable corridor is a linear route combining the export cables for two separately owned windfarms. The offshore export cable corridor will terminate at one landfall location. The Applicant's approach demonstrates co-ordination between two separately owned wind farms, SEP and DEP, as explained in the Scenarios Statement [APP-314], to deliver two projects through a single application. This policy applies to a stand-alone application for a single wind farm promoting a radial connection.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.13.8 of the draft EN-5 is not relevant to SEP and DEP.</p>
Offshore-onshore transmission: Applicant assessment [Impacts]	Draft EN-5 2.13.9	<u>Co-ordinated transmission proposals, including multi-purpose interconnectors, are expected to reduce the overall environmental and community impacts associated with bringing offshore transmission onshore compared to an uncoordinated, radial approach. These reduced impacts could, for example, relate to: fewer landing sites and reduced landfall impacts; reduced overall cable length and impacts; and fewer cable corridors and reduced impacts from these.</u>	<p>The Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and the Supplementary Information to the Scenarios Statement [REP3-074] provide an overview and explanation of the project development scenarios within the DCO. Each of the development scenarios offer a range of benefits, with the preferred option (integrated transmission system built concurrently) particularly benefitting the planning and construction of the Projects, being likely to reduce the overall environmental impact and disruption to local communities, and responding to concerns regarding the lack of a holistic approach to offshore wind development in general. In all development scenarios, there will be one landing point and one export cable corridor and one substation location.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.13.9 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	Draft EN-5 2.13.10	<u>Similarly, the related onshore infrastructure required in conjunction with the offshore transmission to enable offshore wind to be connected at its onshore grid connection point is expected to reduce the overall environmental and community impacts. This is in comparison with that which would be required for radial connections from single offshore windfarms to the shore.</u>	<p>SEP and DEP is a co-ordinated project in the terms of the OTNR and by coordinating two windfarm extensions into a single project with shared cable corridor, landfall and onshore substation location it is maximising the co-ordination of the aspects of the project under the Applicant's control.</p> <p>The onshore infrastructure has therefore been designed to coordinate with the offshore infrastructure, with only one landfall location connecting to the offshore cable export corridor and one onshore substation location. The export cable corridor has also been sited and designed after careful consideration of overall environmental and community impacts as set out under the responses to paragraphs 2.13.15, 2.13.16 & 2.13.17 of the March 2023 draft EN-5 (below) and in Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.13.10 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	<p>Draft EN-5 2.13.11,2.13.12 & 2.13.13</p>	<p><u>For onshore infrastructure, reduced impacts could, for example, relate to fewer substations and transmission lines as well as demonstrating how environmental and community impacts have been avoided as far as possible.</u></p> <p><u>Applicants are expected to be able to indicate how co-ordination including reduction in impacts have been considered drawing on work of others, including that led or enabled under the OTNR such as by National Grid Electricity System Operator [ESO].</u></p> <p><u>For those projects not covered by the strategic network planning undertaken by the ESO, applicants should seek to demonstrate the reduced overall impacts from co-ordination and how the onshore connection locations have been identified. Early Opportunities projects are expected to demonstrate the reductions in environmental and community impact achieved through co-ordination compared with radial solutions.</u></p>	<p>The whole cable routing selection process, and site selection studies for the substation were predicated on reducing environmental impacts as far as possible, as set out in Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089], and the use of embedded mitigation as described within the Design and Access Statement (Onshore) (Revision B) [REP3-056].</p> <p>The Project Vision [APP-313] details the design principles that have been adopted which outline how environmental and community impacts have been avoided as far as possible. Of note, the combining of the two projects in a single DCO has enabled the projects to share a single substation site and a single onshore cable corridor, reducing associated environmental and community impacts.</p> <p>Referred in ES Chapter 19 Land Use, Agriculture and Recreation (Revision B) [REP2-022], SEP and DEP has sought to minimise land take and avoid wherever possible the likelihood of sterile land parcels resulting from construction activity within the study area. This has involved aligning the study area with field boundaries and utilising existing vehicle access tracks where possible. During construction, the easement will be kept to a minimum and access to severed land for farm vehicles would be maintained using agreed crossing points with landowners and occupiers. Furthermore, an Agricultural Liaison Officer (ALO) will be appointed to assist with the appropriate planning and timings of works to minimise disruption to agricultural activities.</p> <p>Ancient woodland (given as an example of an irreplaceable habitat in the National Planning Policy Framework, no definition is given in draft NPS EN-3) is the only irreplaceable habitat that occurs within the Zone of Influence of the onshore cable route. All ancient woodland has been avoided through the route selection process. Where ancient woodland is close to the Order Limits then buffers to distance construction activities from receptors and mitigation measures are secured in the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17] and the Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.19]. Use of</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<p>Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) will be used to avoid impacts to other woodlands).</p> <p>The onshore cable corridor has the potential to affect a single watercourse designated as a SSSI - the River Wensum. Potential impacts to the River Wensum SSSI are considered in ES Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026]. The Applicant has committed to cross this designated water body, other major watercourses, A and B roads, and other key infrastructure using HDD to minimise the potential for any impacts. Project design has avoided sensitive features where possible. Embedded mitigation measures and further mitigation measures are set out in ES Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026]. Again, the use of HDD will avoid impacts to the River Wensum SSSI and other watercourses.</p> <p>The Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.19] sets out measures to manage and mitigate impacts to other ecological receptors. Of note, it is proposed to carry out pre-construction surveys (the detail of which is set out within Table 2), which will inform the final mitigation. The Outline Ecological Management Plan (OEMP) (Revision D) [document reference 9.19] also includes details of the biodiversity net gain commitments which have been made as part of the Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306].</p> <p>The construction impacts on the communities are localised and are set out in ES Chapter 22 Air Quality [APP-108], ES Appendix 23.3 Construction Noise Assessment [APP-266], Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Revision D) [REP5-028], and the Outline Code of Construction Practice (Revision F) [document reference 9.17]. Impacts are reduced through the use of embedded mitigation and specifically HDD to reduce impacts to and ensure continued use of roads during construction.</p> <p>Noise impacts on terrestrial protected species is considered in ES Chapter 20 Onshore Ecology and Ornithology (Revision C) [REP3-026].</p> <p>During the course of the design development of the Order Limits for SEP and DEP key constraints were avoided where possible and included populated</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<p>areas and residential properties. This is detailed further in ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089].</p> <p>This project is not part of the HND and will be delivered as a Pathfinder project of the OTNR.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraphs 2.13.11,2.13.12 and 2.13.13 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
<p>Offshore-onshore transmission: Applicant assessment [Coastal connections]</p>	<p>Draft EN-5 2.13.15, 2.13.16 & 2.13.17</p>	<p>The sensitivities of many coastal locations and of the marine environment as well as the potential environmental, community and other impacts in neighbouring onshore areas must be considered in the identification onshore connection points.</p> <p>Onshore connection points for offshore transmission bringing power from offshore wind farms must be considered as part of the overall offshore transmission network design and in conjunction with the onshore network by the body responsible for the design.</p> <p>Onshore connection locations for offshore transmission must seek to minimise environmental and other impacts, both onshore and in the marine environment and including to local communities.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 3 Site Selection & Assessment of Alternatives [APP-089] sets out the iterative process for determining the onshore connection point for offshore transmission. ES Appendix 3.2 - Cable Landfall Concept Study [APP-176] details the feasibility of having a landfall at Weybourne.</p> <p>The route of the offshore export cable corridor and the location of landfall has been subject to an extensive site selection process considering the marine environment and potential environmental, community and other impacts in neighbouring onshore areas. The landfall site has been selected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerably flatter topography (8 m cliffs at Weybourne compared to 32 m high cliffs at other potential locations); • Shorter export cable route, minimising the area of environmental impact; • Good access using existing roads and tracks; • Avoids the SSSI and any interaction with NNR (NNR) along the Norfolk coast [e.g. Mundesley Cliffs SSSI and Paston Great Barn NNR]; • Avoids the NNHC; • Avoids the Annex I habitats of The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC (Special Area of Conservation) which are in unfavourable condition; • Potential for long HDD technique at the landfall, avoiding impact to the chalk outcropping associated with the CSCB MCZ and Weybourne Cliffs SSSI;

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located close to the existing Dudgeon and Sheringham Shoal HDD landfalls for which considerable experience, data and lessons learnt are available resulting in a high level of confidence in the engineering feasibility of landfall and HDD works at this location; and • Private land along the beach for duct preparation (as was used during the construction of the Dudgeon OWF). <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraphs 2.13.15, 2.13.16 and 2.13.17 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
Offshore-onshore transmission: mitigation	Draft EN-5 2.14.1	Adverse impacts on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) have caused consenting delays, and in some cases a need for compensatory measures under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Conservation of Offshore Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, or measures of equivalent environmental benefit under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. Therefore, applicants should consider and address routing and avoidance/minimisation of environmental impacts both onshore and offshore at an early stage in the development process. Applicants should also facilitate delivery of strategic compensation measures where appropriate.	<p>The site selection avoids Marine Protected Areas (MPA) where possible including the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC.</p> <p>Up to 11 km of the offshore export cable corridor passes through the Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ). The MCZ protects important geological features including the best examples of subtidal chalk beds in the North Sea, as well as subtidal exposures of clay and peat.</p> <p>Stage 1 Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone Assessment (MCZA) (Revision B) [document reference 5.6] confirms the construction, operation and decommissioning of the project will not hinder the conservation objective of maintaining the protected features of the CSCB MCZ in a favourable condition or restoring them to favourable condition. The cumulative impacts of all development scenarios and with Hornsea Three will also not hinder the conservation objective. Therefore, mitigation measures are sufficient to mitigate against environmental impacts and strategic compensation measures are not warranted.</p> <p>A range of embedded mitigation measures have been identified to avoid, minimise and mitigate potential effects on the CSCB MCZ in the Outline Cromer Shoal Chalk Beds (CSCB) Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) Cable Specification, Installation and Monitoring Plan (CSIMP) (Revision B) [document reference 9.7].</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
			<p>The embedded measures include minimising the length of export cable corridor in the MCZ, widening the export cable width to allow micrositing, avoiding cable crossing the MCZ, avoiding the outcropping chalk feature in the nearshore.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that the export cables can be buried by using a similar ploughing method to the one used at the Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm (SOW) which would minimise the need for external cable protection for unburied cables within the MCZ.</p> <p>The Applicant will update the Outline CSCB MCZ CSIMP following detailed design and additional geophysical and benthic surveys and confirmation of the mitigation measures with Natural England and the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) before construction starts.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.14.1 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
	<p>Draft EN-5 2.14.2</p>	<p><u>In the assessments of their designs, applicants should demonstrate:</u></p> <p><u>how environmental, community and other impacts have been considered and how adverse impacts have followed the mitigation hierarchy i.e. avoidance, reduction and mitigation of adverse impacts through good design; and how enhancements to the environment post construction will be achieved including demonstrating consideration of how proposals can contribute towards biodiversity net gain, as well as wider environmental improvements in line with the Environmental Improvement Plan and environmental targets.</u></p> <p><u>In addition, all applicants are encouraged to demonstrate how the construction planning for the proposals has been co-ordinated with</u></p>	<p>Further details of the environmental, community and other impacts are set out in individual topic chapters of the ES for SEP and DEP.</p> <p>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. The Consultation Report [APP-029] demonstrates how the Applicant has sought and incorporated communities' comments into the design of this project.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation to minimise potential impacts at the coast from cable installation and operation are described in ES Chapter 6 Marine Geology, Oceanography and Physical Process [APP-092] and include for example minimising the requirement for cable protection measures and thus effects on sediment transport. Use of external cable protection would be minimised in all cases and in the nearshore is only included for potential use at the HDD exit point.</p> <p>The onshore cabling will be entirely buried underground and avoid sensitive areas. Where the cable cannot avoid sensitive areas, the Applicant commits to using HDD when crossing the River Wensum SSSI, major watercourses, A and B roads, and other key infrastructure.</p>

Topics	Paragraph Number	Requirements in the draft NPS EN-5	Applicant Response
		that for other similar projects in the area on a similar timeline.	<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 in ES Appendix 20.6 Initial Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Revision B) [REP3-048] and the Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-306]. The assessment identified minor net losses to Habitat Units and River Units with minor net gains to Hedgerow Units. Opportunities include replacing removed habitats with higher distinctiveness, for example, neutral grassland in lieu of modified grassland, although these will require agreement with landowners.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to work with stakeholders to reduce impacts and ensure deliverability of SEP and DEP together with other projects within the area, including the Food Enterprise Park (FEP), Solar Docking Farm, transport projects such as the A47 and Norwich Western Link, Hornsea 3 and Norfolk Vanguard/Boreas.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.14.2 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>
Offshore-onshore transmission: Secretary of State decision-making	Draft EN-5 2.15.1	Coordinated approaches to delivering offshore-onshore transmission to minimise overall environmental, community, and other impacts, as set out above, must be considered.	<p>The Applicant demonstrated its commitment to design the project in a co-ordinated way by having one landfall location, one onshore and offshore cable export corridor, by siting the onshore substation in close proximity of Norwich Main Substation after accepting the National Grid offer. Most importantly, the project has been selected as a Pathfinder project to the OTNR which will provide lessons learnt for future projects in England. Impacts on the environment and communities are avoided, for instance ancient woodlands are avoided by the cable route and where the line of the route passes across the River Wensum SSSI and SAC a trenchless technique is used to pass under it. The Applicant's approach to coordination is explain in the Scenarios Statement [APP-314] and in various responses given above to other policy strands within the NPS, which are not repeated here.</p> <p>As such SEP and DEP can be considered in accordance with paragraph 2.15.1 of the March 2023 draft EN-5.</p>

References

<p>Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, a Ministerial letter confirming SEP and DEP part of the first tranche of Pathfinders under the OTNR, dated 29 June 2022.</p>
<p>Department for Energy Security and Net Zero and Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy, Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener, October 2021.</p>
<p>Department for Energy Security and Net Zero and Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy, Energy white paper: Powering our net zero future, December 2020.</p>
<p>Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, Draft Overarching National Policy Statement for energy (EN-1) March 2023</p>
<p>National Grid (2022) Pathway to 2030, A holistic network design to support offshore wind deployment for net zero.</p>